United States of America

Congressional Record

CORRECTION

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 22, 2010 No. 44

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC.
March 22. 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANN KIRKPATRICK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

DARK DAY FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Yesterday was an historic day in this Nation. The problem for our citizens is that it was historically dark. Madam Speaker, it's raining in Washington today. It's raining because our Founders are weeping. Our Founders are weeping over the incredible vote taken yesterday that was an affront to federalism, an affront to individual liberty, and an affront to freedom. And it's distressing—so very distressing—to so many citizens across this land because they know there were positive solutions—there are positive solutions—to put in place as it relates to the challenges that we face in health care.

As a physician, I know that when you put government in between patients and families and doctors, it is destructive—destructive to the trust that we hold dear in order to bring about the greatest amount of quality health care in our land. It was distressing on another avenue as well, and that is it was so hyper partisan—the hyper-partisan way in which this vote passed. Madam Speaker, the bipartisan vote on this bill was a ''no'' vote. The vote was 219–212—all Republicans, joined by 34 Democrats, opposing the bill.

In much of the debate yesterday, we heard about how it was being compared to Social Security in 1935 and Medicare in 1965 and the momentous aspects of those votes. Madam Speaker, it's curious to note that on those votes, the House approved the Medicare bill in 1965 by a vote of 313–115, with nearly half of the House Republicans voting for it at that time. In the Senate, it was approved 68–21, with half of the Republicans supporting it. A major difference between that vote and this vote. Social Security passed the House in 1935 by a vote of 372–77, with four-to-one, or 80 percent of the Republicans supporting it in the House, and 75 percent of the Republicans in the Senate supporting it.

So, Madam Speaker, it is so distressing that this bill had to be so divisive—not just for this Chamber, but for our land. The American people are angry. And they're angry because they don't believe that the bill that was passed yesterday includes any of the fundamental American principles that we hold dear for health care—affordability, accessibility, quality, responsiveness, innovation, choices. All of those are things that we believe ought to be in place for health care in our Nation. All of them are violated by the bill that was passed yesterday and reportedly will be signed into law tomorrow by the President.

Madam Speaker, the American people are angry. They want Washington to listen. They deserve Washington to listen. We are about to be a government that no longer has the consent of the governed. Madam Speaker, that's a very dangerous place to be. So I call on Speaker PELOSI and I call on the Democrats—the Democrats in charge in this House—to end the arrogance of one-party rule; end the tyranny of one-party rule; end what Alexis de Tocqueville over 150 years ago said was the only threat to our Nation, and that is the tyranny of the majority. End the tyranny of the majority in this town right now.

The challenges that we have in this Nation are immense, and they can be solved most beneficially, respecting our Founders and respecting our citizens, by working together positively in a truly bipartisan way and by listening and representing our constituents. I call on the Speaker for positive action for freedom and for liberty and for democracy.

HONORING THE LIVES OF DOUG SHRIVER AND RAY WRIGHT

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

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Doug Shriver, who was tragically killed with his friend Ray Wright on Friday, March 19, while clearing snow from the roof of Mr. Wright's cabin above Creede, Colorado. Mr. Shriver was my friend and a tremendously respected member of the San Luis Valley and Colorado water community. He was only 54 years old.

Printed on recycled paper.

Combined, both of these men held nearly 60 years of water knowledge related to the Upper Rio Grande basin and State of Colorado. Shriver was on the Colorado Ground Water Commission and served as president of the Rio Grande Water Users Association, an umbrella organization for ditch companies along the Rio Grande. All of these board positions were on a volunteer basis.

Doug's service on these boards put him in the middle of the San Luis Valley's successful fight to keep its groundwater, sought by the American Water Development, Inc., and later the Stockmen's Water Company, both who hoped to sell it to the big cities. At the time of his death, he championed the establishment of subdistricts to further protect the San Luis Valley's groundwater, a concept where groundwater users pay a combination of fees and assessments to retire farm ground and reduce groundwater pumping to protect the aquifer. Shriver was a visionary in the San Luis Valley and Colorado water community. He strongly believed that both wildlife and agriculture could live together, and was a vocal advocate for the rural way of life at the Statewide level. A native of eastern Rio Grande County, he farmed potatoes and small grains. He was also an avid outdoorsman, who loved to ride snowmobiles and four-wheelers in the high country. My heart goes out to his family and his wife Carla.

Madam Speaker, today, I also rise to pay tribute and honor the life of Ray Wright, who was tragically killed with his friend Doug Shriver in the same accident while clearing snow from the roof of his cabin in Creede, Colorado. Mr. Wright was my friend and a tremendously respected member of the San Luis Valley and Colorado's water community. He was 56 years old.

Wright served on the Rio Grande Water Conservation District for nearly two decades, with the last 10 years as president. He was also a member of Colorado's Interbasin Compact Committee, a Statewide board tasked with balancing the State's water needs, and had served two terms on the Colorado Water Conservation Board. All of these board positions were on a volunteer basis.

I served with Mr. Wright on the Rio Grande Water Conservation District board. His service on that board put him in the middle of San Luis Valley's successful fight to keep its groundwater, sought by AWDI and Stockmen's Water, who both hoped to sell it to big cities. At the time of his death, he championed the establishment also of the subdistricts to further protect the San Luis Valley's groundwater.

Ray was also a visionary in the San Luis Valley and the Colorado water community. He strongly believed that both wildlife and agriculture could live together, and was a vocal advocate for the rural way of life. A native of Rio Grande County, he farmed potatoes and small grains. He was also an avid outdoorsman and angler, who built his own bamboo fly rods.

He leaves three daughters—Suzanne, Sarah, and Lauren—as well as his longtime partner, Mona.

HEALTH CARE DEBATE ISN'T OVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, we had a significant event happen in this hall last night. And I don't have a lot to say about it. I'll let the numbers speak for themselves. Over $500 billion in Medicare cuts for seniors. Over $500 billion in new taxes for small businesses. In my home State of Texas, over $24 billion in unfunded Medicaid mandates. This is not the health care reform that the American people want. They want us to work together and come together in a bipartisan manner to have real solutions for their problems. We want every American to have access to quality, affordable health care. Unfortunately, the majority didn't want to deal with us. But this isn't over. They've got to get it passed through the Senate. There are going to be multiple lawsuits across the country and they're going to have to answer to the American people in November of this year.

I found it very telling at the end of the Speaker's speech last night that she had shifted her conversations from health care reform to health insurance reform. This debate isn't about health insurance reform. It's about giving every American access to quality, affordable health care. And I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to achieve that when this bill comes back to the House of Representatives.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m. today.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Father of love, source of all blessings, help us pass from our old life of brokenness and sin to the new life of healing and grace.

May Your word today bring good news to those most in need of Your mercy.

In our service to others and this Nation may we find You in our midst as our saving Lord with redeeming power.

Prepare us for the glory of Your kingdom 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. HALVORSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. HALVORSON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

CONCERNED CITIZENS MADE A DIFFERENCE

(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, the health care takeover vote last night was a battle in the ongoing war between supporters of limited government and the forces of big government. The fight will continue as we promote limited government and expanded freedom.

I was very encouraged in the last year by the activation of concerned citizens who fought hard to protect the doctor-patient relationship and prevent a Federal Government takeover of health care. Yesterday's outcome is sad for America, but don't think for one second citizens didn't make a difference.

After making voices heard loud and clear at town halls and tea party rallies across the country, voters moved on to the ballot boxes in Virginia, New Jersey, and Massachusetts. Washington liberals may have chosen to ignore the message, but citizens can remind them again soon that they are a force which has awakened to support change in the future.

Please know that while these efforts to protect the doctor-patient relationship and prevent a Federal Government takeover of health care were overlooked by a majority of lawmakers, they are certainly appreciated by the majority of freedom-loving Americans across the country.

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mrs. HALVORSON asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. HALVORSON. Madam Speaker, I want to just say that now that the health care bill has passed and the rhetoric and the politics and the noise can be set aside, now we will have an opportunity to let the American people know about what is in it.

This is going to be about accountability, about choice, and about lowering costs. And now, as we are able to let everybody know what this is about, the American people are going to finally be able to see through all this noise.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Speaker, yesterday was a historic day. We saw the passage of the job-killing government takeover of health care, 18 percent of our economy. But we want the American people to know that today many of us are introducing the identical legislation.

I have introduced already the repeal of yesterday's law, as has my colleague STEVE KING, as will many other of my colleagues today. We will not stand for the Federal Government taking over 18 percent of the health care sector.

From the inception of Bailout Nation in September of 2008 until last night, the Federal Government has taken over an astounding 48 percent of the private economy in the last 18 months. This is unprecedented. We will not allow this to stand. That is why we have introduced this important legislation.

This fall we will take back a constitutional conservative majority, and after the next Presidential election we will repeal this bill.

IT'S TIME TO CHILL OUT

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

Mr. FILNER. My colleagues, it's time to chill out. It's time to chill out. Government takeover of the health care system? Let it go.

The private insurance companies are still in charge. Your private doctor is still in charge. You have the choice of where you want to go, what hospital you want to go to. All we are saying—and I am going to say it to my district. I have got 150,000 constituents who don't have health insurance, and 135,000 of them are going to have health insurance after this bill passes. They don't care what your rhetoric is and your fear is. They're going to have health insurance for the first time maybe in their lives.

Kids who are in college will be able to stay on their parents' health insurance. We're going to put some brakes on the health companies' ability to cut you off for preexisting conditions or just cut you off if it costs too much.

It's time to chill out, Republicans. Let this bill work. Let our constituents finally get health care.

ACORN IS BACK!

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, they're back.

We've all heard about ACORN, and it seems to me that ACORN is nothing more than a criminal enterprise. Here's why. They've been caught helping undercover journalists open a prostitution ring with underage girls. They've been caught in voter registration fraud scams. At least 14 States are investigating ACORN for voter fraud. Even Mickey Mouse can now vote. Imagine that. And ACORN signs up the poor into their membership rolls. The poor give their bank account information, and ACORN deducts membership dues without the express consent of these individuals.

In a bipartisan vote last year, Congress voted to strip Federal funding from this rogue fraudulent organization. Not one dime of taxpayer money should be spent on this group. However, White House Budget Director Peter Orszag has directed all Federal agencies to open the Federal funding floodgates for ACORN again.

Why did the administration trump the will of Congress and the American people? American tax dollars should not fund this apparent band of thieves.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING ALEJANDRO AGUIRRE

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize an outstanding individual from my South Florida community, Alejandro Aguirre. Alejandro is the editor of Diario Las Americas, South Florida's first Spanish language daily newspaper.

Diario Las Americas was founded on July 4, 1953 by Alejandro's father, Dr. Horacio Aguirre. Diario helps inform scores of my constituents on current events and matters that impact our local, State and Federal Governments. Alejandro's dedication and professionalism are evidenced by the quality of each publication of Diario.

Since 2009, Alejandro has also been president of the Inter-American Press Association. This organization champions freedom of the press and freedom of expression throughout the Western Hemisphere.

The IAPA has spoken out and shined the light of truth on the dark corners of repression throughout our hemisphere. The group has spoken out against the imprisonment of independent journalists in Cuba. The members have also spoken out against the growing decay of freedom in Venezuela.

I want to thank Alejandro for his courage, for his service, and, most of all, for his friendship. The Aguirre family is a shining example for us all.

''IF YOU LIKE THE PLAN YOU ARE IN, YOU CAN KEEP IT''

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, we heard just a few minutes ago from the other side that it is time to show the American people what is in this bill. I couldn't agree more. It is high time. So with an acknowledgement to Dr. John Goodman at the National Center for Policy Analysis, let me just run through a few of the numbers.

Nineteen million people are predicted to lose their employer-sponsored insurance. Thirty-three million people, the number of people in traditional Medicare, at risk because of cuts in Medicare spending, according to the Medicare chief actuary.

There will be no tax increases for anyone who earns less than $200,000, except the 73 million people who earn less than $200,000 who will see their tax bill rise, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation. A 2.3 percent hidden tax on medical supplies, class II medical supplies, sutures, syringes, needles, some pregnancy tests, a 10 percent tax on tanning salons, according to the reconciliation summary, and a $60 billion hidden tax on health insurance.

To quote, ''The average family will save $2,500 in health care costs by the time I complete my first term as President of the United States.'' However, according to the Congressional Budget Office, a $2,100 premium increase for the average family.

There is a lot more like this, and I will be exposing this over the coming days.

ANNOUNCING THE PASSING OF ARTHUR ''JIBBY'' JIBILIAN

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

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is with great sadness that I come to the well to announce the passing of Arthur ''Jibby'' Jibilian, a World War II hero.

During World War II, Jibby was a Navy Radio Operator who volunteered with the OSS and participated in the largest successful rescue mission of 513 downed airmen behind enemy lines in Yugoslavia. Jibby stayed behind until the very last airman was rescued on December 27, 1944.

The heroic efforts of Jibby and his fellow OSS officers and the Yugoslav people are told in ''The Forgotten 500''; however, they have yet to receive any military or government recognition for their actions.

I introduced H.R. 3496, which honors Jibby with the Medal of Honor. He

said, ''I am well aware that the Medal of Honor is not bestowed lightly. However, let me say that just being nominated is an honor in itself. Therefore, I am in a win-win situation.''

I will continue working on this legislation to honor this exceptional American with the recognition he deserves.

A TALE OF TWO RALLIES

(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, the national media gave a sharply contrasting tale of two weekend rallies.

A gathering of thousands opposing the administration's health care scheme drew overwhelmingly negative coverage. The Washington Post front page described it as a ''hideous display.'' CBS said the health care debate ''turned even nastier at the rallies.'' ABC called the protesters ''angry'' and ''ugly.'' A Newsweek correspondent described the protesters as ''an angry mob.'' To anyone there, all these descriptions were obviously untrue.

In contrast, an immigration-amnesty rally over the weekend received positive coverage. The Washington Post said ''the festive crowd beat drums and waved American flags.'' CNN said protesters came out to ''support the Obama administration in its next big battle.'' The New York Times said protesters were there to ''vent'' and that ''most flew American flags overhead.''

The national media should give Americans unslanted news, not favor rallies that support their liberal agendas.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

END VETERAN HOMELESSNESS ACT OF 2010

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4810) to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the services provided for homeless veterans under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4810

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''End Veteran Homelessness Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN AMOUNT AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED FOR COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR HOMELESS VETERANS.

Section 2013 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''fiscal year 2007'' and inserting ''fiscal year 2010''; and

(2) by striking ''$150,000,000'' and inserting ''$200,000,000''.

SEC. 3. IMPROVEMENT OF PAYMENTS FOR PROVIDING SERVICES TO HOMELESS VETERANS.

(a) IMPROVEMENT OF PAYMENTS.—Section 2012 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''per diem'' wherever it appears;

(2) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''daily cost of care'' and inserting ''annual cost of furnishing services''; and

(ii) by striking the second sentence;

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraph (B):

''(B) The Secretary shall annually adjust the rate of payment under subparagraph (A) to reflect anticipated changes in the cost of furnishing services and to take into account the cost of providing services in a particular geographic area. The Secretary may set a maximum amount payable to a grant recipient under this section.'';

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''other sources of income'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''the cost of services provided by the grant recipient as the Secretary may require to assist the Secretary in making the determination under subparagraph (A)'';

(D) by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following new subparagraph (D):

''(D) In making the determination under subparagraph (A), the Secretary may consider the availability of other sources of income, including payments to the grant recipient or eligible entity for furnishing services to homeless veterans under programs other than under this subchapter, payments or grants from other departments or agencies of the United States, from departments or agencies of State or local governments, or from private entities or organizations.''; and

(E) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) The Secretary shall authorize payments under this subsection to each grant recipient on an annual basis but shall make a payment to each grant recipient for each calendar quarter in an amount equal to a portion of the annual amount authorized for such recipient. Upon the expiration of a calendar quarter, each grant recipient shall provide to the Secretary a statement of the amount spent by the recipient during that calendar quarter, and if the amount spent is less than the amount provided for that calendar quarter, repay to the Secretary the balance. If the amount spent by a grant recipient for such purpose for a calendar quarter exceeds the amount provided to the recipient for that quarter, the Secretary shall make an additional payment to the recipient in an amount equal to the amount by which the amount so spent exceeded the amount so provided, as long as the total amount provided to such recipient in a calendar year does not exceed the amount of the annual payment for that recipient.'';

(3) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following new paragraph (3):

''(3) Payments under this subsection to a grant recipient or eligible entity may be used to match, or in combination with, other payments or grants for which the recipient or entity is eligible.''; and

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The section heading for such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 2012. Payments for furnishing services to homeless veterans''.

(2) SUBSECTION HEADING.—The heading for subsection (a) of such section is amended by striking ''PER DIEM''.

(3) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 20 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 2012 and inserting the following new item:

''2012. Payments for furnishing services to homeless veterans.''.

SEC. 4. SUPPORTED HOUSING PROGRAM OUTREACH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 20 of title 38, United States Code, is further amended by adding at the end of subchapter III the following new section:

''§ 2024. Supported housing program outreach

''(a) LANDLORD OUTREACH.—(1) The Secretary shall ensure that each medical center of the Department that provides treatment and services under the supported housing program under section 8(o)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(19)) employs or provides (through coordination with a public housing agency, homeless service provider, or other appropriate organization) one or more specialists, which may include peer specialists who were formerly homeless veterans, for handling housing issues in conjunction with the program under this subsection.

''(2) Such specialists shall conduct outreach to landlords to encourage and facilitate participation in the supportive housing program, mediate disputes between veterans receiving assistance under such program and landlords, establish and maintain a list of dwelling units available for rental with assistance under such program, and carry out other appropriate activities.

''(b) HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION AND RAPID RE-HOUSING ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall coordinate with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide assistance to homeless veterans in accessing the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program administered by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for assistance for basic essentials, security deposits for rental dwelling units, and advance payments of the first month's rent for such units.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to subchapter III the following new item:

''2024. Supported housing program outreach.''.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS PROGRAM TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES IN PERMANENT HOUSING.

Section 2044(e) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(D) $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2012.

''(E) $75,000,000 for fiscal year 2013.

''(F) $100,000,000 for each subsequent fiscal year.''; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking ''each of the fiscal year 2009 through 2011'' and inserting ''each fiscal year''.

SEC. 6. PROMOTION OF AWARENESS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS PROGRAMS TO ASSIST HOMELESS VETERANS AMONG HOMELESS WOMEN VETERANS AND HOMELESS VETERANS WITH CHILDREN.

Section 532 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after ''homeless veterans'' the following: ''(with a special emphasis on promoting awareness of such assistance among homeless women veterans and homeless veterans with children)''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 1415

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

Madam Speaker, this is the first of a series of six pieces of legislation that will benefit our Nation's veterans. This Congress, and certainly this committee, has been concerned with these veterans in our daily work, and we are proud to present these items which will help prevent veterans' homelessness, protect National Guard employment, help veterans keep their home, give veterans a cost-of-living adjustment.

Before I begin on this package, Madam Speaker, I just would like to briefly comment on a little item that came up yesterday during the debate on health care.

One of our veterans service organizations and the ranking member of our committee claimed that the bill that we would pass would hurt veterans' health care. I just want to point out on behalf of all the Chairs on this side of the aisle, all the legal opinions that have been made, veterans' health care is not affected by the health care bill that we passed. All the benefits will be retained. Nobody will be penalized for being part of the veterans health care system or any other part of veterans health benefits.

Congress actually received a letter yesterday from the Vietnam Veterans of America which said: ''It is unfortunate that some continue to raise what is now even more clearly a false alarm that is apparently meant to frighten veterans and their families in order to prompt them to oppose the pending legislation. While there is a legitimate debate as to whether or not the pending health care measure should become law, Vietnam Veterans of America does not appreciate spreading rumors that are not accurate by any political partisan from any point of the political spectrum.''

I just want to allay any fears that veterans have about this health care legislation. And certainly our committee, should anything arise that was unintended, we will move quickly to make sure that veterans health care is kept at a high quality and no one is penalized for having veterans health care in this country. So I want to point that out, Madam Speaker.

Now, to get back to the bill we have, H.R. 4810, under consideration. Almost half the homeless on the street tonight, Madam Speaker, are veterans—anywhere from 150,000 to 200,000. This is a national disgrace. It is our national disgrace. It's been an issue that I have been working on since I came to Congress when I joined the Committee on Veterans' Affairs almost 18 years ago. Now that the Democrats have the majority, we want to put forward a plan, as our Secretary of Veterans' Affairs has announced, a plan to end veterans' homeless within 5 years. Zero tolerance. That's going to be our policy.

Today we have the opportunity to take bold action to combat homelessness, but, as I said, we have a willing and eager administration to make sure that we achieve this goal. President Obama and his Secretary of Veterans' Affairs have, as I said, pledged to end homelessness over the next 5 years. Our Secretary has committed to expanding proven programs and launching innovative services to prevent veterans from falling into homelessness.

This bill before us, H.R. 4810, does three important things to provide the administration with the necessary tools to combat homelessness:

First, the bill would provide additional funding for the Grant and Per Diem Program, which provides grants to community agencies so they can, in turn, provide transitional housing, health services, and other supportive services to homeless veterans. Providing needed resources to the local agencies that care for our homeless veterans is just one way our grateful Nation can support the vital and compassionate work performed in communities all across the country.

Second, this bill helps low-income veteran families who are occupying permanent housing from becoming homeless by extending powerful and effective support services. Examples of these services include outreach, case management, and assistance in obtaining benefits from the VA, as well as public benefits from State and local agencies.

Finally, H.R. 4810 helps the increasing number of female veterans who end up being homeless. This is especially magnified for our women veterans coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan, who are four times more likely to become homeless than their male counterparts. My bill would direct the Department of Veterans Affairs to focus outreach efforts on homeless women veterans and homeless veterans with children.

This powerful bill is the result of significant work by the entire committee. I would like to thank the chairman of our Subcommittee on Health, MIKE MICHAUD from Maine, and Ranking Member HENRY BROWN from South Carolina for the bipartisan leadership they demonstrated on this bill. I'd also like to recognize the important contributions of our colleagues HARRY TEAGUE of New Mexico, CIRO RODRIGUEZ of Texas, and PHIL HARE of Illinois. Each of these Members are true advocates for homeless veterans and introduced legislation helping homeless veterans that are now key provisions of this bill. I'd also like to thank our staff from the Health Committee, especially our staff director, Cathy Wiblemo, who has worked so hard on this legislation for such a long time.

There are hundreds of thousands of servicemembers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. It is our duty as a Nation, when we put our men and women in harm's way, to care for them when they return. We must also live up to the promise to honor the service and sacrifices of our veterans from previous conflicts. This is an opportunity today, Madam Speaker, to make a difference in the lives of veterans who are sleeping in cars, looking for public housing, searching for relief, and feeling helpless.

I urge all of our colleagues to pass H.R. 4810 to provide the help and support that our homeless veterans need and deserve.

I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. I would say to the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Mr. FILNER, he just did a 1-minute where he said, Let it go, let it go. So I'm a little surprised he's bringing up the health care bill and talking about it prior to these six wonderful bills we're going to pass on Veterans' Affairs. But since he brought it up, I think it's probably appropriate that I return with our side of this issue, because, as he pointed out, last night the House of Representatives passed the Senate bill, which was the government setting up exchanges—which these exchanges include taxes, they include mandates and regulation, and it's phased in over a number of years to 2014. But there are some problems, frankly, with that bill. If there were no problems, then IKE SKELTON, who's chairman of the Armed Services Committee, would not have brought it up 2 days ago, sort of furiously to try to get it in, because he voted against the health care bill.

So the chairman of the Armed Services Committee voted against the Senate health care bill last night. The day before that, he brought up the idea that we have to protect DoD veterans who are on TRICARE. That's probably one of the flaws in the bill that's being sent to the President. It has some serious ramifications for our military and dependents under TRICARE, Madam Speaker, for veterans' widows, orphans, and for children suffering from spina bifida as a result of a parent's exposure to Agent Orange during the wars in Korea and Vietnam. As deputy ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I joined with Ranking Member STEVE BUYER, of our committee, and Armed Services Committee Ranking Member BUCK MCKEON to introduce

H.R. 4894 to protect the Department of Defense and the VA beneficiaries.

So I'm a little surprised that the Democrat leadership didn't take up our bill. Instead, they passed a more limited bill introduced by, as I mentioned, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, IKE SKELTON, which, after reading it, provides limited protection for TRICARE beneficiaries but not the DOD and VA health care systems and the VA health care benefits. Moreover, I was also surprised to learn from the Congressional Budget Office there could be a cost associated with our bill, the $4.4 billion, so-called, for the cost of our bill. I'm an original cosponsor.

So what are the implications for these beneficiaries? Simply, it means that the government takeover of health care could result in a savings of $4.4 billion made on the backs of servicemembers, widows, and orphans, and children suffering from spina bifida as a result of a parent's exposure to Agent Orange. I don't think the public realizes that. So I think it's important to get this information out, and I'm hopeful that we can solve this problem.

Over the weekend, there were a lot of claims made that there is no problem for TRICARE and VA health care beneficiaries under the Senate health care bill that was passed by the Democrats yesterday. Well, frankly, there is, and it's a big problem. As I mentioned earlier, Madam Speaker, if it wasn't a problem, then IKE SKELTON, the Armed Services Committee chairman, would not have been here 2 days ago trying to offer a scaled-down bill to correct the problem. He would not have taken his own bill, H.R. 4887, to the floor in a quick effort to solve this issue.

So it's important to reiterate that this bill does not protect the DOD and VA health care systems. It doesn't fully address TRICARE either, as a result of the CBO score of H.R. 4887. The Ike Skelton bill does not stop $4.5 billion from being cut from TRICARE, but we think ours will. The veterans service organizations know what is happening. The American Legion, the VFW, DAV, and the National Association of Uniformed Services have all supported our bill, H.R. 4894, which they believe will protect veterans.

So, Madam Speaker, I hope that the House Democrat leadership will see fit to act as soon as possible to allay the fears of all these veteran service organizations as soon as possible to correct the measure with H.R. 4894, to stop these cuts and to protect the individuals and their families who have served and sacrificed on behalf of our Nation and, I might add, to allay the fears of men at war who think when they come back they will retire or possibly be under Champus/VA.

With those comments, let me then move to the bill that we're considering. I rise in support of H.R. 4810, End Veteran Homeless Act of 2010.

Now, my colleagues, this bill would amend Title 38 of the United States Code to make certain improvements in the services provided for homeless veterans. This important legislation represents a combination of a number of bills that moved through the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and I believe truly exemplifies the manner in which our committee can and does work together in a bipartisan fashion to bring forth legislation that improves the lives of our veterans.

It is with a deep and personal commitment that I and everybody else on the Veterans' Affairs Committee embrace and aggressively want to tackle the challenge of homelessness and veterans and forward our mutual goals of ending this chronic problem among our veterans.

Since the enactment of the Homeless Veterans Comprehensive Assistance Act back in 2001, which significantly expanded the VA's homeless program, we've seen a significant number of previously homeless veterans returning to leading productive and sober lives. H.R. 4810 continues that proactive approach by permanently extending a VA program that provides grants to entities that help low-income families that are homeless, transitioning to permanent housing, or already in permanent housing; increasing the annual amounts authorized for VA's Homeless Grant and Per Diem Program from $150 million to $200 million; and encouraging the VA to expand its promotion for homeless veterans to include programs for homeless veterans that are female or that have children.

VA's latest estimate indicates that about 107,000 veterans were homeless on any one given night last year. With the unemployment rate for veterans from Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom aged 18 to 24 standing at a staggering 21.1 percent, more simply must be done to ensure that our veterans come home not to joblessness and homelessness, but to supportive communities and meaningful employment.

□ 1430

I recently had the pleasure of participating in the grand opening of the new HONOR—Hope, Opportunities, Networking, Outreach, and Recovery—Center in my congressional district in Gainesville, Florida. This newly renovated comprehensive VA homeless center includes a 45-bed domiciliary to care for disabled and homeless veterans with special medical needs. The HONOR Center will also have program offices for outreach, grant and per diem, and other essential services, including a special area that's designated just for women. The HONOR Center will provide a full continuum of care and a homelike environment and will provide homeless veterans with family-style dining and special recreation areas including a nice library with a meditation room and a full-time recreational therapist.

The HONOR Center has been in development for nearly 3 years, and I was very pleased and proud to see such a wonderful resource for homeless veterans open in my congressional district in Gainesville, Florida.

So, Madam Speaker, H.R. 4810, the End Veteran Homeless Act, is one important step in achieving our goal of eliminating homelessness among veterans. But still, my colleagues, it is only one step. While I support its passage, I look forward to continuing to work hard in the future to make sure America's veterans are welcomed back from service with open arms, good jobs, and happy and healthy homes.

Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I would like to thank Chairman FILNER and Ranking Member BUYER, who unfortunately couldn't be here this morning, of the Veterans' Affairs Committee as well as Chairman MICHAUD and Ranking Member BROWN of the Subcommittee on Health for bringing this bill forward. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4810 and do their part to ensure that not a single one of the brave men and women who fight in uniform to defend our rights come home to a life without a job and a home.

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

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, a famous President once said: ''We have nothing to fear but fear itself.'' The deputy ranking member—I didn't know we had such a title—is spreading fear, and I would just like to make it clear to every veteran, every family of veterans, and all Americans, there will be no reduction of any benefits of any veteran in the veterans health care system. There will be no taxes. There will be no diminution of services. Let's just make that clear.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4810.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FILNER. I urge my colleagues to unanimously support the bill. I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4810.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

NATIONAL GUARD EMPLOYMENT PROTECTION ACT OF 2010

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1879) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for employment and reemployment rights for certain individuals ordered to full-time National Guard duty, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1879

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Guard Employment Protection Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS FOLLOWING CERTAIN NATIONAL GUARD DUTY.

(a) REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS.—Section 4312(c)(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (D);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) ordered to full-time National Guard duty under the provisions of section 502(f) of title 32 when the period of duty is expressly designated in writing by the Secretary of Defense as covered by this subparagraph.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subparagraph (F) of section 4312(c)(4) of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to an individual ordered to full-time National Guard duty under section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, on or after September 11, 2001, and shall entitle such individual to rights and benefits under chapter 43 of title 38 of such Code on or after that date.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

I would like to thank Congressman MIKE COFFMAN of Colorado who is here with us for introducing the National Guard Employment Protection Act of 2010. One of the protections provided by the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act, or USERRA, is to require employers to support a servicemember's absence for up to 5 years if called to active military duty. At the time when USERRA was enacted into law back in 1994, Congress intended to minimize the disruption to the lives of servicemembers as well as to their employers and prohibit discrimination against persons because of their service in the military.

Unfortunately, current statute does not provide National Guard members who are ordered to full-time active duty with the same protections. This is especially disheartening at a time when our Guard is called up to active duty in support of missions to secure the homeland or provide relief abroad. And of course since 9/11, the Guard has been doing almost half of the fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan. Many of them are bumping against the 5-year USERRA protection for their civilian jobs, and H.R. 1879 seeks to address this inequity and extend reemployment rights for those ordered to full-time National Guard duty.

Congressman HARRY TEAGUE of New Mexico worked with Congressman COFFMAN to add a provision to allow the Secretary of Defense to designate which duties qualify. So I would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from New Mexico for their bipartisan efforts on this important bill. It is time, Madam Speaker, that Congress ensures that members of the National Guard are afforded the employment protections they deserve. I urge all my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1879, as amended.

This bill amends title 38 United States Code to provide for employment and reemployment rights for certain individuals ordered to full-time National Guard duty. Madam Speaker, it's well known that the National Guard and Reserve units have carried a significant load in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Many of these units have served multiple combat tours, and others have provided homeland security services, such as maintaining an airborne alert here in the D.C. area. Additionally, Guard units have performed heroically at times when natural disasters like Hurricane Katrina devastated New Orleans.

As a result of these demands, many of the members of the Guard have accumulated significant active duty time and are now in danger of exceeding the 5-year limit on active duty that is protected under the Uniform Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act, or USERRA. So I'm pleased that our colleague MIKE COFFMAN from Colorado has taken the action to recognize that active duty performed under title 32 should be added to the types of duties exempted from the 5-year limit. I also thank Chairman HERSETH SANDLIN and Ranking Member BOOZMAN of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity for their bipartisan work, as well as Chairman FILNER for bringing this bill to the floor.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to Mr. COFFMAN, a fellow veteran who served in the Army and the Marines in the first gulf war and second gulf war in Iraq.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to stand before you today in strong support of H.R. 1879, the National Guard Employment Protection Act. I created this legislation in order to extend the same reemployment rights for all of our National Guard personnel regardless of whether they are assigned to a homeland security mission or deployed overseas to Iraq or Afghanistan. Under current law, the members of the National Guard who are called up for active duty in support of homeland security missions inside the United States are not provided the same reemployment rights to their civilian occupations that other members of the National Guard and Reserve have when they are called to active duty for overseas military assignments.

There is no doubt that the soldiers and the airmen serving in the National Guard must have the same reemployment rights irrespective of where they are ordered to serve. The bill recognizes that those who are called up for homeland security missions can face the same hardships and challenges in trying to return to their civilian employment as someone who has been away from their civilian occupation due to an overseas military assignment.

With the passage of H.R. 1879, National Guard members will no longer have to worry about being put into a position where they are forced to choose between retaining their civilian employment or serving our Nation in a critical homeland security mission.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1879, as amended, the National Guard Employment Protection Act of 2010.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1879, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FILNER. I want to urge everybody to support this important legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1879, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECOGNIZING THE 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BLINDED VETERANS ASSOCIATION

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 80) recognizing and honoring the Blinded Veterans Association on its 65th anniversary of representing blinded veterans and their families.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 80

Whereas, at 8:45 a.m. on March 28, 1945, 100 blinded members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II formed the Blinded Veterans Association at Avon ''Old Farms'' Army Convalescent Hospital in Connecticut;

Whereas the founders of the Blinded Veterans Association were a cross-section of heroes and pioneers who not only shaped the rich history, philosophy, and knowledge of education and rehabilitation of the blind, but also provided insight into current and future challenges facing the blind and engaged in continual advocacy efforts to ensure that services for all blinded persons would be unique and specialized;

Whereas, on March 28, 2010, the Blinded Veterans Association will mark its 65th anniversary of dedication to blinded members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families;

Whereas in 1946, General Omar Bradley, of the Veterans Administration, appointed the Blinded Veterans Association as the first official representative for blinded veterans for the filing of claims and appeals to the Veterans Administration, making the Blinded Veterans Association only the eighth veterans service organization to receive such authorization;

Whereas the Blinded Veterans Association was originally incorporated in New York State as a nonprofit association, and then moved to Washington, DC, in 1947;

Whereas in 1958, the 58th Congress approved the Congressional Charter for the Blinded Veterans Association;

Whereas from its early beginnings, the Blinded Veterans Association encouraged the blinded veterans it served ''to take their rightful place in the community with their fellow men and work with them toward the creation of a peaceful world'', and it has continued to advocate for the war-blinded to regain independence, confidence, and self-esteem through rehabilitation and training; and

Whereas many people of the United States recognize March 28 of each year as Blinded Veterans Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress—

(1) expresses appreciation for the efforts of the Blinded Veterans Association in improving the rehabilitation services, education, and benefits for blinded veterans of the United States;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of Blinded Veterans Day; and

(3) calls upon the people of the United States to observe Blinded Veterans Day with appropriate programs and activities.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 80, recognizing and honoring the Blinded Veterans Association on its 65th anniversary of representing blinded veterans and their families, sponsored by Mrs. HALVORSON of Illinois. Mrs. HALVORSON, as a first-term Member, has been incredibly active and committed to veterans on our committee.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois to further explain the bill.

Mrs. HALVORSON. I thank Chairman FILNER for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it was truly a privilege to introduce H.J. Res. 80, which recognizes and honors the Blinded Veterans Association on its 65th anniversary. Madam Speaker, this simple resolution helps to honor the service and sacrifice of the more than 165,000 blind or visually impaired veterans.

The resolution helps us to remember that on March 28, 1945, 100 blinded members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II formed the Blinded Veterans Association in order to help veterans and their families meet and overcome the challenges of blindness. The following year, in 1946, General Omar Bradley of the Veterans Administration, appointed the BVA as the first official representative for blinded veterans for the filing of claims and appeals to the Veterans Administration. This made the Blinded Veterans Association only the eighth Veterans Service Organization to receive such distinction and responsibility.

In 1958, Congress followed General Bradley's lead and echoed his recognition of the BVA by officially approving the BVA congressional charter. Since that time, the BVA has encouraged and assisted blinded veterans to take their rightful place in the community with their fellow men and work with them towards the creation of a peaceful world.

□ 1445

Their leadership continues to advocate for the war-blinded to regain independence, confidence and self-esteem through rehabilitation and training. Almost 13 percent of the evacuated wounded servicemembers in Iraq and Afghanistan have suffered a serious eye injury of one type or another. This means that the Blinded Veterans Association's services are just as crucial today as they were 65 years ago.

H.J. Res. 80 recognizes the extraordinary members and work of the BVA, and the good that they do for America's visually impaired veterans. I thank the members of the BVA for their service and strongly encourage my colleagues to do the same by voting in favor of this resolution.

Mr. FILNER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, not only does the BVA provide support for our Nation's blind veterans, the organization also provides inspiration and support for their family members via the Kathern F. Gruber Scholarship Awards. This worthy scholarship enables spouses and dependent children of blinded veterans to achieve their goals in higher education.

Our blinded veterans have made tremendous sacrifices on behalf of our Nation to ensure our safety and our freedom. It is altogether appropriate that we honor them this day and join the Blinded Veterans Association in celebrating its 65th anniversary.

Obviously I am a strong supporter of H.J. Res. 80, a resolution to recognize and honor the Blinded Veterans Association on its 65th anniversary of representing blinded veterans and their families. As all of us know, recovering from the tragic loss of sight is a traumatic and life-changing event. Veterans who are burdened with this loss are forced to relearn almost every task associated with normal daily activities. Such rehabilitation is a difficult but necessary challenge blinded veterans must overcome to integrate back into civilian life. The Blinded Veterans Association was established specifically to help these severely injured veterans and their families during this most difficult period.

On March 28, 1945, 100 blinded members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II formed the Blinded Veterans Association. Just a year later, in 1946, General Bradley of the Veterans Administration appointed the BVA as the first official representative for blinded veterans who were filing claims and appeals to the Veterans Administration. This made the Blinded Veterans Association the eighth veterans service organization to receive such authorization.

Chartered by Congress in 1958, the BVA has worked throughout the years assisting blind veterans in acquiring Department of Veterans Affairs disability compensation and health care benefits, as well as other Federal and local benefits. Thanks in large part to the efforts of the BVA, there are now ten blindness rehabilitation centers located at various VA medical centers across this country.

Madam Speaker, along with this legislation, which obviously you can see how important it is, we wanted to honor today these blinded veterans on their 65th anniversary. But, Madam Speaker, our committee also had requested consideration of H.R. 4360, a bill to designate the blind rehabilitation center in Long Beach, California, as the Major Charles R. Soltes, Jr., O.D. Department of Veterans Affairs Blind Rehabilitation Center. This legislation has the support of the entire California delegation and the major veterans service organizations in California and would further honor blind veterans to whom Major Soltes provided so much service and so much sacrifice.

I would like to inquire, if it is appropriate to the Speaker, or perhaps

Chairman FILNER, if they could explain why this very important bill was not permitted consideration on the floor today?

Mr. FILNER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. I yield.

Mr. FILNER. As the gentleman knows, we included that bill on a list of seven bills that we asked to be taken up on the floor, and we were scheduled for six of them. That is as far as I know.

Mr. STEARNS. I understand he is saying that it wasn't put in the loop at the moment, it wasn't put on the schedule, but I think you are also saying that this is the type of bill that you support and you believe should be part of a vote on the floor. Can I assume you support this bill?

Mr. FILNER. If the gentleman would continue to yield, I was one of the Californians who signed the original petition, and I support the bill. We are as mystified as you are.

Mr. STEARNS. Well, Madam Speaker, I think it is unfortunate that this bill to honor an individual who did so much for our blind veterans community and paid the ultimate sacrifice in service to his country, this particular bill is not being considered this afternoon. Many of us are disappointed, and we will work with Ranking Member BUYER and Chairman FILNER, since he is a signee on the unanimous delegation letter, to have it brought to the floor at the earliest opportunity.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res 80, "Recognizing and Honoring the blinded veterans association on its 65th anniversary of representing blinded veterans and their families," a bill sponsored by my colleague from Illinois, Congresswoman HALVORSON.

H.J. Res. 80 will honor those who have sacrificed greatly for this nation and have lost their eyesight in the process. These veterans have given great contributions and made incredible personal sacrifices so that all of us in this country might live in a safe and secure nation and world. When we pay tribute to the service of our brave veterans, we acknowledge the great debt that this Nation owes them.

Because I realize that our veterans deserve our very best, I introduced H.R. 1240, the Vision Impairment Specialist Training Act (VISTA), passed into law as part of larger bill. The provisions of VISTA help our nation's blind and low-vision veterans by establishing a scholarship program for students seeking training in blind rehabilitation. There are more than 160,000 legally blind veterans in the United States, but approximately 35,000 are currently enrolled in Veterans Health Administration. Members of the armed forces are important to our nation and we show them our appreciation by taking care of them when they no longer can serve.

Caring for our veterans also means giving them our time. I have had the honor of visiting with some of our wounded soldiers at Walter Reed Army Hospital in Washington, D.C. Many of these soldiers were recovering from some of the most horrific wounds imaginable. But what made the most indelible impression on me was that to a man and woman, there was no self-pity or anger at their fate. Instead of anger or sorrow there was only concern for their fellow soldiers and pride in the certain knowledge that they had fought valiantly on behalf of a country they loved. There is no reason that any of our veterans should not receive the highest care from all of us in this country. I hope all Americans take the time to visit their local VA hospital and thank the wounded for their service to our country." We must do everything possible to let our veterans know how much we value their service.

We all know that no one has paid a higher price than the brave men and women through the years who gave the last full measure of devotion to their country. Whether it is the ultimate sacrifice of life or the loss of limb or the loss of time with family and friends, we owe our veterans an enormous outstanding debt of gratitude. So, let us celebrate and recognize our blinded veterans during the 65th anniversary of the Blinded Veterans Association.

It is out of my profound respect and gratitude for all who wear and have worn the uniform of the United States that I continue to work so hard to pass legislation that will ensure that veterans receive the health care, job opportunities, housing assistance, and educational benefits they deserve. Caring for our veterans also means giving them our support when they need it.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.J. 80.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues' unanimous support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 80.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

HELPING HEROES KEEP THEIR HOMES ACT OF 2009

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3976) to extend certain expiring provisions providing enhanced protections for servicemembers relating to mortgages and mortgage foreclosure, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3976

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Helping Heroes Keep Their Homes Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF ENHANCED PROTECTIONS FOR SERVICEMEMBERS RELATING TO MORTGAGES AND MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE UNDER SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Paragraph (2) of section 2203(c) of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-289) is amended—

(1) by striking "December 31, 2010" and inserting "December 31, 2015"; and

(2) by striking "January 1, 2011" and inserting "January 1, 2016".

(b) PROTECTION FOR SURVIVING SPOUSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 303 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 533) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) PROTECTION FOR SURVIVING SPOUSE.—With respect to a servicemember who dies while in military service and whose death is service-connected, this section shall apply to the surviving spouse of the servicemember if such spouse is the successor in interest to property covered under subsection (a).".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (e) of section 303 of such Act, as added by paragraph (1), shall apply to a surviving spouse of a servicemember whose death is on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Congressman TOM PERRIELLO of Virginia for introducing H.R. 3976, the Helping Heroes Keep Their Homes Act of 2010. Mr. PERRIELLO is one of the first-term members we have on our committee. They are incredibly active and committed. Mr. PERRIELLO hit the ground running in his first year and is here today with a bill that will make an immediate difference in the lives of our Nation's military veterans.

I yield to Mr. PERRIELLO to explain the bill.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Madam Speaker, I am proud to stand in support of H.R. 3976, the Helping Heroes Keep Their Homes Act, a bill that I introduced to help ensure that our veterans have the resources they need to confront the myriad of challenges in today's economic environment.

Homeownership is the touchstone of the American dream. H.R. 3976, the Helping Heroes Keep Their Homes Act, will reauthorize home foreclosure protections to prevent lenders from foreclosing on veterans' homes within 9

months after the end of military service. Unfortunately, some of the protections established in Public Law 110–289 are scheduled to expire at the end of this year. This bill will ensure that these critical protections remain available to our veterans.

H.R. 3976 is a commonsense bill that has been supported by the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. I appreciate the bipartisan support on this bill, the chairman's leadership and others', and I urge all members of this body to join me in supporting our military families by voting in favor of this bill.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, if I might digress, I just wanted to thank Mrs. HALVORSON on H.J. Res. 80 for introducing the resolution, and the chairman and Mr. BUYER for bringing that joint resolution to the floor. I think that is important to remind all of my colleagues.

Madam Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 3976, as amended, a bill to extend certain expiring provisions providing enhanced protections for servicemembers relating to mortgages and mortgage foreclosure.

Madam Speaker, Public Law 110–289, the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008, extended the protections against foreclosure and related actions on servicemembers' homes contained in the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act from 90 days to 9 months following lengthy deployments. Extensions of these protections will sunset December 31, 2010.

To address the continuing lengthy deployments by our servicemembers, the Veterans Home Preservation Act of 2010 would simply extend the mortgage-related sunset days contained in Public Law 110–289 through December 31, 2015. The bill also adds a new clause that would apply these same mortgage protections to a surviving spouse of a servicemember who dies while in military service and whose death is service connected.

Madam Speaker, these are good provisions that are appropriate given the current economic climate. I thank the authors of the bill, Mr. PERRIELLO, as well as Chairman HERSETH SANDLIN and Ranking Member BOOZMAN for their fine work, and the Veterans' Affairs Committee chairman, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. BUYER, the ranking member, for bringing this legislation to the floor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3976, as amended, a bill to extend certain expiring provisions providing enhanced protections to servicemembers relating to mortgages and mortgage foreclosure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate that these protections are still needed. Two years ago or so we went through this major foreclosure crisis. We unfortunately, have not solved it and expect a recurrence, and we must protect and serve these brave men and women in uniform with the same commitment and dedication with which they protected and served us.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3976, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3976, "Helping Heroes Keep their Homes Act of 2009," a bill that will prevent mortgage lenders from foreclosing on a veteran's home after their service.

Strengthening comprehensive programs by investing in our veterans, requiring housing counselors to grant more housing opportunities at each Veteran Affairs centers is the right thing to do. It is my distinct honor to stand here today to support a bill that will allow us to show our appreciation to our veterans who are in danger of losing their homes and possibly becoming homeless.

I really find it unacceptable that an estimated 131,000 veterans are homeless on any given night after honorably serving their country. We are doing our veterans a great disservice. We owe our veterans the utmost respect, appreciation, and definitely a home to come home to after serving as a member of our Armed Forces. In these challenging economic times, we must do more to provide for our veterans basic needs. H.R. 3976 shows that all Americans take pride in our veterans service to this Nation, and just as the military doesn't believe in leaving a soldier behind on the battlefield, I believe that I speak for all Americans that we don't believe in leaving our veterans behind . . . we must help them push forward.

In these challenging economic times, with returning veterans experiencing unemployment rates in the double digits, we must do more to provide for our veterans' basic needs. This legislation shows that the U.S. is grateful for our veterans' service. Just as the military pledges to leave no soldier behind on the battlefield, this Nation will leave no veteran behind when they come home. This bill will allow us to show our appreciation and honor the service of veterans who have served this country and who now look to us to serve their needs.

Madam Speaker, these veterans have given great contributions and made incredible personal sacrifices so that all of us in this country might live in a safe and secure nation and world. Ensuring that our veterans are safeguarded from losing their homes is a small step towards repaying the insurmountable debt that all of us owe to all veterans. We must do everything possible to let our veterans know how much we value their service. We would be irresponsible and ungrateful if we acted otherwise.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3976.

Mr. FILNER. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3976, as amended. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3976, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2010

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4667) to increase, effective as of December 1, 2010, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4667

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as ''Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.

(a) RATE ADJUSTMENT.—Effective on December 1, 2010, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall increase, in accordance with subsection (c), the dollar amounts in effect on November 30, 2010, for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation under the provisions specified in subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNTS TO BE INCREASED.—The dollar amounts to be increased pursuant to subsection (a) are the following:

(1) WARTIME DISABILITY COMPENSATION.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1114 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1115(1) of such title.

(3) CLOTHING ALLOWANCE.—The dollar amount under section 1162 of such title.

(4) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO SURVIVING SPOUSE.—Each of the dollar amounts under subsections (a) through (d) of section 1311 of such title.

(5) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO CHILDREN.—Each of the dollar amounts under sections 1313(a) and 1314 of such title.

(c) DETERMINATION OF INCREASE.—

(1) PERCENTAGE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each dollar amount described in subsection (b) shall be increased by the same percentage as the percentage by which benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased effective December 1, 2010, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

(2) ROUNDING.—Each dollar amount increased under paragraph (1), if not a whole dollar amount, shall be rounded to the next lower whole dollar amount.

(d) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons under section 10 of Public Law 85–857 (72 Stat. 1263) who have not received compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 3. PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTED RATES.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register the amounts specified in section 2(b), as increased under that section, not later than the date on which the matters specified in section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 2011.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

I rise in support of this bill which ensures that hard-earned benefits for disabled veterans and their surviving family members keep pace with their living expenses. This bill, like the last, was introduced by Mr. PERRIELLO of Virginia. It will benefit each disabled veteran or survivor from the World War I era through the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I yield to the hardworking, active, and committed Mr. PERRIELLO for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Madam Speaker. Today I rise in support of H.R. 4667, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2010, a bill that I was proud to introduce in support of America's veterans.

Over 140 years ago, President Lincoln called upon our Nation ''to care for him, who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan.'' This charge is as compelling today as it was in 1865. It underscores the important role that our veterans play in defending our freedoms and the obligation we all have as a Nation to provide our brave veterans the care they need once returning home.

□ 1500

H.R. 4667, the Veterans Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2010, will provide an increase to the rates of basic compensation for disabled veterans and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation to their survivors and dependents, along with other benefits, in order to keep pace with the rising cost of living. The disability COLA would become effective December 1, 2010, and will be equal to that provided on an annual basis to Social Security recipients.

In these challenging economic times, our disabled veterans depend upon these tax-free payments not only to provide for their own basic needs, but for those of their spouses, children, and parents as well. Without an annual COLA increase, these veterans and their families would see the value of their hard-earned benefits slowly erode. We would be derelict in our duty if we failed to guarantee that those who sacrificed so much for this country receive benefits and services that fail to keep pace with their needs.

Doing right by veterans must always be a top priority for Congress. I believe that passage of this bill will send a clear message of support to those who wear the uniform of the United States military, a message that says we will never forget your service and sacrifice and that a grateful Nation will take care of you when you return from the front lines of freedom.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill on behalf of this Nation's veterans and continue the bipartisan support that we showed in the committee.

Mr. FILNER. Thank you, Mr. PERRIELLO, and again I want to thank you for your service to our Nation's veterans.

I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4667, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living-Adjustment Act of 2010. This legislation would increase, effective December 1, 2010, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rate of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

Now, this COLA adjustment includes veterans disability compensation, additional compensation for dependents, clothing allowance, dependency and indemnity compensation to surviving spouses and their children. This is an important annual authorization which provides much needed assistance to our Nation's veterans, and, obviously, I encourage all my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers and am prepared to close.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I'd like to thank my House colleagues, Mr. HALL of New York, chairman of the Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee, and Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado, the ranking member of the subcommittee, as well as the House bill sponsor, Mr. PERRIELLO of Virginia, for their leadership on H.R. 4667. I also thank Chairman FILNER and the ranking member, Mr. BUYER, for advancing this bill. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, just like our military men and women did not hesitate to offer to lay down their lives to defend our freedom and the way of life that we cherish, we will not hesitate to defend the funds necessary to support themselves and their families.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4667.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FILNER. I urge my colleagues to support the COLA bill, H.R. 4667.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, HR. 4667.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ENERGY JOBS FOR VETERANS ACT

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4592) to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in energy-related positions, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4592

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be referred to as the ''Energy Jobs for Veterans Act''.

SEC. 2. VETERANS ENERGY-RELATED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PILOT PROGRAM.—To encourage the employment of eligible veterans in the energy industry, the Secretary of Labor, as part of the Veteran's Workforce Investment Program, shall carry out a pilot program to be known as the ''Veterans Energy-Related Employment Program''. Under the pilot program, the Secretary shall award competitive grants to three States for the establishment and administration of a State program to make grants to energy employers and labor-management organizations that provide covered training, on-job training, apprenticeships, and certification classes to eligible veterans. Such a program shall be known as a ''State Energy-Related Employment Program''.

(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under the pilot program, a State shall submit to the Secretary an application that includes each of the following:

(1) A proposal for the expenditure of grant funds to establish and administer a public-private partnership program designed to provide covered training, on-job training, apprenticeships, and certification classes to a significant number of eligible veterans and ensure lasting and sustainable employment in well-paying jobs in the energy industry.

(2) Evidence that the State has—

(A) a population of eligible veterans of an appropriate size to carry out the State program;

(B) a robust and diverse energy industry; and

(C) the ability to carry out the State program described in the proposal under paragraph (1).

(3) Such other information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—A State that is the recipient of a grant under this section shall use the grant for the following purposes:

(1) Making grants to energy employers and labor-management organizations to reimburse such employers and organizations for the cost of providing covered training, on-job training, apprenticeships, and certification classes to eligible veterans.

(2) Conducting outreach to inform energy employers, labor-management organizations, and veterans, including veterans in rural areas, of their eligibility or potential eligibility for participation in the State program.

(d) CONDITIONS.—Under the pilot program, each grant to a State shall be subject to the following conditions:

(1) The State shall repay to the Secretary, on such date as shall be determined by the Secretary, any amount received under the pilot program that is not used for the purposes described in subsection (c).

(2) The State shall submit to the Secretary, at such times and containing such information as the Secretary shall require, reports on the use of grant funds.

(e) EMPLOYER REQUIREMENTS.—In order to receive a grant made by a State under the pilot program, an energy employer shall—

(1) submit to the administrator of the State Energy-Related Employment Program an application that includes—

(A) the rate of pay for each eligible veteran proposed to be trained using grant funds;

(B) the average rate of pay for an individual employed by the energy employer in a similar position who is not an eligible veteran; and

(C) such other information and assurances as the administrator may require; and

(2) agree to submit to the administrator, for each quarter, a report containing such information as the Secretary may specify.

(f) LIMITATION.—None of the funds made available to an energy employer through a grant under the pilot program may be used to provide training of any kind to a person who is not an eligible veteran.

(g) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Together with the report required to be submitted annually under section 4107(c) of title 38, United States Code, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the pilot program for the year covered by such report. The report on the pilot program shall include a detailed description of activities carried out under this section and an evaluation of the program.

(h) ADMINISTRATIVE AND REPORTING COSTS.—Of the amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subsection (j), two percent shall be made available to the Secretary for administrative costs associated with implementing and evaluating the pilot program under this section and for preparing and submitting the report required under subsection (f). The Secretary shall determine the appropriate maximum amount of each grant awarded under this section that may be used by the recipient for administrative and reporting costs.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term ''covered training, on-job training, apprenticeships, and certification classes'' means training, on-job training, apprenticeships, and certification classes that are—

(A) designed to provide the veteran with skills that are particular to an energy industry and not directly transferable to employment in another industry; and

(B) approved as provided in paragraph (1) or (2), as appropriate, of subsection (a) of section 3687 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The term ''eligible veteran'' means a veteran, as that term is defined in section 101(3) of title 38, United States Code, who is employed by an energy employer and enrolled or participating in a covered training, on-job training, apprenticeship, or certification class.

(3) The term ''energy employer'' means an entity that employs individuals in a trade or business in an energy industry.

(4) The term ''energy industry'' means any of the following industries:

(A) The energy-efficient building, construction, or retrofits industry.

(B) The renewable electric power industry, including the wind and solar energy industries.

(C) The biofuels industry.

(D) The energy efficiency assessment industry that serves the residential, commercial, or industrial sectors.

(E) The oil and natural gas industry.

(F) The nuclear industry.

(j) APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2015, for the purpose of carrying out the pilot program.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Madam Speaker, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics recently released survey data showing unsettling numbers on the employment rates of newly returning veterans. Last year, the unemployment rate for our Iraqi and Afghanistan veterans was over 10 percent. Even more disturbing were figures showing that the jobless rate of younger veterans exceeded 20 percent.

Congressman HARRY TEAGUE, a first-term member of our committee from New Mexico, proposed an innovative way to provide training for veterans in the energy industry. He introduced this act, H.R. 4592, the Energy Jobs for Veterans Act.

I would yield to Mr. TEAGUE for further explanation of the bill.

Mr. TEAGUE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 4592, the Energy Jobs for Veterans Act. I would like to thank Chairman FILNER for bringing this legislation to the floor and Chairwoman HERSETH SANDLIN and Ranking Member BOOZMAN for their assistance in crafting this legislation. Finally, I would like to thank the Democratic and Republican professional staff of the Economic Opportunity Subcommittee, namely, Juan Lara, Javier Martinez, and Mike Brink, for their work and expertise.

Madam Speaker, our dependence on foreign oil threatens our national security and the lives and safety of our men and women in uniform serving their country overseas. When the fierce global competition for petroleum drives up the price of crude, millions upon millions of dollars flow into the coffers of nations that don't like us too much. In too many cases, that money has financed weapons and operations that have resulted in the deaths of American soldiers.

What can we do about it? It's simple. Produce our energy in America, instead of importing it from Iran, Saudi Arabia, Nigeria, and Venezuela.

How do we do it? Also straightforward. We invest in the production of energy right here in America. We produce American oil. We produce clean-burning American natural gas. We extract liquid fuels from algae. We construct wind and solar farms. We make our homes more efficient, and we invest in nuclear power.

What's the result? We keep our money at home. We create energy jobs all over America, and we bolster our national security.

My bill means that those who fought for their country abroad would be able to continue their work for the security of our country when they return home by getting a job and a career producing our energy right here in America.

My bill says, if you risked your life for your country fighting enemies funded by foreign oil purchased with American dollars, then you can come home and continue your work for our national security, this time with a career in the energy industry.

The Energy Jobs for Veterans Act will incentivize employers to hire veterans for jobs being created by American energy. The bill instructs the Department of Labor to award competitive grants to three States to establish programs to reimburse employers and other organizations for providing on-the-job training and apprenticeship programs for veterans that are employed by energy companies. The bill will allow States to reimburse employers for training and apprenticeship provided to veteran employees.

Unlike other employment programs for veterans that fund training but don't guarantee employment, the Energy Jobs for Veterans Act incentivizes companies to hire veterans in the first place, and ensures that veterans are learning on the job and collecting valuable work experience from the beginning.

Eligible energy employers are those involved in the energy efficient building, construction, and retrofits industry, the renewable electric power industry, the biofuels industry, the energy efficiency assessment industry, the oil and gas industry, and the nuclear industry.

This is a pilot program and it's 100 percent competitive. The Secretary of Labor must make the awards to the most competitive applications for funds. If this works, we can expand to more States and different industries.

Madam Speaker, now let's get down to why it is really important.

On March 12th, the Labor Department announced that the unemployment rate last year for young Iraq and Afghanistan veterans hit 21.1 percent. The number was well above the 16.6 percent jobless rate for nonveterans of that same age group, 18–24. As of last year, 1.9 million had deployed for the wars since 9/11. Many have struggled with mental health problems, addiction, and homelessness as they return home. Difficulty in finding work can make the adjustments much harder.

Our veterans were on the front lines defending our freedom. We can't leave them behind now. I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this bill.

I will enter into the RECORD these seven letters of support for my bill from my congressional district.

MARINE CORPS LEAGUE OF NEW MEXICO,
March 22, 2010.

Representative HARRY TEAGUE.

SIR: I have just received a copy of Bill H.R. 4592.

I am Marine Corps League Department Commandant for the state of New Mexico. You have the support of the League as well as my personal vote of approval of H.R. 4592. The returning service personnel need all the assistance we as Americans can give them.

Sincerely,

VERNON MOLLAN,
Commandant of Marine Corps League, State of New Mexico.

SAPPHIRE ENERGY,
San Diego, CA, March 8th, 2010.

Hon. HARRY TEAGUE,
U.S. House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TEAGUE: Sapphire Energy commends you for taking bold measures to both expedite the development of our green economy and provide on-the-job training to America's veterans, through H.R. 4592, the ''Energy Jobs for Veterans Act'' This bill addresses three of our nation's most pressing concerns—energy independence, climate change, and job creation—by helping veterans integrate seamlessly into the domestic energy industry. As the leading company in the algae-based fuels industry, Sapphire Energy applauds you for your consistent leadership on these issues at large, and specifically as it relates to this bill.

Our war heroes fought to secure America's freedom abroad, and should be given an opportunity to continue their work here at home. H.R. 4592 enables them to do so, by preparing them for a life-long career in the thriving domestic energy industry, which will ultimately help America achieve its foremost security imperative: energy independence. No one has put more on the line to help secure America's security—and no one is better suited to continue doing so on the home front—than our Nation's veterans. As such, Sapphire Energy lends its full support to this initiative, and your concerted efforts to enact the ''Energy Jobs for Veterans Act.''

Sincerely,

TIM ZENK,
Vice President of Corporate Affairs, Sapphire Energy, Inc.

LAS CRUCES GREEN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: On behalf of the Las Cruces Green Chamber of Commerce, which represents over 300 businesses in Dõna Ana County, I'd like to express our support for H.R. 4592. The Energy Jobs for Veterans Act will not only provide much needed incentives to make sure that our veterans can find well-paying jobs but also make sure that our growing energy sector has a pool of well-trained workers. This would be an excellent boon to our community.

Sincerely,

NICK VOGES,
Las Cruces Green Chamber of Commerce.

CENTER OF EXCELLENCE FOR HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT,
Carlsbad, NM, March 10, 2010.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: The Center of Excellence for Hazardous Materials Management (CEHMM) is a non-profit organization in Carlsbad, NM with a research and development program to convert algae to biofuel. The Center of Excellence is committed to the hire of individuals who can think on their feet, follow direction and wish to contribute to a green energy venture with tremendous potential.

I believe that many veterans meet all of these criteria, and we welcome applications from this esteemed group. CEHMM currently employs several veterans who have been excellent employees.

CEHMM fully supports the ''Energy Jobs for Veterans Act'' and would welcome the chance to participate as a member of the biofuels industry.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS C. LYNN,
Executive Director.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' SERVICES,
Sante Fe, NM, February 24, 2010.

HARRY TEAGUE,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: New Mexico is striving to provide services to our veterans that will enable them to transition into society by providing avenues for employment and business training.

The proposed Energy Jobs for Veterans Act will allow New Mexico to increase the outreach to recently discharged veterans to provide training in the emerging energy-related fields such as wind, solar, biofuels, geothermal, nuclear, as well as oil and gas.

New Mexico is a mostly rural state and this very important piece of legislation will go a long way to provide training and outreach to those veterans who live in rural areas of our state where we currently see a high unemployment rate. The men and women who proudly and bravely served our country deserve all of the opportunities possible when it comes to job creation. They were first in line to raise their hand to defend this country and we believe they should be first in line for jobs when they are discharged.

We appreciate all the support and hard work that you have provided to New Mexico veterans and we fully support this legislation.

Respectfully,

JOHN M. GARCIA,
Cabinet Secretary.

VFW VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, DEPARTMENT OF NEW MEXICO,
Glencoe, NM, March 22, 2010.

Hon. HARRY TEAGUE,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: The Department of New Mexico, Veterans of Foreign Wars, strongly supports H.R. 4592 Energy Jobs for Veterans Bill. We share the same vision ''Those who fought for their country abroad would be able to continue their work for the security of our country when they return home—by getting a job, and a career, producing our energy right here in America.''

Sincerely,

RAUL SANCHEZ,
Commander, Department of New Mexico, VFW.

PNM RESOURCES,
Albuquerque, NM, March 11, 2010.

Hon. HARRY TEAGUE,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TEAGUE: PNM Resources commends your thoughtful leadership in the development of our green economy and your support of on-the-job training to America's veterans through HR 4592, the ''Energy Jobs for Veterans Act.'' This bill addresses three of our nation's most pressing concerns—energy independence, climate change, and job creation—by helping veterans integrate seamlessly into domestic energy industry. As the largest utility in New Mexico and one of the first utilities to support climate legislation, PNM Resources applauds you for your commitment to diligently address these issues and your leadership on this bill.

America's veterans should have every opportunity to utilize and develop their skills domestically. HR 4592 prepares our veterans for a life-long career in domestic energy industry, which will ultimately help America achieve its foremost security imperative: energy independence. No one has put more on the line to help secure America's security our Nation's veterans. As such, PNM Resources lends its full support to this initiative, and your concerted efforts to enact the ''Energy Jobs for Veterans Act.''

Sincerely,

JIM FERLAND,
Senior Vice President, Utility Operations.

Mr. FILNER. Thank you, Congressman TEAGUE, for your strong advocacy on behalf of our veterans. This innovative and competitive idea will ensure that our returning veterans have the employment opportunities they require to make the difficult transition into the civilian workforce, while also addressing America's need for energy independence.

Madam Speaker, Congress must act to ensure our returning veterans have employment opportunities as they strive to reintegrate into the civilian workforce. This bill would help do just that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 4592, as amended, a bill to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in energy-related positions.

Madam Speaker, I think the final bill is better. I applaud the manner in which the bill was developed. As originally introduced by Mr. TEAGUE, the

bill would have established a Department of Labor grant program to subsidize employers for salaries paid to newly hired veterans working in the energy sector.

The ranking member of the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, Mr. BOOZMAN, Dr. BOOZMAN, expressed some reservations, some concerns about the approach, and he offered to work with Mr. TEAGUE to craft a bill that would pay for skilled development, providing on-the-job training for veterans in the energy sector. And to the credit of Mr. TEAGUE, he's worked with our side in a bipartisan manner.

I believe we have a better bill that will promote greater veterans employment results in the long run. I liken it to helping a veteran, in a way, instead of perhaps giving him something for a day, we're also giving him the opportunity to learn so that it will be for a lifetime.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers and am prepared to close.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, once again, I thank Chairwoman HERSETH SANDLIN for her leadership and Ranking Member Dr. BOOZMAN and Mr. TEAGUE for their work to bring us a bipartisan bill. I urge my colleagues to support it, as amended, to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in energy-related positions.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, as we conclude this package of six bills that I think do so much for our Nation's veterans, this committee has been proud to work in a bipartisan way to get these bills to the floor.

I would like to remind my colleagues that this committee, in the last 4 years, has, in fact, done a tremendous amount for our Nation's veterans. We have increased the health care budget by more than $20 billion, 60 percent increase in health care for our Nation's veterans. We've updated the GI bill and have a GI bill for the 21st century that about 200,000 students are taking advantage of in this first year of the bill.

We are helping to improve access for our rural veterans, for our women veterans, and, as we show today, to make sure we bring an end to our homeless veterans. So we are very proud of the work that we are doing for the veterans that we are so proud of.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FILNER. And as I close, Madam Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material, both on the previous bill, H.R. 4667, and the current bill, H.R. 4592, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4592, "To provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in energy-related positions," a bill sponsored by my colleague Congressman TEAGUE from New Mexico.

H.R. 4592 increases job opportunities increase job opportunities for veterans by reimbursing employers for the cost of providing on-the job training for veterans in the energy sector through a new "Veterans Energy Related Employment Program" of competitive grants.

We have an obligation to ensure that our veterans can continue to use their expertise and talents that they have so ably used in serving this great nation. We can do this by showing our appreciation of the service of veterans and actively provide opportunities for them to work. These veterans have given great contributions and made incredible personal sacrifices so that all of us in this country might live in a safe and secure nation and world. It is time that we pay up and stand up for our heroes. For, what is the price of freedom?

As President Kennedy once said, 'The price of freedom is high, but Americans have always paid it.' And no one has paid a higher price than the brave men and women through the years who gave the last full measure of devotion to their country. Whether it is the ultimate sacrifice of life or the loss of limb or the loss of time with family and friends, we owe our veterans an enormous outstanding debt of gratitude.

From Bunker Hill to Yorktown, from Washington, D.C. to the Battle of New Orleans, from Bull Run to Gettysburg and Antietam to Appamattox, brave Americans gave their lives so that the nation might live. And from Alsace Lorain to Verdun, and Normandy to Berlin and Pearl Harbor to Okinawa, from Inchon and Correigador to Vietnam, Lebanon, Grenada, Kuwait, Afghanistan, and Iraq, Americans have nobly sacrificed their lives so that the world may live in freedom.

The debt of gratitude we owe to the soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen who answered their nation's call and made supreme sacrifices can never be repaid. But the nation can follow President Lincoln's admonition to 'care for him who has borne the battle, and for his [family].' Indeed, it is the least we can do.

It is out of my profound respect and gratitude for all who wear and have worn the uniform of the United States that I continue to work so hard to pass legislation that will ensure that veterans receive the health care, job opportunities, housing assistance, and educational benefits they deserve. Caring for our veterans also means giving them our support when they need it.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4592.

Mr. FILNER. I would urge my colleagues to support this bill. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4592, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1833

AFTER RECESS

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4899, DISASTER RELIEF AND SUMMER JOBS ACT OF 2010

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–454) on the resolution (H. Res. 1204) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4899) making emergency supplemental appropriations for disaster relief and summer jobs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4849, SMALL BUSINESS AND INFRASTRUCTURE JOBS TAX ACT OF 2010

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–455) on the resolution (H. Res. 1205) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4849) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small business job creation, extend the Build America Bonds program, provide other infrastructure job creation tax incentives, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 4810, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 4667, by the yeas and nays.

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

END VETERAN HOMELESSNESS ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4810, 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 California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4810.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

YEAS—413

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

NOT VOTING—16

Barrett (SC)
Blunt
Buyer
Courtney
Davis (AL)
Davis (TN)
Dicks
Hoekstra
Kilpatrick (MI)
Lynch
McCarthy (NY)
Moran (VA)
Neal (MA)
Payne
Shadegg
Wamp

□ 1904

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF THE LATE HONORABLE FRED HEINEMAN, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask our colleagues to observe a moment of silence in memory of our former colleague, Representative Fred Heineman, who represented North Carolina's Fourth District in the 104th Congress. Fred passed away Saturday, March 20, at the age of 80.

Fred Heineman was first and foremost a man who sought to serve his country. He was a marine, a law enforcement professional, and a Member of Congress.

He started out as a beat cop in Harlem. During his 25-year career with the New York Police Department, he shut down organized crime, he rooted out police corruption, and he tried to keep young people away from drugs and crime by giving them positive alternatives to the streets.

In 1979, he came to Raleigh, North Carolina, to serve as the capital city's chief of police. Fred played a role in making that city what it is today, one of the best places to live and raise a family in our country. I worked with him while he served in that role and admired his commitment to the State that became his home.

In 1995, Fred came to this body, serving in the 104th Congress from 1995 to 1996. In the Halls of Congress, he eschewed the title of Congressman or Representative, preferring instead to be called, simply, ''The Chief.''

Over the last few days, I have heard his former colleagues on the police force and in this institution recount the ways he affected their lives. Fred's colleagues respected his expertise on issues of public safety and his strength of conviction. The nature of this institution, I firmly believe, is such that those who remain true to their convictions, who fight for what they believe in, leave it with pride in the service they have rendered.

Fred is survived by his wife, Linda, and six children. I wish to offer condolences to her and the rest of the family on behalf of my wife, Lisa, and me, and on behalf of colleagues in this body.

I would now like to yield to my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), the dean of our delegation, for his thoughts.

Mr. COBLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When Fred Heineman—and you've pretty well touched on it, David, most of it—when Fred Heineman came to this people's House as a result of the 1994 election, I went to him one day and I said, what are your committees of choice? He said, well, I'm not sure. I said, why don't you select House Judiciary? He said, well, my legal background is not that formidable. I said, your law enforcement background is formidable indeed. He said, well, I'm

not sure I could be assigned to Judiciary.

I then went to leadership and told them about Fred Heineman. They perhaps knew him but didn't know the great details that David has just shared with us, and I said I think he would like to be on the Judiciary Committee. He was, in fact, assigned to the Judiciary Committee. Then my chairman of the Judiciary Committee asked me if I would introduce Fred to the Judiciary Committee during his first meeting as a member.

I went to Fred, and I said, Fred, I would like to introduce you as the former chief of police of the Raleigh, North Carolina, police department, but I would also like to introduce you as a cop. I said, would you be offended by that? He looked into my face, and he said very proudly, ''That's who I am. I am a New York cop.'' And with those words, he told me that he valued his time on the Raleigh police force as chief very significantly, but he valued equally significantly his time as a New York cop.

I thank you, David, for taking time to honor the memory of Fred Heineman and, as you said, we wish our best to Mrs. Heineman and the family.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank my colleague and now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to request that our colleagues rise and honor Fred Heineman with a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If Members will please rise, the House will observe a moment of silence.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4667, 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 California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4667.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—407

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

NOT VOTING—22

Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blunt
Buyer
Chandler
Davis (AL)
Davis (TN)
Dicks
Fallin
Hoekstra
Johnson, Sam
Kilpatrick (MI)
Lynch
McCarthy (NY)
Moran (VA)
Neal (MA)
Olson
Payne
Shadegg
Wamp

□ 1919

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. FALLIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 171, I was unexpectedly detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend several votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on final passage of H.R. 4810 and ''aye'' on final passage of H.R. 4667.

COMMEMORATING RETIREMENT OF DETROIT RADIO PERSONALITY DICK PURTAN

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

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the retirement of WOMC–FM radio host, Mr. Dick Purtan, after 45 years on the air in Detroit.

During his career, Mr. Purtan has become a beloved Detroit institution and recognized radio personality nationwide. For his work at WOMC–FM, Mr. Dick Purtan has been inducted into the Michigan Broadcasters Hall of Fame, the National Radio Hall of Fame, and won the Marconi award for being the Nation's top radio personality.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dick Purtan will be remembered for his award winning personality and as a philanthropist and friend to Metro Detroit. As we celebrate his retirement, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing his many achievements and honoring the contributions he made to our community and country.

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT PINE BLUFF

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express congratulations to the small liberal arts college that I attended that started with seven students when it began, a historically black college, in Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

Of course on Friday evening, they played Duke University. It was a major accomplishment for their athletic department. They didn't win, they didn't place, but they did show; and I congratulate them for a tremendous effort.

CONGRATULATING THE 2010 EDINA BOYS HOCKEY TEAM

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to congratulate the Edina High School boys' hockey team on their recent Minnesota Class 2–A State championship title. In a highly anticipated championship game, Edina beat a very strong Minnetonka team to clinch their seventh State hockey title.

After jumping out to a 4–0 lead after the first two periods, the Hornets had to hold off a strong third-period charge from Minnetonka before finishing with an impressive 4–2 victory. The win was a total team effort, with four different players scoring goals and the Hornet defense and goaltending protecting the lead until the final horn sounded.

Edina was led by a great coaching staff and, more importantly, was supported by a large contingent of students, faculty, parents, friends and family throughout the tournament. To each of them, as well as every member of the championship team, I want to offer my congratulations.

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.

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

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

CONGRATULATING THE SAIPAN SOUTHERN HIGH SCHOOL MANTA RAY CONCERT BAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, when we open our hearts to our young people—give generously our support and encouragement—those young people consistently exceed our expectation.

Let me tell you of the story of a dedicated group of students from a tiny island in the western Pacific Ocean, and the teachers who supported and encouraged them. Because on April 20, those students, the Saipan Southern High School Manta Ray Concert Band, exceeding any reasonable expectation, will be performing at one of America's premier musical venues: Carnegie Hall in New York City.

Saipan Southern High School opened just a few years ago, in 2002. Southern was a beautiful new facility, but it needed to be filled with life and with heart. The new students and new teachers quickly adopted the motto ''un eskuela, un korason''—one school, one heart—and began to bring their school to life.

One of the new teachers was William DeWitt. Mr. DeWitt is a wonderful musician himself and his new Saipan Southern music and band students were enthusiastic to learn. But few had any musical training. Yet within a few months of opening, Saipan Southern enjoyed the first performance of its very own band, the Manta Ray Concert Band, and quickly ''un eskuela, un korason'' became more than just a motto because the musical rhythms of the Manta Rays became the heartbeat of Saipan Southern.

The band performed at pep rallies, sports competitions, for the PTA, at graduation. It seemed whenever Saipan Southern had an event, the beat of the Manta Rays provided the musical backdrop. By 2005, the Manta Ray Concert Band had reached a level of proficiency that allowed them to take on the complex Latin rhythms and jazzy dissonances of West Side Story for a production at Saipan Southern.

And their reach extended beyond their school, as they began performing—and entertaining—for the annual Taste of the Marianas festival, Northern Marianas College Charter Day, the Western Pacific Judicial Council Conference, and many other community events. How that heartbeat grew stronger.

In 2008 and again in 2009, the Manta Ray Concert Band captured First Place Gold awards at the Tumon Bay International Music Festival in Guam. Student members of the Manta Ray Concert Band joined the Official Youth Orchestra at the 2008 Summer Olympics and performed in Beijing, China.

Today, the Saipan Southern High School band program has grown to more than 150 aspiring student musicians. The Manta Ray Concert Band has studied under guest conductors from Guam and Japan. They have played for dramatic productions of My Fair Lady, A Winter's Tale, and It's a Wonderful Life. They host their own concerts and perform at others as well. The Manta Ray Concert Band typically presents more than 20 performances annually.

Throughout their exemplary rise, these young musicians and their teachers have struggled with lack of finances, with lack of instruments, with the difficulties of travel for a band of students of various ethnicities and citizenship. But they have not lost heart. Nor have they forgotten that music can fill the hearts of others. When a security guard was brutally murdered at a sister school, the Manta Rays played to raise funds for the grieving family. After a shooting rampage left four dead on the island of Saipan, the Manta Rays raised spirits and funds for those in mourning.

The Manta Ray Concert Band certainly deserves recognition. But they won their most recent distinction solely by virtue of the quality of their music. Still under the dedicated direction of William DeWitt, they auditioned for the right to play at this year's New York International Music Festival at Carnegie Hall. And on April 20, with some of the most accomplished high school and college bands, the Manta Rays will fill the storied venue with their heartbeat.

As usual, they will not be playing for themselves but for others. The band is dedicating its Carnegie performance to Peter Le'au, the first principal of Saipan Southern High School, who, as the Manta Rays' program notes, ''is courageously fighting to recover from a recent illness.''

Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit this tribute to the Saipan Southern High School Manta Ray Concert Band, along with individual names of each band member performing at Carnegie Hall as well as of their esteemed band director and school principal, for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are:

Eun Joung Ahn, tenor saxophone
Ken Alvarado, trumpet
Naomi Cabrera, percussion
Scott Cabrera, trumpet
James Camacho, clarinet
Crista Ching, trombone
Joe Ray Dela Cruz, tuba
Anna Rose Deleon Guerrero, percussion/logistician
Mereylen Denora, trumpet
Pedro Dueñias, alto saxophone
Kevin Fejeran, baritone
Rodolfo Guiao, Jr., baritone saxophone
Jun Yeop Han, tenor saxophone
Hyun Rock Jang, horn
Joseph Jang, percussion
Chan Young Kang, percussion
Haneul Kim, flute
Il Ho (Ted) Kim, trombone
Shin Hye Kwon, flute
John Craig Lamberto, clarinet
Bo Mi Lee, flute
Ji Won (Rebekah) Lee, flute

Trini Macduff, flute
Leagine Mendiola, clarinet
Genevieve Ngiraibuuch, clarinet
Fumi Nimura, clarinet
Momoko Nishikido, trumpet
Maria-Theszaray Omar, flute
David Paek, trombone
Albert Palacios, alto saxophone
Jaynine Parico, percussion
John Park, clarinet
Joshua Roberto, trumpet
Joshua Sablan, horn
Roseanna Sablan, percussion
Elejohn Solomon, clarinet
Min Jung Song, clarinet
So Jung Song, alto saxophone
Jonelie Torres, percussion
Donovan Tudela, bass clarinet
Krysthian Villanueva, alto saxophone
William DeWitt, Teacher
Craig Garrison, School Principal

□ 1930

BORDER SECURITY

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. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Once again, there's a new push for an amnesty bill to pass this Congress. Yesterday, tens of thousands of people marched in Washington, D.C., wanting amnesty. And it was interesting. As I looked over this very peaceful crowd and all those people marching, I wondered why there were no American flags.

In any event, amnesty is not the answer. Even the talk of amnesty causes a flood of people to come across our southern border. Amnesty is no answer to the problem because the problem is the lack of border security. The violence is already out of control in the border region. Thousands more people illegally crossing the border will make an already dangerous situation a much worse disaster, so we have to start with the basics.

First, we must secure the border. We must start with securing the border from the criminal enterprises, including the drug cartels. Just over a week ago, an American consulate employee and his wife were murdered in Juarez, Mexico. Lesley Enriquez, 35, and her husband, Arthur Redelfs, 34, were murdered in a drive-by shooting near the Santa Fe Bridge. The husband of another U.S. consulate employee was also gunned down on the Mexican side of the border.

Murders and kidnappings have caused the closing of the U.S. Embassy in Reynosa until further notice. The U.S. State Department is now rushing to relocate consulate employees in Juarez, Tijuana, Nogales, Nuevo Laredo, Monterrey, and Matamoros, all because of the violence on the border and the kidnappings. Shoot-outs in the streets have killed thousands of people, mostly Mexican nationals.

The drug cartels are fighting each other and fighting law enforcement for control over the lucrative drug routes into the United States. Good people from both sides of the border are being placed in harm's way by these murderous thugs. Even an armed Mexican military helicopter intruded into the United States airspace in Zapata County, Texas. The intentions of this incursion are still unknown.

Over a year ago, Texas Governor Rick Perry asked for Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano for a thousand troops at the border to help with the increasing violence and to prevent the drug cartels from entering the United States. The Governor has asked for more Predator drones for increased surveillance. He was trying to head off this escalation of violence that has occurred recently. The help he requested has never come, and the Governor's request for more troops and drones at the border has been ignored for over a year.

In response to the murders of these Americans, Governor Perry again eventually asked for help. He asked for surveillance planes and a thousand fresh troops at the Texas border with Mexico to help stem the violence. Secretary Napolitano said she would ''look at'' the request, but she thinks there's already enough troops on the border. So Governor Perry has decided he can't wait around on the Federal Government, even though it's the Federal Government's responsibility to secure our borders. He's ordered Texas National Guard helicopters to the border to support law enforcement that is on the border already. They're trying to fight the border violence spillover into the United States.

Texas military forces have requested and obtained OH–58 Kiowa and UH–72 Lakota helicopters to be used to fly up and down the Texas-Mexico border along the Rio Grande River from Brownsville to El Paso, Texas. Of course, their number and exact location will not be disclosed for security purposes.

I've had the opportunity to be on the Texas-Mexico border with our Texas Air National Guard and fly up and down that region to see firsthand the problem of the incursions into the United States, all because the border is not secure. I would hope our Federal Government would support the Governor's actions.

The Federal Government should actually do something to stop the violence and secure the border. It is the first responsibility of government to protect the people, and that includes the people who live along other international borders. We should send more troops. The violence is getting worse every day. Our border sheriffs and law enforcement are outmanned, outfinanced, and they're outgunned, but they're doing everything they can to protect the citizens along the Texas-Mexico border from the violent drug cartels that have come into the United States.

Every single county and city and town along the border needs help in the border war. It is irresponsible to leave these people defenseless. Once again, it affects good people on both sides of the border, Mexicans and Americans as well.

Cartels are waging war on our border. People are not only sneaking across into the United States, they're shooting their way into our country. The violence is exploding into America's border communities. So it's time to put an end to this madness, send sufficient troops to the border, and uphold the national responsibility to protect the citizens of this United States.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.)

WATERLOO

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. As the dust settles, Mr. Speaker, on the Capitol today, I read and article called ''Waterloo,'' by President George W. Bush's speech writer, David Frum. I think it sums up nicely what we've just witnessed, and I wanted to share some excerpts with you.

He began, Conservatives and Republicans today suffered their most crushing legislative defeat since the 1960s. It's hard to exaggerate the magnitude of the disaster. Conservatives may cheer themselves that they'll compensate for today's expected vote with a big win in the November 2010 elections, but, first, it's a good bet that conservatives are overly optimistic about November—by then, the economy will have improved and immediate goodies in the health care bill will be reaching key voting blocs. Second, So what? Legislative majorities come and go. The health care bill is forever.

Now comes the hard lesson: A huge part of the blame for today's disaster attaches to conservatives and Republicans themselves.

At the beginning of this process, he says, we made a strategic decision. Unlike, say, Democrats in 2001, when President Bush proposed his first tax cut, we would make no deal with the administration. No negotiations, no compromise, nothing. We were going for all he marbles. This would be Obama's Waterloo, just like it was for Clinton in 1994.

The hard-liners overlooked a few key facts: Obama was elected by 53 percent of the vote, not Clinton's 42 percent; the liberal bloc within the Democratic congressional caucus is bigger and stronger than it was in 1993–1994; and, of course, the Democrats also remember their history and also remember the consequences of the failure of 1994.

This time, when we went for all the marbles, we ended up with none.

No illusions, please. This bill will not be repealed. Even if Republicans scored a 1994-style landslide in November, how many votes could they muster to reopen the doughnut hole and charge seniors more for prescription drugs? How many votes to re-allow insurers to rescind policies when they discover a preexisting condition? How many votes to banish 25-year-olds from their parents' insurance coverage? And even if the votes were there, would President Obama sign such a repeal?

We followed the most radical voices in the party and the movement, he says, and they led us to abject and irreversible defeat. They were leaders who knew better, would have liked to deal, but they were trapped. Conservative talkers on Fox and talk radio whipped the Republican voting base into such a frenzy that dealmaking was rendered impossible. How do you negotiate with somebody who wants to murder your grandmother or, to be more exact, with someone whom your voters have been persuaded to believe wants to murder your grandmother?

I've been on a soapbox for months, he says, now about the harm that our overheated talk is doing to us. Yes, it mobilizes supporters, but by mobilizing them with hysterical accusations and pseudo-information, overheated talk has made it impossible for Representatives to represent and elected leaders to lead. The real leaders are on TV and radio. They have very different imperatives from people in government.

Talk radio thrives on confrontation and recrimination. When Rush Limbaugh said he wanted President Obama to fail, he was intelligently explaining his own interests. What he omitted to say, but what is equally true, is that he also wanted Republicans to fail. If Republicans were to succeed—if they governed successfully in office and negotiated attractive compromises out of office—Rush's listeners would get less angry. If they're less angry, they listen to the radio less and hear fewer adds about Sleep Number beds.

So today's defeat for free-market economics and Republican values is a huge win for the conservative entertainment industry. Their listeners and viewers will now be even more enraged, even more frustrated, even more disappointed in everybody except the responsibility-free talkers on radio and television. For them, it's a mission accomplished. For the cause they purport to represent, it's Waterloo—ours.

This is a very good self-reflective view of what happened yesterday.

SITUATION IN AFGHANISTAN

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. Today, I was going through some of the newspapers on the Internet and I found a very interesting article that I wanted to bring to the floor. This was Newsweek, March 19, 2010, and the title is, ''The Gang That Could Not Shoot Straight.''

Six billion dollars later, the Afghan national police cannot begin to do their jobs right, never mind relieve American forces. I'm going to repeat that. Six billion dollars later, the Afghan national police cannot begin to do their jobs right, never mind relieve American forces.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rather long article, but I just want to read part tonight and I will read some tomorrow night, because I think about the men and women in uniform—God bless them all—over in Afghanistan and Iraq. I think about the situation they're in. I'm not an expert on history, but I know enough about history to know that any nation that ever tried to conquer Afghanistan never did. They basically failed.

From this article: America has spent more than $6 billion since 2002 in an effort to create an effective Afghan police force—buying weapons, building police academies, and hiring defense contractors to train the recruits—but the program has been a disaster. More than $332 million worth of invoices for police training were approved, even though the funds were poorly accounted for according to a government audit, and fewer than 12 percent of the country's police units are capable of operating on their own.

Let me repeat that. More than $332 million worth of invoices for police training were approved, even though the funds were poorly accounted for according to a government audit, and fewer than 12 percent of the country's police units are capable of operating on their own.

Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, the State Department's top representative in the region, has publicly called the Afghan police an inadequate organization riddled with corruption. I'm going to also repeat that, Mr. Speaker. Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, the State Department's top representative in the region, has called the Afghan police an inadequate organization riddled with corruption.

During the Obama administration's review of Afghan policy last year, This issue received more attention than any other except for the question of U.S. troop levels, Holbrooke told Newsweek. We drilled down deep into this. The worst of it is that the police are central to Washington's plans for getting out of Afghanistan.

□ 1945

Mr. Speaker, I will again tomorrow night read another portion of this article. What it is saying—and what we in Congress need to keep in mind, we can't even fix the streets in my home town in eastern North Carolina, yet we're spending billions and billions and billions and billion of dollars in a country that at best is living in the 16th century.

We've debated health care this weekend. We have other issues we'll be debating. And even though these issues are very important to the American people, how in the world can we keep wearing out our troops overseas, spending billions and billions of dollars that we can't even spend here in America?

So, Mr. Speaker, as I do every night because my heart aches for the military and those who have lost their lives, the families, I will ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I will ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I will ask God in His loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq, and I will ask God to please bless the House and Senate that we will do what is right in the eyes of God.

I will ask God to give strength, wisdom and courage to President Obama that he will do what is right in the eyes of God. And three times I will say, God, please, God, please, God, please, continue to bless America.

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

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

HONORING CAPTAIN TEJDEEP SINGH RATTAN

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and honor one of my constituents, Captain Tejdeep Singh Rattan, for graduation today from the U.S. Army's Officer Basic Leader Course. Captain Rattan was recruited and commissioned by the U.S. Army in 2006 as part of the health professionals scholarship program. After completing his final year of dental work, he joined the U.S. Army Officer Basic Leader Course.

Before joining the Officer Basic Leader Course, Captain Rattan contacted me to indicate his strong desire to continue serving the Nation he loves as a U.S. Army dentist while abiding by his Sikh articles of faith. These articles of faith include wearing a Sikh turban and maintaining uncut hair, including a beard. At the time of his recruitment, he was assured by Army recruiters that his articles of faith would be accommodated, only to later be informed that he must abandon his Sikh articles of faith in order to continue his duties as a United States Army officer.

After learning of his case, I led a number of my House and Senate colleagues in sending letters to Secretary Gates, requesting that the accommodations be made for Captain Rattan and all other Sikh Americans who wish to serve. Thanks in part to our efforts,

Captain Rattan's accommodation request was granted. I am grateful to Secretary Gates and then-Secretary of the Army Pete Geren for reviewing and ultimately granting the accommodation. They have both shown tremendous foresight in recognizing that our Nation's 21st-century fighting force should incorporate all aspects of American society.

Sikhs fought bravely in defense of our Nation in both World Wars, the Korean War and the Vietnam War. At present, Sikhs serve in the militaries of Great Britain, Canada and India, among others, and as United States peacekeepers, often working closely with American troops in troubled regions.

Throughout our Nation's history, the military has succeeded in training individuals from diverse backgrounds and communities to achieve one unifying goal, to protect and defend the United States. By denying Sikh officers the ability to appropriately practice their religion while serving, the Army denies itself access to the important talents and abilities of these individuals who are willing to fight and die for our Nation.

No American should have to choose between his religion and service to our country. At a time when this country is fighting two wars overseas, we can ill afford to turn away skilled, accomplished and patriotic young Americans like Captain Rattan who wish to serve. Captain Rattan's achievement today underscores the importance of preserving diversity in our Armed Forces. It is a testament to one of the most fundamental values, freedom of religion upon which our Nation was founded and which makes the United States a beacon of hope and liberty throughout the world. I wholeheartedly congratulate him on this very important occasion.

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

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

STATES' RIGHTS

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, you know, we have seen for some time the Federal Government, since 1913, usurping States' rights. This Federal Government, this Congress, the House and Senate with the complicity of both Republican and Democratic Presidents, sending to the States unfunded mandates demanding that they come up with millions and billions of dollars that they didn't have, just out of the blue. We've now come up with one that many States believe will bankrupt them.

How did we get here? Well, in 1913 the constitutionally sanctioned process of electing Senators was changed by the 17th Amendment. That was put in the Constitution after great debate, and what it required was that the State legislatures, the States select—not the overall population of the State—but the State legislatures would select the U.S. Senators. That was a check and balance on the Federal Government's usurpation of States' rights because if any U.S. Senator came up here and voted such an unfunded mandate upon the State, he was going to quickly be recalled, as has happened before.

But the appeal—and I don't know how I would have voted on the 17th Amendment because it sounds so good. You know what, we ought to let all the people in the State elect our U.S. Senator. And once that was done, once that amendment was passed, there was no further check on States' rights and the protections afforded in the 9th and 10th Amendments that reserved all power not specifically enumerated, as it says here, in the 10th Amendment: ''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.''

Both Republicans and Democrats have violated that concept. And what could the States do about it? After 1913, they had no power to do anything about it. They didn't have an Army as big as the United States, and we didn't want secession again. We didn't want another civil war. It should be done legislatively and diplomatically and within legislative bodies, however they were called, and within the framework of the U.S. Constitution.

Well, the Constitution, when it was drafted, addressed that point, and it's very clear. And perhaps it took a government to run away, as one State representative or Governor said, The mother of all unfunded mandates. The States—there are 39 of them that have so far said, We're not going to take this anymore. We're going to do something, whether it's going to be legislative, litigation, whatever. We're going to stop this. But the truth is, it may take years to get through the courts to the Supreme Court. It may take years.

So here's the solution: it was in the Constitution all along. It's called article V of the United States Constitution. Now we know that article V has been used many times by this first line, ''The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary''—we know that's been used many times. The House and Senate agree we need an amendment, and so they call for the amendment to be produced. But something—I haven't been able to find it. It's been done before, but it can be. It's there. But here it is: ''Or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall''—it means Congress shall, Congress shall, that it's not any choice that Congress has.

If two-thirds of the States apply and say, We want a convention—not a Constitutional Convention because this can be restricted by the Congress—but an amendment—one amendment would be all that was necessary to return a check and balance on the Federal Government, give the States what the 9th and 10th Amendments reserved to them. Two-thirds of the States make application, Congress shall call in a convention for proposing amendments—not rewriting the Constitution. And this is a procedural issue that the Supreme Court has always said, with regard to procedural issues, That's political. It's procedural. Congress, you do it however you want to. We're not touching that. We're not going to issue a decision. That's what this should be. This is how we return control and some sense of order to the States.

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.)

HEALTH CARE: THE CRISIS OF CONSENT

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. So this is what change looks like. If he were here, Mr. Speaker, in this time of momentous national distress, I would remind the President of the United States that he is not a leader of a party or an ideology. He is the leader of our country, one founded not to ameliorate others but to inspire the world.

As families lose their jobs, their homes and their dreams for their children, as our troops fight in sacrifice in foreign fields for our liberty and security, President Obama's obsessive-compulsive pursuit of an abominable government takeover of health care has defied the public's objections, despoiled this, the people's House, and further alienated Americans from their representative government.

As President Obama's campaign mantra of ''hope and change'' has degenerated into tax and hate, reputable surveys prior to this vote report: the public overwhelmingly thinks that the U.S. Government is broken. Only 21 percent of the public thinks it is being governed with its consent. Only 26 percent of the public trusts the Federal Government most of the time or always; 56 percent of Americans think the Federal Government has become so large and powerful that it poses an immediate threat to the rights and freedoms of ordinary citizens; 70 percent believe the government and big business typically work together in ways that hurt consumers and investors; and 71 percent of Americans think the Federal Government is a special interest.

In the wake of this health care debate, despicable dysfunctional process and product, it is clear the most dangerous special interest is Big Government and President Obama is its lobbyist. In contrast to Americans' faith in themselves, every major piece of legislation proffered by the President and his Democratic Congress expands and empowers Big Government at the expense of the people, possessed of a smug, cynical, patronizing view of Americans as dependents desiring State benefits, this arrogant administration and its enablers have defied the American people and bipartisan opposition in Congress to unilaterally jam through a trillion-dollar government takeover of health care.

Why? For so many Americans, the answer is that this President and his Democratic Congress think they are smarter than you, want to run your life, and want to make government your ruler, not your servant. It threatens not only our health care system but it tears the social fabric of our Nation. Instead of working towards a more political Union, the President exacerbated the disorder of our Nation and wrought an experiment in human freedom and self-government on the precipice of implosion.

To do so the President has the power, but not the right. Thus he has merely scored a Pyrrhic victory over the American people. Ultimately, his government-run medicine scheme will be repealed and replaced because America's strength and salvation remains her free people, not a person.

And this November, America's sovereign citizens will remind the President and Democratic Congress that we the people do not work for government. The government works for us. No, the President and his Democratic Congress will not break us beneath Big Government. Devoted to our freedom and a more perfect Union, we will keep the faith, trust the public, calm the chaos, and heal our country.

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.)

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

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

□ 2000

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor this evening to anchor an hour for the Congressional Black Caucus on health care reform. I have several of my colleagues here to join me. Interestingly enough, three are from three of the relevant committees that put the bill together in the House.

When I left my private practice of 21 years, I promised my patients that I would continue to do everything I could to ensure that they got the health care they needed, even though I was leaving the practice. Too many were uninsured. Too many had several chronic diseases. Too many could not afford even 1 month's supply of medicine. And our low-capped Medicaid funding was of very little help.

Last night our Democratic leadership and my Democratic colleagues helped me make good on that promise. Because of the landmark legislation that we passed last night, the most momentous piece of legislation since Social Security, Medicare and the civil rights bills, not only my constituents but all Americans will have access to affordable, quality, and comprehensive health care. And African Americans and other minorities will benefit because of the provisions that are included to reduce the disparities that Surgeon General Heckler called an affront to American ideals and to the genius of American medicine.

So tonight some of my colleagues will help to explain the many benefits of the bill we passed last evening and the way that our communities will be able to be helped by the legislation.

I would like to first call on the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Health Subcommittee who played a very important role in developing the bill as it went through Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Let me thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and thank her for all of her good work on the legislation. For the past 12 to 14 months, I have watched you as you have worked tirelessly to get a finished product that we can all be proud of. And so I want to thank you on behalf of the 600,000 people that I represent in the First Congressional District of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, every President in this country for the past 50 years or more has tried to reform health care. Unfortunately, all of them have failed, both Democrat and Republican. We have a health care system in this country that is in serious need of reforming. And President Barack Obama, during the Presidential campaign of 2008, campaigned on the platform that if elected, he would bring health care reform to the American people and for the American people. It was a hotly contested campaign, as we can all remember, but he was victorious because the American people had confidence that President Obama had the ability and the vision to bring people together to enact this worthwhile legislation and to do other great things for our country.

Well, we started the 111th Congress, and President Obama told us from day one that he was ready to deliver on the promise that he made to the American people. And so we in the Energy and Commerce Committee and Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN and many of us worked very hard to put together a good, strong piece of legislation. But I can tell you that we would not have enacted this bill last night without the courageous, visionary leadership of President Barack Obama.

In the Energy and Commerce Committee, we worked very hard to craft legislation that we were very proud of. At the same time as we were doing our work, the United States Senate was also crafting a piece of legislation and they completed their work on Christmas Eve, as we all remember. Well, what the American people may not fully understand is that in this body, before we can have a piece of legislation delivered to the President's desk, both the House and the Senate must agree. And so during the Christmas holidays, the Democratic leadership from both Chambers worked very hard to try to reconcile the differences between these two bills.

The unfortunate thing, Mr. Speaker, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, is we had no participation, no help whatsoever from our Republican friends on the other side of the aisle. When I say we had no help at all, we actually had none. The fact of the matter is that out of the 178 Republicans who serve in the House of Representatives, not a single one worked with us on this legislation. We tried unsuccessfully on many occasions to try to include Republicans in our deliberations, but there was apparently a strategic decision, a political decision on their part to not participate.

Over on the other side of the Capitol, the same thing happened in the United States Senate. Out of the 40 Republicans who serve in the Senate, not a single one worked with us. And so it was Democrats who had to try to get this legislation shaped and to get it ready for passage. And so during the Christmas holidays, the Democratic leadership worked very hard. They worked through Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve and all through the holidays to try to reconcile their differences. And finally toward the end of the holiday season, there was a compromise between the Chambers and we reached a decision on this legislation.

The problem was that we lost a seat in the United States Senate. Due to the unfortunate passing of our hero, Senator Edward Kennedy from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, we lost a Democratic seat in the United States Senate. Senator Kennedy's replacement was not from the Democratic Party. We found ourselves with less than the supermajority that is required in the United States Senate.

So President Obama called the leadership together many times, and we decided that we would go forward, notwithstanding the fact that we had a setback, that we would go forward and that this House of Representatives would take up and pass the Senate-passed bill, and that is important. That is a point that I want to make tonight. The bill that we passed last night was parliamentarily correct. It conformed with all of the rules of the House and the Senate. The bill that we passed last night was the identical bill that the United States Senate passed on Christmas Eve with 60 votes. We passed that bill last night in the House with 219 votes in favor of passage. We only needed 216 votes to get it done. Today the bill is on the President's desk, and we will go down to the White House tomorrow morning for the signing of the Senate bill that was passed by the House of Representatives.

Now here is the problem that we have. The Senate bill that we passed has some shortcomings. It has some areas that need improving, and so the President has worked with the leadership here in the Congress and we have come up with some fixes, if you will, with some amendments, with some changes to the Senate bill that will make it better. We all know about the provision in the Senate bill that was put in by a single Senator, that is going to be removed, and there are going to be other provisions of the Senate bill that will be removed.

Last night, not only did we pass the Senate bill but we also passed the fixes that the President asked us to pass, and those fixes are now pending in the Senate for consideration this week.

Senator REID, the majority leader in the United States Senate, has told us that the Senate will begin working on the fixes tomorrow after the President signs the bill. But, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. Speaker, we have made monumental progress. No President has ever been able to do this, but because of the vision and the masterful leadership of the President and the Speaker of this House and the majority leader and the majority whip all working together, we have been able to finally pass this legislation.

This legislation does not go into effect immediately. There will be a phase-in. As you can imagine, we cannot reform the health care system in America and the health insurance system in America overnight. It is going to take time. But I can tell you, and I can tell the American people, that by the year 2019, 95 percent of the American people will have health insurance and access to quality health care. That is what we promised the American people. That is what we are going to deliver. There will be a phase-in starting within the first 6 months of this year.

We are going to help our seniors with their prescription drugs. Those who fall into the doughnut hole, they will be given a stipend to help them purchase. We will allow families to maintain their children on their insurance policy up to age 26. So there will be a gradual phase-in.

Finally, let me conclude by saying that I represent a low-income district. The First Congressional District of North Carolina that I represent is the fourth-poorest district in the United States of America. We have a lot of low-income people, and I am happy to report to my constituents and to people all across America that for the first time in our history, individuals will be able to qualify for Medicaid. Low-income individuals will be able to get Medicaid. Right now families can qualify for Medicaid, but not individuals. An individual who makes less than $14,400 a year will get Medicaid. A family of four that makes less than $29,000 a year will be able to qualify for Medicaid, which is free. For an individual who is between the incomes of $14,400 a year and $43,000 a year, you will be able to get assistance. You will be able to get a subsidy in purchasing insurance. If you are at the low end of $14,400 a year, you will pay $36 a month in order to get a quality insurance policy. If you are at the high end of $43,000 a year, you will pay $342 in order to get a high quality insurance policy.

Now for a family of four, it is a little bit more but it is very affordable. For a family of four that makes $29,300 a year, your premiums will be $73 to insure four people in your family. At the high end, if you make $55,000 a year, you will pay $369 a month. We have made tremendous progress with the passage of this bill. We are very proud of the progress that we have made, and I just want to publicly thank the Speaker of the House of Representatives, NANCY PELOSI, the majority leader, STENY HOYER, and the majority whip, Mr. CLYBURN. I want to thank all of the leadership and the chairmen of each one of the relevant committees who participated in this bill: the Energy and Commerce Committee under the leadership of HENRY WAXMAN and formerly JOHN DINGELL; the Ways and Means Committee under the leadership of Mr. LEVIN from Michigan, formerly under the leadership of Mr. RANGEL; and the Education and Labor Committee under the leadership of GEORGE MILLER from California. All of these committees, working together with the Budget Committee led by JOHN SPRATT of South Carolina and LOUISE SLAUGHTER from New York leading the Rules Committee, all of these individuals working together to get us to the point where we were last night.

The passage of this bill is monumental. It is historic. Yesterday was not an ordinary day in the House of Representatives. I thank my colleagues who voted for this legislation. I look forward to the results that it will yield.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank Congressman BUTTERFIELD, and thank you for going through the process that we have gone through over the past year because it has been a little difficult, I think, for the American people to understand, and I think you helped to clarify how we got to where we were last night, and also you were able to clarify what some of those exchange subsidies and Medicaid would mean to the average family.

I just wanted to say before I recognize Congressman SCOTT, when you look at the uninsured that are going to be helped in this country—10.8 percent of non-Hispanic whites are uninsured. The uninsured rate for African Americans is 19.1 percent; for Asian Americans, 17.6 percent; and for Hispanics, the Latino Americans, the uninsured rate is 30.7 percent. So just providing coverage for the 32 million Americans that will be covered for the first time by this legislation will make a big difference in the lives of people of color and their families. But insurance is not enough, and there are other provisions that we will talk about a little later.

□ 2015

But at this time, I'd like to yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, who not only is on the Education and Labor Committee, which played a major role in crafting the original House bill, but also on the Budget Committee, a senior member of the Budget Committee, which had a major role in preparing and reporting out the reconciliation bill that we voted on last night.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Thank you very much. And I want to thank you, Dr. CHRISTENSEN, for your hard work and dedication. The Congressional Black Caucus is fortunate to have a leader in health care who is a physician and knows health care and, particularly, a physician with an expertise in public health. So we're very fortunate, and I want to thank you for bringing us together. You've worked long and hard on health issues, and particularly those issues in which there are health disparities, where African Americans suffer disproportionately in some diseases and knowing what we can do about it.

Mr. Speaker, America has been debating health care for 100 years, and we've come to some agreements. We know, for example, and I think there's general agreement within this House, that the status quo is unsustainable; 14,000 Americans losing their health insurance every day. The costs are going up. Twenty years ago, the average American family spent about 7 percent of the family income on health care and now it's 17 percent, and it's going and continuing in that direction.

Millions have no insurance at all, particularly those with preexisting conditions who are unable to get any insurance. So we know that one thing that, if we're going to deal with the problem, one thing that we have recognized is that any solution that's going to be meaningful has to be comprehensive. You cannot solve the problem of preexisting conditions, those with preexisting conditions not getting insurance unless everybody has insurance.

If people can wait until they get sick before they buy insurance, many people will wait until they get sick before they buy insurance. And those in the insurance pool, on average, will be sicker and sicker; the cost, average costs will be higher; more people, healthy people will drop out; and the costs will spiral out of control. We know that. So we know if we're going to deal with preexisting conditions, it has to be in the context of a system where virtually everyone is buying insurance.

We know that we have to make some comprehensive changes. We know we need to debate the issues. But, unfortunately, during the recent debate, we've heard complaints. We've heard some blames. We've heard a lot of misrepresentation. We've heard some slogans and even name calling. And yesterday, we finally took a huge step in guaranteeing quality and affordable health care for all Americans, and we have a bill that we can discuss. You can talk about what might be in the bill, what isn't. We have a bill. And let's talk about what's in the legislation.

First, the bill will provide affordable health care insurance for over 30 million Americans who are uninsured today, including those with preexisting conditions. The gentleman from North Carolina has outlined how affordable it is. Those at the very low end of the spectrum will pay very little. Those much higher up in the spectrum will pay more, but it's still easily affordable, particularly when you compare it to what people are having to pay today.

These bills will provide security for those who have insurance because 14,000 Americans will no longer lose their insurance every day. And those who have insurance will not have to watch the cost of their insurance skyrocket every year.

And insurance companies would be no longer able to cancel policies right when you get sick by looking back and finding a little comma out of place or something so they can cancel your policies when you most need them.

They also can't stop making payments in the middle of your illness, because we remove lifetime caps on benefits. Just because you have a very expensive and chronic disease, with the insurance that we're providing, you will get the medical care that you need.

No longer will those with health insurance have to pay copays for preventive services. And those with insurance won't have to go bankrupt, because the bills provide affordable limits on copays and deductibles.

Most of the people in bankruptcy court are there because of health expenses. And most of those there because of health expenses have insurance, but their copays and deductibles are such that they still have to lose everything in bankruptcy court.

And because the legislation will provide affordable health insurance to virtually all Americans, families with insurance will no longer have to pay an extra $1,000 a year to offset the health care costs for those that show up in the hospitals without any insurance.

Seniors will no longer have to fall into the doughnut hole where they're paying premiums and getting no benefits.

Our youth will be able to stay on family policies until they're 26 years old.

Small businesses will see significant savings in health insurance because they can purchase insurance with the same price advantages as big businesses do now with the large cost advantages of volume. And many small businesses will also receive tax credits, temporary tax credits to help them provide insurance for their employees.

This plan is more than paid for. CBO projects significant savings during the first 10 years and huge savings in the next 10 years. The major funding for it is treatment of unearned income for those making more than $250,000, just like earned income.

Whatever your earned income, you pay a Medicare tax on that income, if it's earned income. If it's unearned income, stocks and bonds and trading and dividends and interest, you don't pay a Medicare tax on that.

The major funding in this provides that whatever your income, you will be paying a Medicare tax. So those making more than $250,000 will pay on their unearned income just like everybody else is paying on their earned income.

The gentleman from North Carolina has indicated some of the provisions that go in fairly soon. Most won't go into effect until 2014 because it takes time to put all of the provisions together and get them active, but there are a lot of things that go into effect right away.

Small business tax credits, for those small businesses to make employee coverage more affordable, tax credits up to 35 percent of the premiums will go into effect immediately.

We will also begin to close the doughnut hole. For those seniors in the doughnut hole, we'll provide a $250 rebate to help them, and gradually we will eliminate the doughnut hole.

Pre-preventive care under Medicare. Right after the bill becomes effective, we'll eliminate copayments for preventive services and exempt preventive services from deductibles under the Medicare program. So those who are getting preventive services won't have to pay copays and deductibles.

There's help for early retirees. We'll create a system to help offset the costs for those businesses that are providing health care for early retirees, those 55 to 64. Before they get on Medicare, there will be a program to help those. Those are very expensive to cover, and many companies want to cover them but can't afford it. We will provide an affordable way for them to cover them.

We will end rescissions. There will be a ban against insurance companies from dropping people when they get sick.

There will be no discrimination against children with preexisting conditions. We will prohibit health insurance from denying coverage to children with preexisting conditions.

There will be a ban on lifetime limits and coverage. We will prohibit health insurance companies from placing lifetime caps on coverage. So if your chronic illness is very expensive, they can't cut you off right in the middle of treatment. There will be a ban on annual limits on coverage. And there won't be a complete ban early on, but we will tightly restrict any new plan's use of annual limits to ensure that you can get all of the health coverage that you need. Eventually, there will be a total ban on lifetime benefits.

Free preventive care under all new private plans. We will require all new private plans to cover preventive services with no copays and with preventive services being exempt from deductibles.

We will provide a new independent appeals process to ensure that consumers in new plans have access to an effective internal and external appeals process so that, if you're not treated properly by your insurance company, you have an effective means to appeal.

There'll be immediate help for those with preexisting conditions. Eventually, those with preexisting conditions will get insurance just like everybody else, won't be able to discriminate against those with preexisting conditions. But until the plan is fully implemented, those with preexisting conditions will be able to buy from a high-risk pool that will be subsidized because, obviously, the cost of that insurance will not be, should not be affordable, but we'll make it affordable with subsidies. So those with preexisting conditions can get relief right away.

It extends coverage for young people up to their 26th birthday on the family policy. If young children aren't getting health insurance on their job or while they're in school, they can stay on their parents' policy up until their 26th birthday.

We significantly increase funding for community health centers, and that starts right away. So within the next 5 years, we will absolutely double the number of patients being seen at community health centers. And we'll start making investments in training programs to increase the number of primary care physicians, nurses, and other public health professionals. All of that goes into effect right away.

Now, some are criticizing the plan, and it's interesting to listen carefully to the criticism. With all of what this bill does, one of the criticism is, Well, the bill has too many pages. Another is, We don't like the order in which we're casting the votes. Look at all of this comprehensive health care, and all they can talk about is the order we're voting in and the number of pages.

Now, some believe that the program is unconstitutional, and, when pressed,

they'll also say that, Well, Medicare is unconstitutional, too, and they want to repeal Medicare. And when we talk about repealing Medicare, I'd like to refer everyone to the budget introduced by the lead Republican on the Budget Committee. The long-term budget on that committee offered by the Republican side does not include a Medicare program. It includes a little voucher program where the cost increases will not keep up with medical inflation, so gradually, year by year, the value of that voucher erodes to the point where, 50 years from now, it'll be worth about 25 percent of the costs of medical care for senior citizens. They will allow it wither on the vine. So when you talk about Medicare being unconstitutional, be careful, because they actually want to repeal Medicare as we know it.

Others complain that it takes away their freedom to be uninsured. I was first elected to the Virginia House of Delegates in 1977. This is the first year I've heard anyone talk about their urgency of the need to enjoy the freedom to be uninsured.

Now, I'd like to—they say, well, they're going to debate it during the campaign for reelection, and I can't wait, because what will the campaign be?

Seniors, get back in that doughnut hole where you belong. We're going to repeal the law.

Young adults, get off that family policy and get out there on your own.

Small businesses, give those tax cuts back and start buying insurance at the retail rate rather than the wholesale rate. Pay 18 percent more like you're doing today.

Those with preexisting conditions, give me that policy back. You weren't supposed to get the policy. That was in the legislation that we want to repeal.

I can't wait for that debate because, as I said last night before we took that important vote, I said that future generations will look back at the votes we cast last night just as today we look back at the votes on Social Security and Medicare. And when they passed Social Security and Medicare, the votes were not unanimous. There were those that voted ''no.'' But future generations will look back and see that many of us proudly voted in favor of health care for all. And I hope they look back with the same pride on those votes we cast last night as we do to the votes cast in favor of Social Security and Medicare.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Congressman SCOTT. And thank you for going over the provisions and those that come into play this year, when the President signs the bill, when the reconciliation bill is signed, and which provisions start perhaps in a year or so, because it's very important to understand that as this bill is passed, within 6 months, many of the provisions that provide, that stop the exclusion for children with preexisting disease, for example, is already in place, that the doughnut hole will start to be closed, that we'll start to build our primary care workforce to meet the needs of the 32 million newly insured, and that the small business tax credits will begin, all within 2010.

□ 2030

I would like to now yield such time as he might consume to my co-chair of the Congressional Black Caucus Health Task Force and also a valued member of the Ways and Means Committee—again, one of the committees that had a major responsibility for crafting the bill and the pay-fors in the bill that we passed in the House and the bills that we worked on and passed last night.

Thank you, DANNY, for joining us.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you very much, DONNA, and I want to thank you for the tremendous leadership that you have shown the whole time that we have been together in Congress. As a matter of fact, we came in at the same time, and you've been engaged in health activity before getting here and you have been a leader ever since.

As I listened to Representative BUTTERFIELD, I was reminded of the fact that the Bible says that where there is no vision, the people perish. And I think we have been very fortunate to have a bold, courageous, and visionary President as the leader of this country. As a matter of fact, he was bold enough, brave enough, and visionary enough to say that we are going to reform health care delivery. And many people thought that that was a far stretch, that it was a far reach because people had been trying to do it, had been talking about it, but had not been able to accomplish it. And I guess as the boys on the street would say, And then along came Barack. Along came President Obama.

I know that there are thousands and thousands of people who have been engaged in the struggle to push health care forward. And, DONNA, I can imagine that you have been in thousands of hours of discussions over the years with the National Medical Association, with the American Public Health Association, with the Black Nurses Association, with the National Dental Association, with the National Association of Social Workers, all of these groups.

I was thinking of my own experiences in terms of having worked in health care prior to running for public office having sat on the boards of hospitals, having worked in neighborhood clinics, having been president, as a matter of fact, of the National Association of Community Health Centers; and so that goes back at least 30 years. Individuals have been opened.

And although the 1-hour that we're doing tonight was taken out under the auspices of the Congressional Black Caucus and your leadership, the last person who called my office just before I came over was not black. It was not an African American. As a matter of fact, he was a non-African American gentleman who called the office, and I happened to answer the phone. And he says, Is this the office of Congressman DANNY DAVIS? And I said, Well, yes, it is. He says, Well, I just want to leave a message for the Congressman. And I want you to tell him that I actually cried when this bill was passed, when that vote was taken. And I just want him to know that people in my community and my family and my neighborhood have been waiting for this day. And I said, Well, I want to thank you for calling. He said are you the Congressman. I said, Well, yes, I am.

And I represent a district—I call it the most interesting piece of geography in North America. There is nothing quite like it. It includes the Gold Coast in Chicago, all of downtown Chicago, the Magnificent Mile, downtown Chinatown, Greektown, Old Town, New Town, Brushfield. But it also includes pockets of poverty. It includes suburban districts. It has 21 hospitals in it, four medical schools, 92 community health center sites, of course, research institutes. So you can imagine what a bill like this means to the people of my district.

For example, it will improve coverage for 334,000 of my residents. Not 3,000. Not 4,000. But 334,000. It will provide tax credits for up to 158,000 families, 14,000 small businesses.

The doughnut hole, it will remove the doughnut hole ultimately for 76,000 beneficiaries who right now have those experiences. It's going to extend coverage to 52,500 uninsured individuals who currently go to the county hospital when they have to get the health care who experience episodic care and living in a county where the taxpayers are always crying, of course, about the heavy burden of having to pay for health care for these individuals. And so the coverage is so impactful.

My congressional district also trains an awful lot of medical personnel. As a matter of fact, at the University of Illinois of Chicago, we train more African American physicians than anybody else in the country other than Meharry and Howard. We train nurses, we train inhalation therapists, we train medical personnel that go all over the world because we have the largest medical center district in the country.

And so health care is a big piece, a big part not only of the service but a big part of the economy. And people who have never, ever before in their lifetimes had any health insurance at all now can feel safe, comfortable, and secure in having the coverage that they need.

This legislation, in my mind, is the most impactful health legislation that we have seen since Medicare and Medicaid. And someone was asking me the other day, they said, Well, you know, the Medicare, the money that we spend—I said, Well, you know, there is no point in talking to me about Medicare. I am confident that both my mother and my father would have died sooner had there not been Medicare. As a matter of fact, my mother went 150

miles sometimes to get to the hospital so that she could receive dialysis for an ailment that she had.

There are people that live all over rural America who've had no access to health care at all. There are people in inner-city America who live close to the medical center district where we have all of these resources; we have resources but they have no money. Therefore, they cannot access the resources, and they have to pass by all of these hospitals. They have to pass by all of these resources and know that they cannot access them.

I agree with my colleagues who have suggested that that has been a magical piece of work. African Americans often wonder where are people placed. Well, it just happens that there were African Americans on all of the committees of Judicial—all of the committees. Three members of Energy and Commerce—of course you, DONNA, Representative BUTTERFIELD, Congressman BOBBY RUSH, all on Emergency and Commerce; five members of the Congressional Black Caucus on Ways and Means. Much of the time that we were discussing and debating this bill, CHARLES RANGEL was in fact the chairman and had a great deal to do.

I will just mention that in addition to the health components of this legislation are the tremendous increases in education for minority-serving institutions like Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic serving institutions, Native American institutions, institutions for Pacific Islanders. So comprehensively it does education, it does health, and it is just great. And I'm so delighted.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I am pleased to yield to Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. DAVIS, I want to thank you so much for the presentation you've made. And I just really enjoy the stories that you tell and the way you represent the people of your congressional district.

You know, all of us have unique congressional districts. We say that all of the time. No two Members of this House are identical. You have your district and I have my district, and each one is unique.

As I travel throughout my district in North Carolina, many people tell me that they have health insurance but it's not worth the paper that it's written on. They are counted as insured; but in reality, they are uninsured.

For example, a gentleman in my district told me that he has had insurance for more than 10 years on the job and he pays $200 a month out of his paycheck, but he's never used it. And when I asked him why he hadn't used it, he said because the deductible is $5,000 per year and as far as he was concerned, he is uninsured.

I went into another part of my district and went to a dialysis center, and a young man there told me that he had been insured by a very reputable insurance company and that he needed a kidney transplant and his sister donated a kidney to him. And it was a successful transplant and it worked very well. But after 2 years, his insurance company stopped paying for the anti-rejection medication that he needs for his kidney. And he lost the kidney, and now he is back on dialysis and the government is paying hundreds of thousands of dollars a year to sustain him.

Those are the types of stories that I hear in my district, and they are so sad.

There's a minister in my district who was—he is a married man, and he and his wife had a family policy and they were paying $400 a month for insurance. And the minister was diagnosed with prostate cancer, and his wife was diagnosed with a neurological condition; and because of those two conditions, the insurance company raised the premiums for $400 a month to $3,500 a month, which was more than his income. Those are the types of stories that I am hearing in my district.

And I want to find out if the same thing exists in urban America. I'm in rural America. Do you hear those types of stories in urban Chicago?

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I yield to Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. You know, you wouldn't think it but, yes, as a matter of fact. Gee, I would hate to be in a situation especially at my age and not have health insurance and preexisting conditions be a factor in whether or not I could get a policy. I mean, it would probably be sky high, off the roof. You could never get it.

And this is just such a great development. It's enough for us to be talking about for the next 5 years again.

I want to just thank you, DONNA. I really do. Because much of what we do is process. I mean, consent is certainly a part, but it takes hours and hours. It takes negotiations, interaction. You've been there all the way. You've been our leader on health care, and it's such a pleasure to serve with you and know of your tremendous dedication to this cause.

□ 2045

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank you for those kind words, but I can say without any hesitation that each one of us here this evening, in our own capacities, and in the committees that we serve, and in the subcommittees that we serve, have really put in a lot of hours and have really helped to shape the final product that we are so proud of having voted on last night. And the Congressional Black Caucus played a major role in shaping that.

Congressman BUTTERFIELD mentioned Medicaid and the expansion of Medicaid, and we talk a lot about food desserts, but in many of the poor communities around this country we have provider desserts. The low reimbursement rates that have traditionally been paid and for Medicaid providers has caused hospitals and many health care providers not to be able to sustain practices or keep their doors open in poor communities.

This bill will change that. We will be increasing the reimbursement to Medicaid providers at the same level as Medicare and hopefully that that will encourage more physicians and providers to come into the poor neighborhoods where many of the patients are Medicaid beneficiaries and provide the care that they need.

You know, the turn of the 19th century one of our great intellectuals, W.E.B. Du Bois, spoke about the peculiar indifference to the poor health of African Americans in this country. And I am so grateful to be a part of a group of 42 individuals in the Congressional Black Caucus who have worked over the years, over the 40 years of our existence, but particularly in this last year as we have shaped this bill, to begin to end that peculiar indifference to the state of our health.

Some of the other areas besides the Medicaid expansion and the improved reimbursement to providers to encourage them to come back into poor communities is the expansion of the workforce. We know that as the 32 million people begin to come into the health care system that we are going to need so many more providers. But we are also an increasingly diverse society here in the United States, and so there is great emphasis on diversifying that workforce. I am talking here about some of the disparity provisions, the provisions in the health care reform bill that are targeted at reducing those health disparities that African Americans and other people of color have suffered from for so long. And part of reducing those disparities is making sure that we have a diverse workforce to work within those communities.

So in addition to encouraging, through programs like the health care opportunities program and increasing funding for that, increasing funding for the National Health Service Corps program, which pays individuals 4 years of their medical tuition, in addition to increasing loan repayments, especially for individuals who practice in poor and rural areas, we also have included provisions that provide additional support to institutions, minority-serving institutions, as Congressman DAVIS spoke of, the HBCUs, the Hispanic-serving institutions and the tribal colleges, but also any institution that has a history of training underrepresented minorities.

Those professions would be for physicians, for nurses, for nurse educators, and there is a specific section that deals with increasing the public health workforce, a very important part of the workforce when we talk about the emphasis that we are now going to be putting on prevention. In addition to that, there are mental health workers for our communities.

We also have grants to community-based organizations to train community health workers who, I think, will

be the backbone of the new health infrastructure, especially in communities that are poor, that have not had good health over the years, where people from within those same communities will be trained to be able to do outreach and support to people in their communities.

There is a provision that expands and strengthens the Office of Minority Health in the Department of Health and Human Services and adds two new offices, one in the Food and Drug Administration and the other one in the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, two important agencies that do not have a specific office focus on minority health.

And at the National Institutes of Health, where we have had a Center For Minority Health and Disparity Research, we now will elevate that, with the signing of the Senate bill tomorrow, to an institute where that institute will have more, more funding, to begin with, but also more influence over the research that's done at NIH in every area to ensure that the concerns and the interest and the impact on minority populations or any population that is experiencing health disparities will be considered.

Data collection is another area that we have been able to insert provisions on, and not only to collect data on disease but to also talk about and collect data on racial ethnic minorities, gender, and to follow the disparities in Medicare and Medicaid, to monitor those disparities and to report on those disparities so that they can be corrected.

I want to speak lastly about the issue of the territories. This was something that, of course, the delegates from all over the offshore areas of the United States worked very hard on, and we were very lucky, blessed, to have the full support of the Congressional Black Caucus, Hispanic Caucus and Asian Caucus, and of our leadership. We would not have had the inclusion in this monumental landmark legislation were it not for the support of our colleagues in those caucuses and the support of our leadership.

So I want to especially thank our Speaker again, she has been thanked many times here this evening, but for her strong support and for her strong leadership; our Majority Leader, STENY HOYER; our Majority Whip; the chairs of the committees, the relevant committees here in the House, Chairman RANGEL and also Chairman LEVIN, Chairman WAXMAN, Chairman Emeritus DINGELL, Chairman MILLER, and all of the entire leadership team for giving us the support, and really the entire Democratic Caucus, for encouraging us and supporting us and ensuring that, no, we don't have full State-like treatment, as the 50 States, but we do have a significant increase in Medicaid and the ability to be included into the exchange, and I want to thank our leadership for that.

We are coming close to the end of our time, and if there is no other issue that my colleagues want to raise, I want to thank them for joining me here this evening and helping to explain to the American people what is actually in the bill, clearing up some of the misconceptions and some of the misunderstandings that are out in the public.

Again, we are very proud to have been a part of this process and to have passed the bill that we did last evening, and we look forward to the President signing it tomorrow.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material under the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order on health care reform this evening.

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to thank my dear friend and colleague, Doctor DONNA CHRISTENSEN of the Virgin Islands for anchoring this special order hour. I cannot think of a more fitting person to lead us in a discussion of health care tonight than Dr. CHRISTENSEN, who is not only a medical doctor, but also the co-chair of the CBC's Health and Wellness Taskforce along with Congressman DANNY DAVIS of Illinois.

Dr. CHRISTENSEN has been at the forefront of our fight to ensure that health care reform makes significant strides toward eliminating racial and ethnic disparities, and achieving disparities for residents of the U.S. territories. Thank you, Dr. CHRISTENSEN for your leadership and your hard work.

I'm Congresswoman BARBARA LEE of the Ninth Congressional District of California and chairwoman of the 42 member strong Congressional Black Caucus. I stand here brimming with pride and joy because of what we did here last night after such a long journey that began many decades ago.

Yesterday morning members of the Congressional Black Caucus attended church services together, where we were reminded of the moral imperative to reform health care.

Strengthened by the power of prayer we forged ahead with clarity of purpose, courage and determination, undeterred by the losing hateful rhetoric and threatening tactics of anti-health care protesters.

Last night, my colleagues and I cast a historic and monumental vote to improve the health and wellness of millions of Americans who suffer because they are uninsured and under-insured and because of massive gaps in our nation's health care system.

I spend a lot of time in emergency rooms with my 85 year old mother and my sister who has Multiple Sclerosis. I see these people—the uninsured. They are desperate. Many are hard working people who may have lost their jobs, or simply fallen on hard times, or have never even had the opportunity to make their way in society. Some of them can't hold a job because they are chronically ill. This is simply unacceptable.

So, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus cast our votes for all those people who deserve health care but simply can't afford it. We cast our votes for our senior citizens who will see their prescription drug costs go down. We cast our votes for our children and grandchildren, so that they can live longer, fuller and healthier lives. We cast our votes in the memory of those people who didn't have preventive care and died prematurely.

Throughout the long and arduous process culminating in the historic vote last night, many members of the CBC worked tirelessly to make sure that this bill holds insurance companies accountable and included a number of cost-saving provisions. We were vocal advocates for provisions in the bill to combat health disparities, illnesses and diseases that disproportionately affect our community.

The statistics are startling, but they are clear:

Nearly one in five African Americans (19%) is without health care insurance.

African Americans in general spend a higher percentage of their income on health care costs compared to their white counterparts (16.5% vs. 12.2%). However despite spending a larger share of their income on medical care, African Americans face continuing health care disparities.

African Americans also tend to reside in areas without hospitals or hospitals that have limited resources and may affect the quality care they offer. This is particularly a problem for hospitals in predominately African American communities where Medicaid reimbursements are low, charity cares is higher, and there is a shortage of health care providers who find it more difficult to maintain a practice.

African Americans suffer from higher percentages of chronic diseases such as heart disease, kidney disease and diabetes which are perpetuated by a lack of access to quality care. Currently, 48% of African American adults suffer from a chronic disease compared to 39% of the general population.

To those who suffer from those health disparities, our vote last night carried significance similar to the passage of the Civil Rights Act in that it fulfills a dream that has been elusive for far too long and for far too many Americans.

Among the key provisions in the legislation that CBC members fought to have included are:

Expanded support for community health centers, which play a vital role in expanding access to preventive and other care in our nation's most vulnerable communities.

Key health equity provisions: greater support for programs that will increase the racial and ethnic diversity in the nation's health workforce, as well as improved data collection so that we can better measure health inequities and develop solutions to end all health disparities.

Strengthening the existing Office of Minority Health at HHS, creating new Offices of Minority. Health across HHS agencies, and establishing the National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities at NIH as an Institute.

Inclusion of coverage for residents of the U.S. territories, including a significant infusion of new Medicaid dollars, as well as access to the Exchange so that Americans in the territories will have access to affordable, high-quality health insurance plans.

The bill guarantees transparency on rates and enables state insurance commissioners to

recommend to the National Insurance Commissioner whether a particular insurer should participate in the Health Insurance Exchange, taking into account excessive or unjustified premium increases in making that determination. This will hold private insurers accountable, ensure affordability and help provide quality coverage for American families:

Expansion of community health centers.

This bill makes several immediate reforms that will directly improve the health and wellness of millions of Americans. Some of those provisions are:

Offers tax credits to small businesses to purchase coverage;

Provides relief for seniors who reach the Medicare prescription drug donut hole;

Provides immediate access to insurance for Americans who are uninsured because of a pre-existing condition through a temporary high-risk pool;

Requires new plans to cover preventive services and immunizations without cost-sharing;

Requires new plans to cover an enrollee's dependent children until age 26;

Prohibits pre-existing condition exclusions for children in all new plans;

Prohibits individual plans from dropping people from coverage when they get sick.

I could go on because the list of all the good things in this bill are many.

So to put it simply, this bill is a victory not only for our constituents, but for all Americans because it will make us a stronger and healthier nation.

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am coming to the floor of the House tonight to try to clarify for the American people some of the things that have happened here over the weekend. As you know, we passed a very big bill last night, hasn't been quite 24 hours, it was about 11 p.m. Eastern time when everyone else in the country was watching basketball tournaments and otherwise engaged with weekend activities, this House was in full session, the place was packed, Democrats and Republicans, and we passed a bill that had been passed by the Senate on Christmas Eve.

Now, I remember when I first got here, Republicans were in the majority, and when we would pass major pieces of legislation, if there was an all-day fight, we would be accused of waiting until the dark of night to try to sneak this legislation through. Now, I have never been one who would pass on the chance to attribute to coincidence that that can be adequately explained by conspiracy, but how is it that we passed, in the Senate, this very difficult legislation the day before Christmas when America was engaged in other activities, and then here on the floor of the House last night at 11 o'clock on a Sunday when most every other honest American was doing something other than watching their Congress.

I do have to address some of the things that I just heard mentioned from the other side. Remember that there were two pieces of legislation passed here last night. One was the previously passed Senate bill which the House passed. That one is on its way down to the White House. That's going to be signed by the President. That's going to be the law.

And then we also passed a sham bill, a bill that might be called a fig leaf because no one really likes the Senate bill. The Speaker of the House said that herself. No one wants to vote for the Senate bill, and I agree with the Speaker. No one wanted to vote for the Senate bill. So how did they get their side to vote for the Senate bill? Well, they said don't worry, we are going to fix the problems that you don't like in the Senate bill, and we will do that under reconciliation so it's only going to require 51 votes over in the other body, don't worry, we will get that taken care of.

The only problem is, the Senate bill that we passed here last night had already passed the House before last summer—you might not recognize it because it was a housing bill then, but it passed the House last summer—went to the Senate, got changed into a health care bill and then got brought back to the House. And the question before the House, will the House now accept the amendment, the Senate amendment to H.R. 3590, the answer was affirmative, and the bill is on its way down to the White House for a big signing ceremony, probably tomorrow.

Now, what's going to happen to the reconciliation bill? It also passed, and it passed, and went back to the Senate. And is there anything that compels the Senate to take up that bill and work on it? Why, no, there is not.

In fact, the Senate might rationally argue, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, the other body might rationally argue that, hey, we already passed our health care bill, we passed it on Christmas Eve, you guys apparently liked it because you ratified the amendments we had to it, and last we saw, it was on its way down to Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House. So why would we pick up this contentious package of fixes in the bill?

You know, quite honestly, the oxygen may have all gone out of the room for health care legislation in this Congress. Fourteen months is a long time to have fought this thing, and the Senators may just not have the stomach to pick this thing up and fight through it again.

So some of the things that we need to be careful about when people are talking about the bill—and I will do this too, many of us here in the House are not that familiar with the Senate bill that we just passed because it was the Senate bill. We had a health care bill that was marked up in my committee and passed out of committee over my objection July 31. I didn't like the bill, but I knew it. I submitted amendments and some of those were even accepted. So I had a lot of familiarity with that bill.

Now, that bill went to the Speaker's office, sat there for a couple of months, got changed all around. All of my amendments got pulled out, every other Republican's amendments were pulled out of that bill. It became a 2,000-page bill, even with the loss of those amendments, and was brought back to this House in early November, and this House passed the House bill.

□ 2100

We knew the House bill. Many of us were—although we didn't like the House bill, we were fairly comfortable with what it contained and what it didn't contain. The Senate bill is completely different. Most of us did not ever see the Senate bill before the Senate brought it up on Thanksgiving and then passed it right before Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, quite honestly, many of us felt like we'd already read a lot of health care bills this year; do we really need to read that Senate bill? Maybe not. Because the Senate will pass it and then the normal procedure is we call a conference committee. We go to conference committee and we debate both sides, get to the debate the House bill, the Senate bill, Republicans and Democrats, a true bicameral process. We're finally going to have that open and transparent process that was promised to us and we'll read the conference report. We won't have to worry about the Senate bill because it's all going to be changed anyway.

Except that didn't happen because, for whatever reason, the Democrats did not want to do a conference report. They say it's because Republicans were going to block the appointment of conferees. But, Mr. Speaker, I would just point out to you that in December and early January there were 60 Democratic votes in the Senate, 256 Democratic votes here in the House. There wasn't much we could block, even if we wanted to. So how we would have blocked the appointment of conferees is anyone's guess, but I did hear that mentioned several times during the debate. So let me just set that point straight.

They thought they could just put things together on their own outside of a conference, and they were doing a darn good job of it. The last week in December, the first week in January on into the second weekend in January, people were meeting in this Capitol, meeting in this building, in the new Capitol Visitors Center, and putting together the pieces, cutting secret deals with unions, cutting secret deals with this group and that group, and we were going to have a bill that would just be blessed by both sides. No conference report. Not necessary because we'll just bring a new bill to the floor that will be the amalgamated bill. The Senate will vote for it. They've got 60 votes.

The House will vote for it. They've got 256. And if they don't lose too many, then they can pass pretty much whatever they want. Then we'll have a health care bill.

What happened in that scenario was that the second Tuesday in January they had an election in the State of Massachusetts. As a consequence of that election, suddenly the Democrats' 60-vote supermajority in the Senate was no more. Now, the new Senator was not seated for several weeks after that election and there was still time to come together with a hasty conference committee and get that thing done or even push through that amalgamated bill, but, for whatever reason, they didn't do that. It really looked for a while like things might just languish indefinitely.

Now we all know the story. In those last 10 days, the President really engaged, the White House engaged, and the Speaker's office engaged. They were just going to get this bill through the House because that was the quickest way—they always say a line is the shortest distance between two points. The shortest distance to getting health care legislation passed in this Congress, in this President's first half of his first term, was to pass the Senate bill through the House. It was something no one wanted to do. No one wanted to vote for that bill. It had awful things. Most of us don't know all of the awful things in that bill because it was the Senate bill. We passed House bills. We knew the House bill, but we heard the minority leader say it last night from this floor, Most of you on the Democratic side do not know what's in that bill.

Now, I dare say, today you've learned a lot of what's in that bill because you've got the phone calls from the press the same as I have. Suddenly, the press got real curious about what was in the Senate bill and they're asking all kinds of questions. So tonight perhaps we can deal with some of those. But one of the things I wanted to point out at the very beginning, be careful what you talk about when you hear us talk about what's in the bills, because both sides of the aisle, both Democrats and Republicans, may not be quite sure what's in the bill.

We heard testimony, or we heard the speeches on the other side here just a moment ago about how Medicaid rates now were going to be plussed-up for primary care doctors. Medicaid rates will become Medicare rates. Well, that actually, in fact, is only for primary care doctors and it is only for 2 years, but it is also only in the reconciliation bill. Did we pass the reconciliation bill? We did in the House. They haven't in the Senate. What did we pass that has passed the Senate? The Senate bill. And that does not have that plus-up in Medicaid rates. In fact, the expansions of Medicaid that we have now put forward that were in the Senate bill, the expansion of Medicaid, will be reimbursed at standard Medicaid rates, which vary from State to State. But I will tell you, as a medical provider, those put a lot of providers back on their heels, because those rates do not pay the cost of delivering the care, and there is only so much of that kind of business you can do in an average day and still keep your doors open.

So there is a problem with expanding Medicaid to larger and larger populations. The provider community is going to find it difficult to be able to absorb that many more Medicaid patients into their practices because the reimbursement rates are going to remain low. In fairness, it was fixed in the reconciliation bill, but if the Senate doesn't take that up, it never happens. It was the skinniest of fig leafs because it's not there when you need it. What is there is the Senate bill, which is on its way down to the White House, and that will be the law of the land, which will expand Medicaid, to be sure, but does it have the enhanced Federal matching in there for Medicaid? In one State it does. In one State it does. The reconciliation bill was going to fix that so all States would have what that one State now has in the Senate bill, but it is the Senate bill, and only one State has that enhanced Federal match for Medicaid: the State of Nebraska. The famous Cornhusker kickback.

So what happened here last night, what transpired on the floor of the House last night was really dramatic and, in many ways, a fitting end to the 14 months of chaotic process that had brought us to this point. We've heard over and over and over again—and I don't want to belabor the point, and this may well be the last time that I discuss the process that brought us here. But it is worth mentioning, because over and over and over again last night during the debate we heard, You Republicans obstructed at every step of the way. Remember, there's 177 of us; there's 256 of you. We can't obstruct anything, particularly the House of Representatives, where majority rules on almost everything.

And, oh, by the way, the Rules Committee really rules. And the Rules Committee has a nine-to-four advantage for the Speaker. There's not much you can do with 177 Republicans in the House of Representatives if you want to obstruct. Well, you can all hang together and make a principled vote that we're all against this. And that's indeed what has happened.

But the real debate was an internal debate within the Democratic caucus, because had they had the votes, they could have done this in February. Had they had the votes, they could have done this in January. They could have done it in December, the day after Christmas, as opposed to the day before Christmas when the Senate bill was passed. If they'd known this was what they were going to end up with, maybe they should have just done that and saved everybody 3 months of additional anxiety.

The fact of the matter remains, Republicans did not obstruct this bill. Democrats obstructed this bill. Democrats and, oh, yeah, one other thing. They never had the popular support of the American people. Now think about that for a minute. We passed a bill that's going to affect in a very profound and personal way the next three generations of Americans. That's a pretty big bill. One-sixth or one-seventh of the Nation's economy. That's a pretty big bill.

Now, we've heard over and over again, if you're going to do something like that, it needs to be bipartisan. So Republicans should have signed onto the bill. Republicans should have backed the bill. Republicans should have been there. But, wait a minute. The people did not want this bill. Poll after poll after poll has shown, fill in the blanks—52 percent, 55 percent, 60 percent—of the people did not want this House-passed bill, did not want the Senate-passed bill, did not want what the United States Congress was going to do to health care.

Now, if you don't have popular support, then even if you've got 256 Democrats and, now, 59 Senators and the White House, it's very difficult to get your Members to—it's a very technical term we use here in the House of Representatives. It's called, ''walking the plank for your leadership.'' It's very difficult to get your Members to walk the plank for leadership when everybody back at home is howling mad because of what you're doing. And I'm sure many people felt—the old saying that Everett Dirksen used to have, ''When I feel the heat, I see the light.''

A lot of people saw the light when they went back home. Now they came back to Washington and got their arms twisted and things promised and things promised to be withheld and goodness knows what and they lined up and walked the plank last night. That's what we saw.

□ 2110

People are voting in favor of things they said they would never do. They misled their constituents back home. People turning at 90-degree intersections to principles that they've held for a long time. It was painful to watch. I felt some sorrow for people I saw on the Democratic side having to make these very tough gut-wrenching decisions.

These are good people that are well intentioned, but they got pushed into a corner from which there was no escape. And that corner was the Speaker of the House and the President of the United States. And as a consequence, this bill passed, a pretty slim majority. Not a single Republican. In fact, the only thing that was bipartisan about this bill last night was the opposition because you had 30 Democrats standing with 177, or 178 now, Republicans. That was the bipartisan block on this bill, but they were in opposition.

This bill presents a real problem for the American people. The American

people don't like it. The American people don't want it, but now the American people have it. Now ideally—and people have asked me all day long, Well, what are you, as a Republican, going to do about this now? And the answer is, You fix what you can, and you work toward repeal of the bill.

Now working toward repeal of the bill, you've got to ask yourself. There likely will be bills introduced today and bills introduced tomorrow that will call for the repeal of the bill. I may very well sign on to one or more of those bills. But with the same vote total that we had last night, do you think any of those bills are even going to be brought up for debate? Is the Speaker of the House, is the majority leader going to bring up one of those repealed bills and say, Let's go through this argument and see if any of our Members now feel differently? Well, they could. And there is history there. There is precedent there.

In the late 1980s, this House passed a seriously flawed catastrophic coverage bill for Medicare. They charged Medicare recipients the premium for that catastrophic insurance; and all across the country, people said, Wait a minute, we didn't want that. We didn't ask for that. You're charging us for something we didn't ask for or want. And the seniors in this country rose up, and the very famous pictures of then-chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Dan Rostenkowski, being chased out of his own town hall by senior citizens who objected to what they had done. And Congress did come back in short order and repeal that bill. Will that happen now? I don't know. That's a pretty painful thing for people to have to go through. We'll see.

We've got an Easter recess coming up. If people do town halls and they get that kind of reaction, maybe we'll be back here talking about one of those repealed bills. But honestly, Mr. Speaker, I think that's a pretty heavy lift to repeal this bill that we passed last night, this bill that's now on its way to the White House to become public law. It's pretty difficult to do that in this Congress because it's not likely that there will be the votes. And then, of course, on the Senate side, it's really not likely that there would be the votes. And if it happened, the President likely would feel differently about it and would exercise his authority to veto that repealed bill, and it is unlikely to get to the threshold of a veto override, two-thirds of the House and two-thirds of the Senate to override a Presidential veto.

In fact, if America has the reaction to this bill that I think they're going to have, there may be many more Republicans and many fewer Democrats here in the House of Representatives next year. I don't know if that number will be enough to change the majority control of the House. It sure could be. It certainly looks increasingly likely from the degree of anger and how upset people are that talk about this bill out in the middle part of America. But I don't know if there is the political will to change the majority makeup of the House. Again, even if there is, sure, we'll bring that repealed bill up. We'll bring it up pretty quickly and send it down to the White House, and the White House will veto it. I doubt that there will be a new Congress that's seated that will also have the ability to override a President's veto. Again, that's a tall order, two-thirds of the House, two-thirds of the Senate. So I don't know within the time frame between now and January of 2013, if the numbers work out, for this Congress to have the ability to repeal the bill. It's worth trying. It's worth testing. But I don't know if that's a realistic trajectory.

Well, then, what can we do? I think it is extremely important to at least begin to work on some of the more egregious portions of this bill. And I will just tell you, one of the things that really bothers me about this bill that we did is the instituting of an individual mandate to purchase health insurance. Now surely it is the responsible thing for every American, every family to have health insurance against the unlikely but frightening occurrence of some of the diseases that can happen to us as human beings. It's the responsible thing to do. But just because it's the responsible thing to do does not mean that your Federal Government has the responsibility to require you to buy it. We've never done that in this country. Simply as a consequence of being born or living in this country, your Federal Government now says that you're going to buy this product.

In fact, when the bill was passed, people said, Well, under the commerce clause, we have the authority to do that. But that kind of turns the commerce clause on its head. The commerce clause is there to protect commerce, but coercing someone to buy a good or service or product and then invoking the commerce clause to protect that transaction really seems to be going at things the wrong way. Now, if an individual State wants to say as a condition of living in our State, there is a mandate that you will buy health insurance—and there are States that have done that, and if their State legislature passes that legislation, and their Governor signs it, and the citizens of that State are okay with that, then good on 'em. That's fine. That is their prerogative. That's one of the things that a State government is there for. If they pass an individual mandate, and the people turn out the State legislature, well, then they learned their lesson. But that's a different set of circumstances than having the Federal Government make that decision that we're going to require everyone to purchase insurance. In my opinion, mandates have no place in a free society; and in my opinion, mandates are not going to get us the kind of coverage numbers that people expect it to.

You stop and think for just a minute, for a mandate to work, there has to be general knowledge that this mandate is there; there has to be general knowledge of the penalties that one would possibly incur for not complying with the mandate; and there must be general knowledge that those penalties will be swiftly and surely administered.

Now, we do have a model for that in this country, and that is called the Internal Revenue Service. The Internal Revenue Service says that everyone who earns income has to pay a percentage of that income in income tax. In fact, it's withheld from most of us from our paychecks every month. But that income tax must be paid, and we all know that, and we all know that if we don't pay our taxes, we may not know exactly what's around the corner, but most of us know it's something we really don't want to find out about.

Now, with such a draconian mandate for Federal income taxes administered by the Internal Revenue Service with such a mandate, you would expect the compliance rate to be pretty high. Well, it is. But it might be lower than what you might think. The compliance rate is around the order of 85, 86 percent. That's with a pretty severe mandate.

What about health insurance? Right now it's voluntary. As I said, it's the responsible thing to do. People should have coverage. People want to have coverage. In this country, most people are covered by employer-sponsored insurance. There is another 8 to 15 percent covered in the individual market. But insurance is a responsible thing to do. And in the voluntary program of insurance that we have in this country, what is the problem that we hear about over and over again? We've got 15 percent of our population without health insurance. Well, that does mean conversely you have 85 percent with insurance. And what is the compliance rate with the IRS? It's pretty close to the same number.

□ 2120

So are you going to get more of that 15 percent to sign up for health insurance if you put this very draconian, liberty-stealing mandate from the Federal Government out there? I don't think so. I think mandates have no place in a free society; and as a consequence, I don't think they belonged in this bill.

Further, what did the stock market do today? It jumped up a bunch, didn't it. You might say, well, see that proves the point, Americans so wanted this health care bill to pass the House of Representatives that they rejoiced by going out and running up the stock market. Or perhaps because insurance companies and pharmaceutical companies are going to profit so much by the fact that you now have to buy health insurance, that their prices went up. Their stock went up because people looked at futures and forecasting and said, wait a minute, insurance might

be a good stock to buy because in just a short period of time, everybody in the country is going to have to buy insurance.

Wouldn't it be a better approach, instead of mandating people to buy insurance, and again, I don't believe you are going to get a reduction in insurance rates by demanding that everyone buy health insurance, because what incentive is there for the insurance company to hold the price down? There isn't any. If anything, there is an incentive to raise rates because you have to buy it, otherwise the IRS is coming to visit grief upon your household. So the insurance companies may be feeling pretty good about this bill that we just passed last night because they are going to sell a ton of product. You are going to have to buy it, or you get into all kinds of trouble. The IRS is going to come and raise billycane on your head if you don't buy this insurance. So the insurance companies are feeling okay with this.

And the pharmaceutical companies, yes, they came to the table with a big bunch of money, and they gave up something to get this health care bill passed. But at the end of the day, the closure of the doughnut hole, yes, but it is for brand name products you get that discount, so they will sell more of that branded product which is the most expensive product, and people are going to blow through that area where they have to match some of the expenses and the catastrophic coverage will kick in pretty darn quick. Pharmaceutical companies may stand to gain a great deal from the passage of this bill. So it is really no surprise that the stock market went up today. Drug companies and insurance companies, they may look to be doing okay in this brave new world order that we gave to the American people last night.

A very famous quote from the Speaker earlier in the debate on all of this was: We need to go ahead and pass this bill so people can find out what is in it, and then they will really like it after the fog of the discussion is removed.

In fact, I have heard essentially that same statement on the floor here today. One of my friends on the Democrat side said, You know, finally, all of the rhetoric can be put aside and people will see what is in this bill, and they will really like it.

So let's talk about what is really in this bill, and I will leave it up to the American people how much they like it. We have already talked about the individual mandate. Absolutely unprecedented. The government has never required people to buy a good or service as a condition of lawful residence in the United States. That is a quote from the Congressional Budget Office.

It will be invoked under the commerce clause. The power to regulate commerce among the States is not unlimited. And here is a thought: What if the courts allowed this to stand? What if that power was in fact unlimited? Your imagination almost cannot handle what some of the things that your Federal Government might decide to do if we removed that power, or we removed that condition on exercising that power.

Some of the other things that are going to be found in this bill are tax increases. I know I heard it over and over again during the debate that the Republicans shouldn't mislead people about tax increases in the bill, but they are there for all to see. Go to the Web site Thomas, the Library of Congress Web site, and download the CBO letter on S. 3590, the Senate-passed bill, and look at some of the tax increases that are there.

Medicare cuts, are they there? Yesterday the Democrats kept saying, There are no cuts to Medicare in this bill. Well, there darn sure are. Again, looking at the tables at the back of the CBO report, some of them look to be pretty darn significant. Reductions in annual updates to Medicare fee-for-service payment rates over the period 2010 to 2019, that is a 10-year budget cycle, that is a cut of $86 billion. Medicare Advantage rates based on plan bids, that is cut $118 billion. Medicare and Medicaid disproportionate share hospital payments, that is cut $43 billion over that 10 years. Community living assistance services and supports, that is cut $70 billion over 10 years.

One of the things that is really disingenuous about these cuts, and they have it laid out year over year in the Congressional Budget Office report, and the next 4 or 5 years those cuts are actually pretty modest, and then they really kick in the last 5 or 6 years. And we all know there is a big Presidential election coming up again in 2012, and so perhaps it is no accident that those cuts are diminished in the early years and then expanded in the out-years.

Payment adjustments for home health care, that is almost $40 billion in reduction. Again, Medicare disproportionate share hospital payments down significantly. That is one of the significant things. It is hard for people to understand what is a disproportionate share hospital payment. Some hospitals see—and remember I told you that Medicaid doesn't really reimburse providers the cost of providing their care. Now no one cares so much about the doctor because who needs doctors in the health care system anyway, but we do care about hospitals. And hospitals historically have been protected. If they see what is called a disproportionate share of uninsured patients or underinsured patients, Medicaid where the reimbursement rate is low, they get a plus-up from the Federal Government, and it is called a disproportionate share payment.

One of the things that they did in the State of Massachusetts, they said we are giving all of this money to hospitals for disproportionate share payments, what if we just took that money and helped people buy insurance? Everybody is insured, and then you don't need to provide the disproportionate share payments any longer.

But you take a State like mine, a State like Texas, where a great number of the uninsured happen to be in the country without a valid Social Security number, for whatever reason. Now we heard the President of the United States stand here in this House in September and say very clearly that no one who is in this country illegally will be able to participate in any of these benefits. If that is correct, and Texas has a problem with people who are in the country without the benefit of a Social Security number who also happen to be uninsured, they won't be eligible for any of these benefits. They won't be eligible for any of the subsidies in the exchanges. They won't be able to access the insurance that Congress is passing. That is not necessarily a bad thing. You don't want to provide an incentive for someone to come into the country without going through the proper channels. So what are we going to do in a State like Texas where we have vast numbers of uninsured who are there without benefit of a Social Security number? They are still going to access care through the emergency rooms of our safety net hospitals, but we are also at the same time cutting those disproportionate share payments to those hospitals. So the hospitals are actually catching the grief from both sides. Their uninsured and underinsured populations are going to go up, and their reimbursement rates are likely to stay low, and disproportionate share payments are going to go down. That is a business plan that may make sense to the Federal Government, but I bet it doesn't make sense to most hospital administrators who run our safety net hospitals around the country.

So anyway, when people tell you that the Republicans are misleading, we are trying to scare you on the Medicare cuts, they are outlined in the Congressional Budget Office report, and they are as plain as day for everybody to see. The subtotal for Medicare cuts: A negative $430 billion over 10 years. Add the other community-living reductions of $70 billion, and that is $500 billion. That is what you have heard Republicans saying for the last several months. You are going to cut Medicare by $500 billion. At the same time, you have more people coming into the Medicare system, and you are really doing nothing to hold down the cost of delivering medical care.

□ 2130

You're creating a situation where you're actually going to increase the stress on the system, not decrease the stress on the system; additionally, $500 billion in new taxes coupled with that $500 billion of Medicare cuts. The President stands in front of us and says, And this bill will be paid for; in fact, this bill will reduce the deficit.

Well, you're leaving out a big part of one of the things that didn't get fixed

in the Senate bill. You've heard me talk before about what's called the sustainable growth rate formula. This is the formula under which doctors are reimbursed in Medicare.

Back in 1988, the institution of the, what's called, relative value payment scale, RBRVS, whatever that acronym stands for, every year we tended to try to ratchet down reimbursements to physicians because we felt, if we didn't, they'd just spend too much money.

Well, what has happened over time, of course, as doctors' reimbursement rates have gone down, they've tried to see more and more patients so that their bottom line didn't suffer. And, as a consequence, the spending has gone up and the SGR has had exactly the opposite effect of what was intended.

We are in a real problem with this formula right now. This year, there were projected to be cuts of almost 21 percent to doctors who provide services to our Medicare patients. The payment rates for part B in Medicare were going to go down by one-fifth. For some specialties, it was going to go down even more than that. But just in general, it was going to go down about 21 percent.

We put a stay on that just about a week ago with a bill that passed by voice vote in this Congress, so it wasn't a recorded vote, and this put a stay on that cut until November. What happens then is anyone's guess because we didn't fix the problem in the House-passed bill. I mean, we didn't fix the problem in the Senate-passed bill. That bill's going down to the President for his signature.

What's going who happen to the doctors in Medicare? Well, Congress needs to fix that. Why hasn't Congress fixed that, by the way? It's been going on for years. Started with the Democrats, then it got worse under Republicans, and it's getting a whole lot worse now that the Democrats have retaken the majority.

Well, why didn't anybody fix that? The reason they don't fix it is because it scores, by the Congressional Budget Office, as a cost, a cost that is, no one really agrees upon the price, but it's somewhere between $250 billion to $350 billion. It could even be more than that if you tried to protect some part B premium payers from the rapid expansion of Medicare costs, Medicare part B costs caused by the rapid increase in repealing the SGR.

Remember that part B premiums are based on a formula: 25 percent of the actual cost of administering the part B program. We add another big cost to the part B program in the repeal of the sustainable growth rate formula, and Medicare recipients, Medicare participants in the part B program may see their premiums go up even faster than they've seen them go up the past several years.

So that's a problem. If we are honest about addressing the problem, it is likely to be $350 billion to $400 billion. But it could be scored as low as $250 billion if you use some smoke and mirrors, which we try to do when we do budget things.

Nevertheless, it's still a big amount of money that will have to be added to this bill, and we didn't do it. We just simply didn't do it. The congressional Democrats told the Congressional Budget Office, don't score the SGR repeal in this bill.

Now, the House will tell you that, Hey, we passed an SGR repeal last November, didn't get any Republican support. Oh, wait, they got one. Okay. It was me. But that bill was going nowhere and everybody in this House knew that was going nowhere. In fact, the Senate had previously rejected the same bill 10 days before. So that was another fig leaf.

Oh, we're going to take care of the doctors. Let's pass this SGR repeal. And, Oh, the rascals in the Senate or the rascals on the Republican side wouldn't let this thing stand.

But the fact of the matter is it hasn't been fixed. The fact of the matter is the Democrats are in charge. The fact of the matter is they need to tell us how they propose to deal with that. This kicking the can down the road—and we did it, too, when we were in power. But this kicking the can down the road is making the problem a lot worse, and it is really putting our seniors at risk of not being able to access physicians. Just look at the statistics out there.

A company called Medicus that is a doctor search firm did a survey in December. And kind of depending upon how you ask the question, they said, If the Democrats' health care bill passes, will that affect your decision to retire or continue practicing medicine? If the public option was contained within the bill, almost 45 percent of physicians said they would consider retirement. That doesn't mean 45 percent of doctors will retire, but it meant nearly half of the doctors in this country would seriously look at it. Doctors who were near retirement age, about a quarter of them, about a quarter said, Seriously consider retiring early. Doctors who were nowhere near retirement age, about a fifth of those said, Yeah, I could see myself having to get out of this.

Now, if you remove the public option from the equation, if you remove the public option, the number goes down, and it's about 30, 31, 32 percent of doctors who would consider retiring early. A significant number of those who are already near retirement age, about 20 percent of doctors who were near retirement age would consider retiring early, even with the public option out of the Democrats' health care plan. And about 7 percent, 7 or 8 percent would if they were nowhere near retirement age. But still, that's a lot of doctors who are considering retiring if we pass one or two of these bills.

Let's leave the public option question alone for just a minute. We need to come back to that later because that is a significant part of this, but amongst the things that are in the bill that people may want to know about are these tax increases, are the Medicare cuts.

Of course, one of the big fights here last night was would the bill contain what's called the Hyde amendment language that would prevent Federal funding for abortion. A lot of controversy ensued. The bottom line is the Senate-passed bill did not contain the Hyde amendment language. The Stupak language that passed in the House bill in November did, but that wasn't the bill we were debating. That wasn't the bill we were passing.

Again, another fig leaf was trotted out in the form of an Executive order. But how many Executive orders did President Obama repeal on his first day of office, Executive orders that President Bush had had in place? It was a ton of them.

Now, the President, to his credit, did say that he would not tear up the Executive order the first day after the bill is passed, but I don't recall if he made a promise about the second day or the third day or the fourth day.

The fact of the matter remains that protection against using Federal funds for abortion, for paying for abortion is pretty tenuous right now, and that thread could be snapped at any time. And the fact is the American people just don't know at this point. And it's a shame, because we could have had that argument. We could have had a more solid amendment. But the fact of the matter is we didn't do that.

Other things in the Senate-passed bill:

The special deal for Nebraska, the Cornhusker kickback, it is in the Senate bill. It did pass. It's on its way down to the President for signature. Does that violate any constitutional principle like equal protection under the law? It might. It might. If the good, long-suffering, taxpaying citizens of Texas now have to subsidize Medicaid in Nebraska, that might get some suspicion from the Supreme Court of violating the 14th Amendment, but we'll have to see.

A special deal for Florida where their Medicare Advantage would not be cut in certain counties in southern Florida. Medicare Advantage cuts, as I pointed out to you, are going to be steep and significant in this bill, but the three counties in Florida will not sustain those cuts. Again, equal protection under the law. That may be a violation of the equal protection clause of the Constitution.

In fact, my attorney general back home in Texas said the Federal health care legislation passed tonight violates the United States Constitution and unconstitutionally infringes upon Texans' individual liberties.

□ 2140

To protect all Texans' constitutional rights, preserve the constitutional framework intended by our Nation's Founders, defend our State from further infringement by the Federal Government, the State of Texas and other

States will legally challenge the Federal health care legislation.

So what looked like a Federal health care bill may in fact have represented a bill for full employment for lawyers in this country.

There are some other bad provisions. There is a tax on the so-called Cadillac health insurance plans. Remember that was supposed to be fixed in the reconciliation bill, but the reconciliation bill is not the law of the land. The Senate bill is the law of the land and that Cadillac tax is in there. So for individuals with incomes under $250,000, they're going to get a significant tax if they have one of the high-end insurance policies. Clearly, that is a broken promise by the administration.

Boy, construction firms. I mean, who did they irritate in the Senate? Construction firms were singled out for higher taxes. In the Senate language, the employer mandate only exists or a fine if you don't provide—if your employees have to access care under the exchanges with subsidies. The fines don't kick in until you have more than 50 employees, but construction firms, there is a much smaller number. Single digits. If they're employed by a construction firm, they will have to pay an employer mandate or an employer fine.

Now, here's one of the provisions that is really—I don't think people know about it. I'm not sure if they do know about it and they understand it, but this new board that has been created in the Senate bill. One of the ways that they attempted to deal with Medicare spending was to assemble this board, this board of commissars and commissioners who are going to set Medicare spending targets, and they will do that and they will set those targets. Yes, they have to come back and be voted on by Congress, but we just have to vote them up-or-down. We can't amend them. We can't say, well, we're just going to plus them up a little bit and reduce this one down a bit. We've got to take the whole board of recommendation as a slate. It's an up-or-down vote here on the floor of the House.

I will just tell you when Congress has to be the enforcers on these things, look what we've done with doctor payments over the years. We're supposed to reduce them, but we really didn't because we didn't want to face the wrath from doctors for seniors so we took the easy way out and gave them a 1-year stay on that. And the consequence on that is the tab continued to run on those doctor payments. So now it's as high as $20 billion that—I am sorry, a 20-percent cut that will have to come out of doctor payments.

We might do the same thing with this independent board, or we would lack the courage to vote on the cuts anyway if we didn't like the way they came down to us. Congress does have a history of doing that.

Some other provisions of the bill double-counts some Social Security payroll tax revenues, double-counts the premiums collected for what was called the CLASS Act. That was one of the great bait-and-switch things that was included in this bill. We're going to provide long-term care insurance. You pay for that $50 a month and then you can get a benefit of $50 a day if you need to access long-term care insurance. Well, this actually scores as a savings because for the first several years it is in play, more premiums are collected than money is paid out. But guess what happens in the second half of, or the second 10 years of, these expenditures? Those payouts are going to exceed the premiums paid. And that is going to be an unmitigated disaster.

And the real pernicious part of the CLASS Act—look, people my age, if they can afford it, they should buy long-term care insurance. Don't wait on the Federal Government to give it to you. Don't believe you're going to get it from Medicare for you. It's only for a short period of time. Yes, you can get long-term care under Medicaid, but you've got to spend yourself to near bankruptcy before you get any of that benefit.

The sensible thing to do if you can afford the premium is to buy a long-term care policy.

The CLASS Act is going to tell people, Hey, you don't have to worry about that. Pay your $50 a month for long-term care. You're covered. That's nonsense. The coverage is thin. It will not be there after a period of time because that program is going to pay way too much money after a few years. And the problem with long-term care insurance is the longer you wait to buy it, the higher the premiums are going to be. For people who are in their early fifties, it's something worthwhile to look into.

But we're going to send a message to the next 10 years of Americans who are turning—Don't worry about it; We've got you covered with the CLASS Act. There is no coverage at all there. In fact, it is going to be an unmitigated disaster when people start trying to access that. Besides that, anyone who's paid for long-term care, anyone who's had a family member in a long-term care facility, does 50 bucks a day really take care of what you need in a long-term care facility? It's nowhere even close.

The bill double-counts some of the Medicare cuts. So we get to count them once, and we get to count them a second time.

Texas is really going to suffer under a reduction in disproportionate share funding. Drug makers will face an annual fee of $2.5 billion. But you know what? That $2.5 billion is not doing to come out of the CEO salaries. It's going to come out of product sales. So that will be passed on to the consumer. So although they look like they're being all great and helping out the President and putting out $2.5 billion, this goes back to the Americans who buy their product.

In 2011, this bill will limit flexible spending accounts to $2,500 per year. Yeah, you'll still be able to have your FSA, but you will be limited on the amount you can put into it.

Here's one that really most people are not aware of. There is a medical device manufacturers' fee which is again going to be passed on to the end user, the consumer, the patient, which is you. Continuing on the time line in 2011, there is a health insurance provider fee—$2 billion in 2011, $4 billion in 2012, and then it goes up from there rather dramatically. Again, a tax on health insurance providers.

Who do you think is going to pay that, the CEO of the big insurance company? Probably not. The guy that's buying the insurance? Probably. Again, I talked about this before. In 2013, the excise tax of 40 percent will be imposed on the Cadillac plans. In 2013, new Medicare taxes on individuals earning more than $200,000 a year and couples making more than $250,000 a year, the Medicare tax on your withholding is going to rise to 2.35 percent. There is going to be a new 3.8 percent tax. Starting in 2013, a new 3.8 percent tax on unearned income. Dividends, interest, capital gains. 2013, an excise tax of 2.9 percent imposed on the sale of immediate medical devices.

Now, not all medical devices—and we all heard the stories about the Band-Aids when the Senate was talking about this. There will not be a Band-Aid tax. This will be for so-called class 2 and 3 medical devices. Class 2 devices would be syringes, sutures, some testing that a doctor might do in their office. Some of those testing kits will be taxed at that 2.9 percent rate.

Let me tell you something here. As a doctor, you don't get to pass that tax on to your patient because most of your patients that come in that are insured, you actually see them at a contractual rate. So whatever the code is, there is a contractual rate for that code and it doesn't include that 2.9 percent tax. And employers with more than 50 employees must pay a fine of up to $3,000 if employees receive tax credits to purchase insurance.

So billions of dollars are going to be spent to hire thousands of new IRS employees needed to collect the taxes. Yet three out of 10 doctors says if Congress goes against their will and the will of the American people and passes this bill, they may retire from practicing medicine. So that's what the people are going to get—more IRS agents, less doctors.

Simple equation. How does that equal health care reform?

Ideally, we would repeal the entire bill and start over with real reforms. It seems unlikely that's going to be able to happen. Really, Members on both sides of the aisle that were concerned about this bill last night need to work together to repeal the more egregious portions of this bill and ultimately work toward the repeal of the entire bill when the make-up of the Congress

and the White House has sufficiently changed to allow that to happen.

Let me talk a little bit again about the Senate-passed bill. We're not talking about the reconciliation bill. We're not talking about the House-passed bill. Remember the Senate-passed bill in December? There was a Senator from Connecticut who said, I cannot vote for a bill if it's got a public option in it.

□ 2150

Maybe it's because there are a lot of insurance companies in Connecticut, I don't know what the reasoning was, but that Senator was very firm that they would not have his vote, and they needed every vote they could to get to 60, so the public option was very reluctantly stripped out of the Senate bill. But is it really going? And the answer is it might not be.

Now, you have heard that several States around the country are looking at, I believe it's up to 37, was the last count, are looking at either filing a constitutional challenge or somehow exempting their State from participating in this new Federal legislation, and that also means that they may not set up the State-based exchange that the bill, the Senate bill, calls for.

Well, what happens in a State that doesn't set up an exchange? Is there not going to be any exchange, so there won't be any insurance in the exchange available to citizens of those States? You would think so, because States should ultimately have sovereignty, except that there is a little known Federal agency called the Office of Personnel Management that is going to be charged with setting up a State-based exchange or a national exchange that every State that doesn't have a State-based exchange, that their citizens can buy through this national exchange. And the Office of Personnel Management, in the language of the bill, is required to set up one insurance company, one for-profit insurance company, and one not-for-profit.

Does this federally administered, national exchange, not-for-profit, insurance company begin to look a lot like the public option that was discussed in the Democrat's bill in the House? The answer is, of course it does.

The Office of Personnel Management currently administers the Federal employee health benefits plan here for all Federal employees, not just in Congress, but all employees. So they are a relatively small agency. That's a big insurance plan, but still, as Federal agencies go, that's a relatively small agency.

It is going to have to rapidly ramp up with a great number of new employees. Perhaps that's one of the ways we are going to deal with unemployment is to hire more people in the Federal Government. But the Office of Personnel Management will have to get considerably larger, and this Office of Personnel Management will now be the de facto public option as it administers the not-for-profit that's in the national exchange that is available to people who are in States that don't set up a State-based exchange.

It is a public option by another name. Unfortunately, the Senator that sought to prevent that from happening did not see the way this was going to work out in their own Senate bill. So when I say the doctors who look at retiring from practice, if there is a public option in the bill, perhaps the more they get to understand that this public option is really in the bill, maybe they will rethink their willingness to continue to work within the system.

Are there other ways to change this bill that we passed last night? Certainly, everyone ought to be treated equally under this bill, and they haven't been. Maybe that's one of the technical fixes we could work on so that there is no geographic disparity, there is no racial disparity. People, equals, ought to be treated equally, and that is one of the things that really we should work on.

I think we should work on getting rid of the individual mandates and the employer mandates. Certainly we could encourage comprehensive coverage for seniors. Right now, look what we are doing to Medicare Advantage. Look what we are doing to putting the tax on the supplemental insurance.

We really should, rather than discouraging seniors from having a Medicare Advantage plan or a supplemental plan, maybe we ought to encourage that. After all, the Medicare Advantage plans are doing what we asked them to do. We asked them for care, coordination, disease management, expanded health IT, expanded use of physician assistants, nurse practitioners, paraprofessionals.

Medicare Advantage plans are performing those functions. They are just now getting to the point where they are really starting to see the cost savings that we all said would be there if they would do those things, and now we are going to take them away. Okay, never mind, we shouldn't have done it anyway, so sorry about that.

Allow health insurance to be sold across State lines. We have talked about this a lot. If you want competition, don't have the Office of Personnel Management create a nonprofit that everyone is going to compete with. That's only one other bit of competition. Let the 1,300 insurance companies that exist in this country, let them compete. Let them compete up on the Internet, let them compete across State lines.

The portability of insurance, Congress attempted to address that back in 1996, arguably made kind of a mess of things. But if we would do things that would establish and create an enhanced portability of insurance, we would go a long way towards establishing a longitudinal relationship, a patient with their insurance company.

If you go from job to job, you don't change insurance companies. You have your insurance company, and you can take it with you. Allow private insurance and alternatives to Medicaid and SCHIP, special health savings account for the chronically ill, health insurance plans to specialize in solving problems for the chronically ill.

All of these things are out there and within our purview. These are all things we should undertake to fix the egregious problems that are in the Senate bill.

$13 BILLION A YEAR FOR HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate being able to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and what has been referred to in the past as the world's greatest deliberative body—and what has to struggle to reach that standard these days, I would say, Madam Speaker.

You know, we are not done yet. This legislation passed the House sometime this morning. I will just say, first of all, I am grateful that this usurpation of American liberty technically in its final phase didn't take place on the Sabbath during Lent, although most of the machinations, debates, and battles, and some of the votes, actually did take place on the Sabbath during lent.

Our Founding Fathers would have considered it a serious violation of the standards of decency to assault liberty on the Sabbath, especially during Lent, and I consider it the same. Sacrilegious may have been something that would have come to mind.

But what we have seen is the Senate version of the bill, which has come over here to the House and was voted on and debated on first, and voted on. And the identical form is the Senate—was the legislation that most of us heard President Obama refer to, and I believe it was in the conference February 25 at the Blair House, as ObamaCare.

Thirty-some million more people put on the rolls, and many of them on Medicaid rolls, many of them don't quite fit the standards that seem to be the highest ideals of the initiation of this legislation. The argument is, if there is $130 billion, it will be reducing the deficit over a 10-year period of time, $130 billion over 10 years. The American people can move a decimal point one place to the left and figure out what that is annually, $13 billion a year by their calculations.

Madam Speaker, I could take you down through the list of the spending that has been out of control by this Congress. It all has to be initiated here, promoted by the President of the United States, trillions, trillions of dollars added up, $700 billion in TARP, $787 billion, which rolled into over $800 billion and the economic stimulus plan, of which only 94 percent of Americans believe did any good, and that

trillions that have been added, that have been advanced by the U.S. Treasury and the debt and the deficit that's created by the Obama budget, and we're being told that we should give up 100 percent of our personal control of our own health insurance and health care in America and completely transform the entire health insurance industry, the entire health care delivery system, when we have 85 percent of the people in America that today are insured and 85 percent of them are happy about it.

And we would transform the entire health care delivery system and the health insurance system in America for what? And the argument is, we will reduce the deficit by $13 billion a year.

Madam Speaker, I would point out that if we were interested in reducing the debt by $13 billion a year, it would be a piece of cake to take $13 billion out of the abusive lawsuits that are being driven by the trial lawyers in America. These numbers come to us in stark relief.

The health insurance underwriters give us a number that 8.5 percent of the overall health care costs in America are driven by the abusive lawsuits. That 8.5 percent, when you do the calculation, comes out to be $207 billion a year. That's the cost of defensive medicine, the litigation, the unnecessary settlements that come, not the part that makes people whole, and the part that goes directly into the pockets of the trial lawyers in America, who are bringing lawsuits and driving physicians to do defensive medicine to the point where it's been going on so long that it's taught in our med schools how you protect yourself from litigation.

□ 2200

You spend the money on unnecessary tests instead. That's my low number, $207 billion a year, which is the Health Insurance Underwriters. That's 8½ percent. These numbers and estimates go from $207 billion up to $210 billion a year, which is the number that's produced by a Government Reform Committee analysis, on up to $650 billion a year.

So if we were really serious about trying to reduce the deficit, we can do this to $13 billion a year for the entire massive ObamaCare legislation that was rammed and force-fed through this Congress, at a tremendous amount of bone twisting. $13 billion a year and $130 billion over 10 years. Think, if we could abolish the abusive lawsuits and finally end the unnecessary tests, those that are defensive medicine, and take that waste out of our health care system. If we could save $200 billion a year up to $650 billion, you've got to be a piker to brag about $13 billion when you're the President of the United States. And the money that they spent to twist the arms here to get down to that. And then, to add the reality to this that the $13 billion a year—I'll say the round number of $130 billion in deficit reduction by the CBO, which was under a tremendous amount of pressure. We'll find out if they're legitimate or not over time, but their credibility may fall into question. I don't question it here tonight, Madam Speaker.

But here are the things to calculate that aren't part of this calculation when people hear that number of $130 billion deficit reduction. That is a half a trillion dollars in Medicare reimbursement rates that are cut out of the reimbursement process today; $500 billion cut out of Medicare. Nobody believes this Congress will vote to cut that spending. Nobody believes that. The people that voted for this bill don't believe that, and the people that voted for this bill will not vote to cut Medicare for half a trillion dollars. That's an accounting gimmick that's designed, like a red herring, to throw the hound off the trail.

Another one of those components of this calculation is $569.2 billion in tax increases. Tax increases on medical equipment, for example. Tax increases across the whole plethora of things that add up to $569.2 billion. And another calculation—and we will get the precise number in a moment—$200-plus billion for the doctors fix.

So when we add this up, Madam Speaker, $500 billion for Medicare to cut the slash of the underreimbursed Medicare as it is today. According to the CMS, the Centers Medicare & Medicaid Services, the Federal Government, by their calculation of cost, not by the actual cost of providers, only reimburse 80 percent of the Medicare costs to deliver their services. And still, they would cut half a trillion dollars out of them?

Add the half trillion to the $569 billion in tax increases, and now you have 1 trillion, 69 billion, 200 million in cuts with the tax increase on one side, the cut in Medicare on the other side. Those two things change the revenue of this. You add to that the $200 billion that is the doctor fix, and now you're up to that area of about $1.25 trillion dollars of funding that are distorted in the calculations of the Congressional Budget Office, because they do what? They do the calculation on what's presented to them.

And we're supposed to be elated over a CBO score of a deficit reduction of $130 billion that I guarantee you, Madam Speaker, and I would guarantee to the American people as well, we will never realize such a thing. We will see a complete transformation of our health care system, except that we have launched an effort to repeal this abysmal piece of legislation.

I would be very happy to yield so much time as he may consume to the relentless doctor and Congressman from Texas, who lives this and has made a pledge of his life's effort to come here and get this health care policy right in America. And he can't have slept very well last night.

Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There's lots of things I could say. Let me say this on the physician fix in Medicare, because that has been something that has been left out of the equation. The Democrats do say that they passed a bill last fall that the Republicans tried to block and the Senate won't take up, but the fact of the matter is they haven't got it done.

What does it really cost to repeal the sustainable growth rate formula? I have some familiarity because this is something I have worked on ever since I first got here. Three years ago, the Congressional Budget Office score to repeal the sustainable growth rate formula was in the neighborhood of $290 billion over 10 years.

But what happens, as we all know, every year that we don't fix the SGR, that dollar figure that should have been saved gets added on to the cost of the fix. There is no way that the cost of fixing the sustainable growth rate formula is 1 dollar less than $300 billion. It is likely $350 billion or more.

What many of us conveniently choose to ignore is that there will have to be something done to protect seniors who are part B participants, because the premium paid by the seniors in part B is, by law, fixed at 25 percent of the cost of the part B program the previous year. Well, if you add that much money to the cost of the part B program, guess what's going to happen to that senior's 25 percent of their premium? It's going to go up significantly.

Well, in Congress, sometimes we don't like to do that because it makes people mad at us and they get grouchy around election time and they won't vote for us, so we are likely to do something to hold seniors harmless from that rate increase. And, as a consequence, that makes the cost of repealing the SGR even higher.

When you hear people talk about perhaps it can cost as much as $400 billion to repeal the SGR, they are talking about, yes, the true cost of repealing the SGR and a protection for seniors—at least low-income seniors—in the part B program. All of that is going to cost money. That's the reason that that number gets inflated so high.

Yes, there were some tricks and gimmicks that were used when the Democrats had their bill here in the fall to hold that cost down to, I think it was, $240 billion or $250 billion. The fact of the matter remains that it is a huge expenditure completely left off the CBO, Congressional Budget Office, tally sheet. As a consequence, you're not being honest with the American people if you said, Well, this is going to be the greatest revenue saver of all time. Nonsense. Start that story with, ''Once upon a time,'' and finish it with, ''And they lived happily ever after,'' because it is truly a fairy tale or a bedtime story, except it's kind of scary when you think of what your children are going to have to face with the amount of debt we are laying at their feet.

Again, this has been through both the Republican and Democratic-controlled House of Representatives that we have let this happen. It's not to put all the culpability at the feet of the Democrats on the SGR formula, but they are culpable in this regard: They are not attesting to it. They are not accounting for it in this formula or in this score sheet, this tally sheet they have. And then they're going blithely around the country talking about how this is going to save the greatest amount of revenue that anyone has ever seen in peacetime.

The President is going to have a signing ceremony tomorrow for the bill that we passed. He is then embarking upon a tour to sell the American people on the concept of what we passed. That's getting a little backwards, isn't it? Shouldn't we have engaged the American people and gathered the popular support from around the country for this bill before we passed it through the House and the Senate and signed it down at the White House?

This has been their problem all along. I have said it before, but it bears repeating. If you do not have popular support for a measure this large, then it's no great surprise that the people push back. And because the people pushed back, yeah, the Republicans didn't want this and they didn't vote for it, but it was the Democrats within their own conference, within their own caucus. This was a fight in the Democratic caucus. Because how can you go home and face your constituents when they have told you over and over and over again in town halls, telephone town halls, emails, cards, faxes, letters, they have told you over and over and over again, We don't want you to do this. We don't trust you.

The congressional approval rating right now is 17 percent and dropping. We don't trust you to do this. You won't read the bill. You won't take the insurance yourself. Why should we believe you that you can do something this large?

□ 2210

Now had we taken an alternative approach, which was rejected by the President, rejected by the Speaker of the House, but had we taken an alternative approach and said, Let's take three things that are really bugging people and try to fix them, and maybe if they see we can do that, maybe they'll give us the permission to work on a few more things.

So instead of a 1,000-page bill that became a 2,000-page bill that became a 3,000-page bill that became a 4,000-page bill—and this was a 4,000-page bill, by the way. There was 2,700 pages in the Senate legislation, and then another 1,300 pages in reconciliation. That's a lot of pages for the American people to have to sort through on a weekend. And many brave souls, I'm sure, tried. Rather than doing a 4,000-page bill, let's do three or five 50-page bills and try to take care of some of the problems.

You know, here's the sad part. Because a lot of the benefits are shifted out so far because it's just going to take a long time to build the infrastructure and the bureaucracy to administer these things, they're ironically going to do some of the things that JOHN MCCAIN suggested during the campaign. They're going to create risk pools for people with preexisting conditions, and subsidize these risk pools, and get people some help right away. That's a good thing. I would support that. I would have supported that a year ago, had we said, Look, we know we want to work on a big health care bill, but let's get some help for the people that are really needing it right now.

And that poor group of people with preexisting conditions, there is a way we can help them. The Congressional Budget Office scored that at about a $20 billion cost over 10 years' time. I personally think it's going to be a little bit higher. But that's a far sight less than a trillion-dollar bill. So why didn't we do that a year ago? Why didn't we have a hearing on it in my committee? Why didn't we call in some experts and say, How do you get this done? We are still going to pass a big bill at some point, but we just really want to help these poor folks who have preexisting conditions today.

Why didn't we have a hearing on, What do we need to do to help people who are perhaps facing early retirement, a way to buy into Medicare? Or is there some other type of insurance product that might be out there? Might we do something in the marketplace that would allow a product to be developed and sold for them? We didn't even try. We didn't have a hearing. We didn't talk about it. We just said, No, we're going to do mandates. We're going to do a public option. We'd love to do a single-payer if we thought we could pull the wool over the American people's eyes for just a few more days, and this is what we want to do.

The reality is that people would look back at it and say, No, you can't do that to us. Mandates are unconstitutional. What about equal protection under the law? This deem and pass thing that they flirted with for a few days really got people in a snit until they finally backed off on that. But why be so duplicitous? Why be so fancy about passing these things? Make it a straightforward bill. Make it the number of pages that someone could reasonably read in one sitting, and tell people what you're going to do, tell people what you're going to propose.

Even better yet, go out amongst the people and find out what they want. This is what I did with my nine principles that I have developed for health care reform that were up on my Web site—or perhaps are still up on my Web site. I listened to the people in my town halls. I listened to the people who were on my telephone town halls. They said, Help us with preexisting conditions. Sell across State lines, fairness in the Tax Code, liability reform, blah, blah, blah. That's what we want.

Why didn't we do it that way? Instead we have this gargantuan bill that we shoved down the throats of the American people. And I don't know, we're stuck up here in Washington. We're insulated inside the cocoon. Our phones have been shut down all weekend. Our faxes have been overloaded. So we don't really know what people are thinking out there. But I've got a hunch they're not happy about what we did last night. I'm sorry to have consumed so much time. I will yield back to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas. And I know that since he had a little trouble sleeping last night, if he has a little longer period of time to vent himself tonight, he may be able to get caught up with this and rest a little. But I do not believe that we're going to be forgetting this, nor will we be backing off.

The first order of business this morning issued a bill draft request to repeal this legislation that passed the House last night, the Senate version of the bill. It's not curious at all that it's happened more than one of us has stepped forward to do that. I'll continue to work on that cause and work to have legislation that can repeal the Senate version of the bill and can be converted into a discharge petition that can then bring a repeal to the floor of the House. There are 212 House Members who voted against it. That means if they will all stick to their convictions—and there was one resignation last night, so that means we have seven more on top of that—that if all of those would sign on the courage of their convictions and seven would have a conversion, we would be able to bring a repeal to the floor of the House. That's one of my efforts, Madam Speaker. And I intend to remain committed to that.

Going back on Dr. BURGESS's comments with regard to cost, he said the doctors' fix has to be in the area of $360 billion. I spoke of the $500 billion cut in Medicare reimbursement rates as part of that bill and tax increases in there, aggregate, that are $569.2 billion. The things that aren't in this bill that change the overall cost of the bill totals $1.4292 trillion that, if they were presented in a fashion that was designed to inform the American people, would have shifted the balance of that scoring from, I'd say, a deficit reduction of $130 billion to a deficit increase of $1.429 trillion, minus $130 billion. So we would be in the area of $1.3 trillion is what the additional cost of all this is that is masked by the cuts in Medicare, the tax increases that people don't seem to be focused on or animated by, and by the necessity to pass a doctors' fix. All of that. And the net, that would be the net deficit that was created by this bill, when you subtract those numbers, works out to be $1.3 trillion, a net deficit created by this bill.

All of this to solve a problem that the President has identified as us

spending too much money on health care. So we spend too much money on health care, and the economy's in a downward spiral—this is all the President—and we can't fix the economy unless we first fix health care. The problem with health care is we spend too much money, and the President's solution is spend a lot more. Speaker PELOSI's solution is spend a lot more.

So that's what got done last night, Madam Speaker. The American people end up with a huge liability that goes on to our children, our grandchildren; and babies yet born will be paying interest on a debt that shows no sign to be reduced anytime within the calculations of the people that are in control of this country today, that being the White House, the gavel here, in the White House, and the gavel in the United States Senate.

So when Dr. BURGESS talks about a story that begins with ''Once upon a time'' and ended with ''happily ever after,'' I don't know if there is a happily ever after for America. But we're living in a once-upon-a-time time, Madam Speaker.

Now, I wanted to take up this issue and roll us back to the Stupak amendment and what happened here in the House last night. The Stupak amendment was brought forward in the weeks before the November 7 first passage of the House version of the bill. It was driven, I think, by the best merits of seeking to prohibit American taxpayers from having to fund abortions. I would like to prohibit abortions; but if we can continue to prohibit American taxpayers from having to fund abortions, at least we're maintaining the current status quo.

That changed last night, Madam Speaker. But the Stupak amendment was motivated and designed to prevent Americans from having to pay for the elimination of innocent unborn human life. That was properly motivated, and it was very hard work here in this Congress. Every Republican supported the Stupak amendment. There were 64 Democrats who voted for the Stupak amendment. Everyone got at least some cover to be able to say, I am pro-life.

That went on from November 7, this cover of being pro-life Democrats, until last night, Madam Speaker. And now it's a legitimate question to ask, Is there such a thing as a pro-life Democrat? Or was it always a political position that was contrived to posture to pacify constituents rather than a deeply held internal conviction that one is willing to stand and sacrifice for? I'm having trouble at this point finding a real pro-life Democrat. I'm sure some of them in their most private world do care a lot about ending the destruction of innocent unborn human life.

But after the Stupak amendment, after the long negotiations that took place, after the events that took place yesterday of Congressman STUPAK in one room, the pro-choice people in another room, shuttle diplomacy going back and forth, and finally about 4 o'clock yesterday, Congressman STUPAK held a press conference and revealed that the Stupak 12, the dozen that had pledged that they would hold out to defend innocent unborn human lives and oppose Federal funding of abortion, decided that they had found a solution that would take them off of the pressure hook and out of the pressure cooker that was being put there by the Speaker.

□ 2220

We have to believe if the Stupak 12 would have stuck together, this anti-liberty, anti-life bill would have failed last night. But it did not.

Now what was the rationale that came before that Stupak press conference yesterday? And in the Stupak dozen, I would point out that we still don't know who they all are. We probably know who some are, but we don't know who they all are. And you can't count votes in this United States Congress or any legislative body unless the people that are on the list are public.

If they say I will be a ''no'' on the Senate version of the bill unless there is a fix that will put real pro-life language in it, if they will step up at a press conference and take their position and make that pledge before God and man, you can generally count on them. But a lot of them were pledged by Congressman STUPAK, but they were anonymous, Madam Speaker.

I never believe an anonymous oath stuck for anything because they can always flip and vote the other way. And when pinned down later on, they can say, I was never one of the Stupak dozen. So they had the option. Those who were not public, those whose names didn't leak out into the press, they all had the option to vote yes or no. If they voted no on the bill because it didn't have pro-life protections in it, then after the final vote, they could always say, Well, I stood up for innocent, unborn human life. I was one of the Stupak dozen.

But if they voted yes, Madam Speaker, and when they were accused later on of flipping their position and not sticking with their publicly announced convictions on pro-life, they could always say, Well, I was never part of the Stupak dozen. I really didn't make that pledge or that oath. I was not part of that deal. So don't write me into this presuming I flipped positions and didn't stick to my convictions because I never announced my convictions. That is what goes on when people who are supposedly part of a coalition remain anonymous and their names do not become public. Their public statements are not part of the record. And so therefore they can vote any way they want to vote and always hide from the accountability. They don't have to give or keep their word. And for months, the Stupak dozen remained anonymous.

And now we have to wonder, was there a single Member of Congress, was it all Democrats on that dozen, was there a single one that had the courage of their convictions that put up a vote to defend innocent, unborn human life? Or did they all find a way to slip into the excuse of, the President of the United States is going to sign an Executive order that will take the Stupak language and make it the law of the land. That is the summary of the Stupak conference yesterday, as I heard it.

The President's Executive order makes protection of innocent unborn human life from the assault of American taxpayers' dollars, pro-life American taxpayers' dollars protected by an Executive order of the President of the United States.

Now, I have to believe that a duping has taken place here. We are the people who have to take an oath, and we are glad to do it. An oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. We take that oath right down here on the floor together, and I carry the family Bible in to take my oath, to uphold this Constitution of the United States. And we are upholding a Constitution—what we understand the text of the Constitution to mean. And what it was understood to mean at the time of its ratification.

It cannot be anything else. It cannot be a living, breathing, growing, moving, changing, morphing organism. The Constitution has to mean what it says. If it doesn't mean what it says, it is no guarantee whatsoever. It is simply a document that allows a judge or a manipulating attorney to manipulate society however they choose to do so. Or the Constitution could just become instead a shield that an activist judge can hold up and say, that is the Constitution. It was my job to interpret it as a growing, moving, changing, morphing document; and because society has changed, the Constitution has to adapt to it. That is nuts.

It is nuts to think that the Constitution has any value if we are going to put it in the hands of an activist judge and have it turn into something that is malleable, that they can shape in their hands however they want to. There wouldn't be any reason for a Constitution if it was growing, moving, changing, and morphing. The text of it has to mean what it was understood to mean at the time of the ratification of the basic document, the Bill of Rights, or each of the amendments in their time as they came through.

And the Founding Fathers put provisions in place so if we weren't satisfied with this Constitution, its text in its original understanding, then we could amend it. A fair amount of wisdom. It is a high bar. But still, it needs to be a high bar to amend the Constitution because this is our guarantee.

And to think that we would have Members of this United States Congress at this very high and presumably well-educated, well-informed, and sophisticated level, that would take an oath to uphold this Constitution, each

2 years as they are seated in this Congress, and believe somehow this Constitution doesn't mean what it says, that there really isn't what you would call a separation of powers, that the executive, the legislative and the judicial branches of government somehow are not defined specifically in here with our individual duties. All legislative powers are vested in the Congress; they are not vested in the President of the United States.

You don't have to read very far into the Constitution, Article I, section 1, ''All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.'' All legislative powers, Madam Speaker.

And yet, Congressman STUPAK and the other 11 of the Stupak dozen found it convenient to believe that this doesn't mean what it says, that a President of the United States can amend the legislation of the land, the law of the land, by Executive order? Who could dream of such a thing? What kind of country could we have if the President can amend the legislation, the Federal code, by Executive order? Any President could come in on a whim and amend the very reasoned deliberations of the House and the Senate that we have come together and concurred in, and sent the document to the President of the United States to be signed into law, and the President could then just simply sign an Executive order to change it?

If the President can do that, why didn't he just write the entire socialized medicine ObamaCare package? If he can run this country by Executive order, we don't need a legislative branch, unless we come together to appropriate money. And why can't you do that by Executive order, too?

This is the kind of thinking that subverts our Constitution. And this initiated and promised from the President of the United States, who used to teach constitutional law at the University of Chicago as an adjunct professor. I will just read this again, just in case we forget what Article I, section 1 says. ''All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.''

The gentleman from Michigan and the 11 other gentlemen and gentleladies who are either publicly part of the Stupak 12 found something that was the best deal that they could find to let them do what they were probably willing to do for a long time before they finally capitulated, and that is vote for this socialized medicine bill, because that is where the political power has gone. So they will migrate where political power is instead of standing on their convictions to defend innocent, unborn life.

How can it be that the President of the United States will sign an Executive order that alters the legislative language of the United States Congress? What utter arrogance on the part of the White House. What utter naivete, at best, on the part of the Members of this Congress that buy into such a thing.

□ 2230

Madam Speaker, I'm not without experience in this category. I didn't just open up the Constitution and read Article I, section 1. I have a deep and long history with defending the Constitution and the separation of powers.

And, in fact, as a State senator, I exercised that at some expense to myself and my family. As a State senator, I took an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Iowa. And some time in 1999, I received a fax that came from an anonymous source, and I never found out where, but it was a photocopy of an article that was written in the Washington Blade here in Washington, D.C., and it said, at that time State of Iowa Governor Vilsack, now Secretary of Agriculture, had signed an executive order, an executive order that granted special protected status for sexual orientation and gender identity. And it was—I want to say it took great credit for that executive order advancing the special rights of people who often read the Washington Blade newspaper.

It seemed to me that somebody had a little bit of extra exuberance that somehow that information would be sent out here to Washington and it would be posted in the paper and nobody in Iowa would have probably picked up on it, but I think somebody out here found it, cut it out, and faxed it to me. That was on a Wednesday evening. I read that article, checked the Iowa Administrative Bulletin, and there on page 632 of the Iowa Administrative Bulletin I found the executive order.

Now, the Governor had had a press conference that day. He'd talked about several other actions on his part, but he didn't talk about the executive order, executive order number 7, granting special protected status for sexual orientation and gender identity.

And I went to our attorneys and I said, I believe this is a violation of separation of powers. I believe he is legislating by executive order, and I believe it's a constitutional violation. And even our attorneys on our side of this analyzed it and said, No, you're wrong. This is very carefully written and artfully drafted and nuanced in such a way that it isn't a violation of the Constitution, and this executive order will stand.

And it didn't make sense to me, and they couldn't explain it to me. And often I find out, if they can't, it isn't just because I can't understand it; it might be they don't either.

So I sat down at the word processor and I put all the language in section 19B.2 of the Iowa Code. I typed it in so I had the words to work with. Then I took the executive order number 7 on page 632 of the Iowa Administrative Bulletin and I patched that in to the code of the civil rights section of the Code of Iowa, Iowa law, just like our Federal Code here, Federal law. And where it struck out words in the Iowa Code, I put strike-throughs in them; and where it introduced words, I put underlines in them, and pretty soon I had a document that showed me what the Code of Iowa would read like if that executive order were allowed to stand.

And it was clear to me that the Governor had legislated by executive order. He'd added two more categories to the special protected status of the Civil Rights Act which was patterned off of title VII of the Civil Rights Act in the Federal Code. So it was clear to me that the Governor, the chief executive officer of my State, had legislated by executive order. I didn't have anybody that agreed with me, but I believed it.

So I sat down and I wrote up an analysis of it. And I set that up and I sent it out to about a dozen of the people out there whose judgment I trust, and I asked them to give me an opinion. And that was on a Thursday night.

And before I got an opinion back from anyone, I was driving down the road that Friday morning about 10:15 or so, maybe 10:30, listening to one of our radio talk show hosts, our top radio talk show host in Iowa, who happens to be one of the people that's talking on WHO radio. And that is the original station where Ronald Reagan had a microphone when he learned the broadcasting business, so anyone that has access to that microphone has a legacy to uphold.

And as our talk show host was talking, he brought up this executive order, which I didn't think anybody knew about but me, and he began going down through a list of items that he objected to and an analysis of it. And as I listened, as I drove down the road, it occurred to me that this sounds a lot like the points that I had sent out the night before to my friends for their opinions. And I pulled my pickup truck—where I come from, they're just a pickup—off on the gravel road at an intersection and I dialed on my cell phone into that radio program.

And he asked me what I thought and I told him. I said, I believe the Governor is legislating by executive of order. I believe it's a constitutional violation of the separation of powers.

And he said, What are you going to do—at the time—State Senator? He said, What are you going to do, Senator? And I said, I'm going to sue the Governor.

And he asked me, Do you have the support of the legislature? I said, There are 150 of us between the house and the senate, and if 149 of them think it's a bad idea, I am suing him anyway, because he's violated the Constitution of the State of Iowa by legislating by executive order.

Now, to move this longer story into a shorter version, Madam Speaker, it comes down to this. I followed through

on that. There were a number of people that joined me as plaintiffs. I'm very glad that they did. They were stalwart, and we stood together. But the case of King v. Vilsack went before the courts, and the courts found in my favor and in the favor of the Constitution and in the favor of the people that stood up to defend the Constitution, and they vacated the executive order because it was unconstitutional. It was an attempt by an executive officer to legislate by executive order rather than allow the constitutional authority of the legislative branch to make those decisions. And so that executive order number 7 was vacated by the courts.

And I believe it was a help to the administration, the Vilsack administration, so that they didn't follow down that path and continue to try to run the State of Iowa without regard to respect for the legitimate authority of the legislative branch.

Well, now Governor Vilsack is the Secretary of Agriculture. We've had our times together, but I'm appreciative of that time, because that gave me the background and that gave me the responsibility to analyze these issues and come to a fundamental conclusion.

If a Governor can't legislate by executive order, neither can a President. It's the height of arrogance to think that you can do so by executive order, especially when the President has so much on the record that would say otherwise.

And I would point out that President Obama was very, very critical of President Bush for his signing statements, not executive orders, that—essentially not an executive order that it would amend a statute that hasn't even gotten to the President's desk yet, but a signing statement that points out reservations about constitutionality of certain segments of a bill.

And here is what President Obama said of signing statements. This is March 9, 2009. He's been inaugurated for a couple of months, a month and a half now. And the title of this memo is, from the White House, ''Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies; Subject: Presidential Signing Statements.''

Now, remember, this is the President who, as a candidate, was critical of President Bush for his signing statements. And he says this: ''In recent years, there has been considerable public discussion and criticism of the use of signing statements to raise constitutional objections to statutory provisions.''

This is the President who has objections to the utilization of signing statements, which I have some of those same reservations to be objective in this.

And he goes on and says: ''There is no doubt that the practice of issuing such statements can be abused,'' an implication President Bush abused those.

Continuing, ''Constitutional signing statements should not be used to suggest that the President will disregard statutory requirements on the basis of policy disagreements.''

I'd better read that again. ''Constitutional signing statements should not be used to suggest that the President will disregard statutory requirements on the basis of policy disagreements.''

That's President Obama as recently as March 9, 2009. And here he is, March 21st, now the 22nd, 2010. So let's just call this a year and a couple of weeks later, the President of the United States apparently believes that he can go beyond the signing statement, even though he's critical of signing statements and the ''constitutional signing statement should not be used to suggest that the President will disregard statutory requirements on the basis of policy disagreements.''

Well, there apparently is a policy disagreement between Bart Stupak and the other 11, however anonymous they might be, and those who are willing to vote for this bill, regardless. But we know the President of the United States doesn't disagree with the policy in the bill that he's about to sign tomorrow.

□ 2240

He and BART STUPAK disagree, as do the 11, as does every Republican that voted for the Stupak amendment and presumably some of those that are part of the 64 Democrats that did the first time around.

But the President's taken a position that signing statements are to be used carefully and with great restraint even though he said as a candidate he didn't support signing statements at all. And now the same President is telling us that he can amend a piece of legislation that's been fought over since last July by everybody in America, finally passes the House of Representatives, goes to the President's desk, and he's going to amend it by executive order to keep our STUPAK happy. And I went to court to sue a Governor who is now the Secretary of Agriculture successfully to make the point that the chief executive officer of the State or the United States has no authority to amend legislation by executive order. King v. Vilsack's in the books. This executive order doesn't have any weight or substance. It will either be thrown out in court or will be disregarded. Mr. STUPAK has to know that.

That is another thing that the President went on and said with signing statements, With these considerations in mind and based upon advice of the Department of Justice, the President, speaking through this memo, I will issue signing statements to address constitutional concerns only when it is appropriate to do so as a means of discharging my constitutional responsibilities. In issuing signing statements I shall adhere to the following principles: Ya-da-da.

Only when it is appropriate to do so as a means of discharging my constitutional responsibilities. The President doesn't have a constitutional responsibility to sign an executive order. It would alter the language in the legislation. That is the responsibility of this Congress. And to think that there would be a piece of legislation that was passed here that could not have passed if the convictions of the people that were required to vote for it would have been reflected in their vote. But no. The false promise of an executive order brings about the flip of a dozen votes and a bill that couldn't pass—in fact, a bill that couldn't pass the United States Senate today passed the floor of the House last night, and it's on its way to the President because the President promised an executive order that would, in effect, amend the legislation that will soon be signed into law. It is a constitutional violation. I have been to court to prove it.

And I would go further and say why would anybody believe that it is the intent of the President to follow through on such a thing if, in the ultra-hypothetical situation, he really had an authority to sign an executive order that would bring about this effect? Why would anybody believe this?

I went back today and a looked through the transcripts of the Illinois State Senate. And here's what I found. State of Illinois, 92d General Assembly, regular session, Senate transcript 20th legislative day, March 30, 2001. Not so old in our time.

Where's the President on the issue of protecting unborn human lives? Well, before the Illinois legislature, several times the Illinois Born-Alive Infants Protection Act was introduced, it was introduced to provide legal protection to all born babies wanted or not, including the right—and it gave them the right to medical care. Then-Senator Barack Obama voted multiple times against such legislation. The President has not stood up to defend innocent unborn human life. When he was asked at the Saddleback Church in August of 2008 when his life began or when life begins, his answer was, That is above my pay scale.

Well, he seemed to think it was not above his pay scale when he spoke on the floor of the Senate that day. And the sum total of the dialogue of the President would tell any careful reader with a somewhat critical eye that the President of the United States must believe that a woman who was seeking an abortion, even though the baby survived the attempted abortion, has a right to a dead baby anyway.

Here's what I read from that transcript on that day, which is March 30, 2001. The floor of the Illinois Senate. And the question came from Senator Obama: ''Thank you, Madam President. Will the sponsor yield for questions?'' Presiding answer responded: ''He indicates he will.''

In which case State Senator Obama followed with this. He said: ''This bill was fairly extensively debated in the Judiciary Committee, and so I won't belabor the issue. I do want to just

make sure that everybody in the Senate knows what this bill is about, as I understand it.

''Senator O'Malley, the testimony during the committee indicated that one of the key concerns was—is that there was a method of abortion, an induced abortion, where the—the fetus or child, as—as some might describe it, is still temporarily alive outside the womb. And one of the concerns that came out of the testimony was the fact that they were not being properly cared for during that brief period of time that they were still living. Is that correct? Is that an accurate sort of description of one of the key concerns in the bill?''

Senator O'Malley, presiding officer, apparently responded and then from, yes, Senator O'Malley, the sponsor of the bill, said, ''Senator Obama, it is certainly a key concern that the—the way children are treated following their birth under the circumstances has been reported to be, without question, in my opinion, less than humane, and so this bill suggests that appropriate steps be taken to treat that baby as a—a citizen of the United States and afforded all the rights and protections it deserves under the Constitution of the United States.''

That is Senator O'Malley.

Senator Obama responded: ''Well, it turned out—that during the testimony a number of members who are typically in favor of a woman's right to choose an abortion were actually sympathetic to some of the concerns that your—you raised and that were raised by witnesses in the testimony. And there was some suggestion that we might be able to craft something that might meet constitutional muster with respect to caring for fetuses or children who were delivered in this fashion.''

Senator Obama continued: ''Unfortunately, this bill goes a little bit further, and so I just want to suggest, not that I think that it'll make too much difference with respect to how we vote, that this is probably not going to survive constitutional scrutiny. Number one, whenever we define a pre-viable fetus as a person that is protected by the equal protection clause or the other elements in the Constitution, what we're really saying is, in fact, that they are persons that are entitled to the kinds of protections.''

In any case, watching the clock tick down, Madam Speaker, I'm going to follow with this—let's see, ''that they are persons that are entitled to the kinds of protections that would be provided to a—a child, a 9-month-old—child that was delivered to term.'' In other words, he draws a distinction between the unborn child that is struggling for life after an attempt of abortion and the child that is 9-months-old.

And he goes on and says: ''That determination then, essentially, if it was accepted by a court, would forbid abortions to take place. I mean, it—it would essentially bar abortions, because the equal protection clause does not allow somebody to kill a child and if this is a''—so he admits that. He admits then abortion is killing a child if you allow that child to be named as a citizen of the United States by law.

Now continuing: ''And if this is a child, then this would be an anti-abortion statute. For that purpose, I think it would probably be found unconstitutional. The second reason that it would be found unconstitutional.

''This essentially says that a doctor is required to provide treatment to a pre-viable child, or fetus, however way you may want to describe it. Viability is the line that has been drawn by the Supreme Court to determine whether or not an abortion can or cannot take place.''

Not true, actually, Madam Speaker. They didn't draw that line. They made exceptions for life or health of the mother and that includes now, according to Dole v. Bolton as to economic or the familial health of the perspective mother, who I consider as a mother that day.

It goes on, and I will just bring this to a conclusion, as the President of the United States continues all of this dialogue on the floor of the Illinois Senate, standing up in opposition to the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act which protects the life of a child that has survived an abortion from being pushed off into a cold room and starved to death so no one can hear that child scream itself to death, the President argues in the substance of this that this woman has a right to a dead baby.

□ 2250

It concludes this way: ''As a consequence, I think that we will probably end up in court once again, as we often do on this issue, and, as a consequence, I will be voting 'present.' ''

This President said he would vote ''present'' on the issue of the Born Alive Act, which is the most outrageous position, and it finds itself in direct contradiction to the Born Alive Act, which is almost identical to the Illinois act that was passed unanimously in this United States Congress, in the House, and by a voice vote in the Senate, or vice versa; I actually don't remember which way, without opposition in each Chamber, but opposition in the Chamber of the Illinois Senate, by the President of the United States, who now we are going to trust to write an Executive order that's not going to be constitutionally upheld, that doesn't have the convictions of the President, but it gives just the smallest of fig leaves for the Stupak dozen. That's what the American people have seen, Madam Speaker. That's what brings some of their outrage.

But shifting subjects and bringing this into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and towards the conclusion, I will point out a press release that does give me some hope. This is a press release that also comes from Chicago, AP. The headline is this: ''ACORN disbanding because of money woes, scandal.'' It's an article by Michael Tarm, and it was filed at 8:57, fairly fresh news for us.

It says, ''The once mighty community activist group ACORN announced Monday it is folding amid falling revenues—6 months after video footage emerged showing some of its workers giving tax tips to conservative activists posing as a pimp and a prostitute.

Hannah and James, in 6 months, according to this article, have brought about the destruction of ACORN, ACORN the criminal enterprise, ACORN that has been involved in advocating for a Community Reinvestment Act and then deciding they are the brokers of who is writing the most bad loans in bad neighborhoods. ACORN, the organization that admitted to over 400,000 false or fraudulent voter registration forms, ACORN that has been under multiple prosecutions in multiple States, at least 14, I believe it is 16 States in the country for voter fraud, voter registration fraud and a number of other activities.

ACORN, the organization that was raided in New Orleans, Louisiana, at their national headquarters, and the Attorney General of the State of Louisiana brought out a massive amount of records, copied those records for ACORN, and they are being sorted through to this day. ACORN, the organization that seemed to want to change the shingle but it couldn't change the faces of the people that were running the organization, and the pressure that's come in this Congress to shut off funding to go to ACORN; the United States Senate shut off funding to ACORN. Thanks to Senator MIKE JOHANNS, who offered the amendments to get that done.

And then there was a judge, Nina Gershon, in the Eastern District of New York, who decided that Congress didn't have a constitutional authority to end funding to a multiple criminal enterprise entity because we failed, our government failed, our Solicitor General apparently failed to make the argument before the Eastern District of New York that Congress had some motive other than punitive. And so there was an unprecedented decision made by Judge Nina Gershon, and she ruled that it was a bill of attainder and we should not have punished ACORN, and that ACORN has access to, and should, to Federal funding for grants and contracts, not only what's going on in the past, what's going on now, but in the future, because they have been successful in the past, and Congress failed to prove.

Well, there isn't going to be that center of ACORN to appropriate funds to as long as we keep the pressure up, Madam Speaker. America is a better place because of this good news tonight.

I am not convinced that this is the end of ACORN. I think people like that re-form again and shape new organizations and come back in an insidious way, but we have got to follow and track all the money all the way down.

We have got to stand up for the principle of life, we have got to stand up for the Constitution. We have got to respect article 1, section 1, where all legislative authority is vested in the Constitution of the United States.

Follow through on ACORN. The sun did come up this morning, even though it was behind the cloud, and there is still some free air left in America.

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

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF SATURDAY, MARCH 20, 2010 AT PAGE H1818

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

[Omitted from the Record of March 20, 2010]

Petition 10. March 15, 2010, by Mr. WALTER B. JONES on the bill H.R. 775, was signed by the following Members: Walter B. Jones, Joe Wilson, and Adam H. Putnam.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

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. SABLAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SABLAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today and March 23 and 24.

Mr. LATTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3590. An act entitled The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 23, 2010, at 10:30 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6723. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 4 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6724. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's ''Major'' final rule — Truth in Lending [Regulation Z; Docket No. R-1370] received March 19, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6725. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Multiemployer Pension Plan Information Made Available on Request (RIN: 1210-AB21) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

6726. A letter from the NIH Associate Director for AIDS Research and Director, Office of AIDS Research, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting Fiscal Year 2011 Trans-NIH AIDS Research By-Pass Budget Estimate and Trans-NIH Plan for HIV-Related Research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6727. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Insurer Reporting Requirements; List of Insurers Required To File Reports [Docket No.: NHTSA-2009-0050] (RIN: 2127-AK46) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6728. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, ''District's Earmark Process Needs Improvement'', pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6729. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, ''District's Earmark Process Needs Improvement'', pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6730. A letter from the Associate Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting the Agency's annual report prepared in accordance with Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002, Pub. L. 107-174, for Fiscal Year 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6731. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Financial Report of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6732. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6733. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Human Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6734. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Human Resources, Evironmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6735. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PIAGGIO AERO INDUSTRIES S.p.A. Model PIAGGIO P-180 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1116; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-061-AD; Amendment 39-16193; AD 2010-03-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6736. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Model S-92A Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0066; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-52-AD; Amendment 39-16190; AD 2009-23-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6737. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 767-200, -300, and -300F Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0031;Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-266-AD; Amendment 39-16192; AD 2010-03-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6738. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135BJ, -135ER, -135KE, -135KL, and -135LR Airplanes; and EMB-145, -145ER, -145MR, -145LR, -145XR, -145MP, and -145EP Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0659; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-060-AD; Amendment 39-16191; AD 2010-03-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6739. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Area Navigation (RNAV) Route Q-108; Florida [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0885; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASO-17] received March 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6740. A letter from the Ambassador, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the 2010 Trade Policy Agenda and 2009 Annual Report on the Trade Agreements Program, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2213(a); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6741. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's FY 2007 annual report on the Child Support Enforcement Program, pursuant to Section 452(a) of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6742. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting First Quarterly Report of FY 2010 under The Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2008, pursuant to Public Law 110-389; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

6743. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the Railroad Retirement Handbook; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

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. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4810. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the services provided for homeless veterans under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Rept. 111–449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1879. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for employment and reemployment rights for certain individuals ordered to full-time National Guard duty; with an amendment (Rept. 111–450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 3976. A bill to extend certain expiring provisions providing enhanced protections for servicemembers relating to mortgages and mortgage foreclosure; with amendments (Rept. 111–451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4667. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2010, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes (Rept. 111–452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4592. A bill to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in energy-related positions; with an amendment (Rept. 111–453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PERLMUTTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1204. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4899) making emergency supplemental appropriations for disaster relief and summer jobs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes (Rept. 111–454). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CARDOZA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1205. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4849) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small business job creation, extend the Build America Bonds program, provide other infrastructure job creation tax incentives, and for other purposes (Rept. 111–455). 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 Ms. WATSON:

H.R. 4900. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, to create the National Office for Cyberspace, to revise requirements relating to Federal information security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas:

H.R. 4901. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Appropriations, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, House Administration, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 4902. A bill to establish additional research, study, and reporting requirements for the Department of Defense working group reviewing the possible repeal of current United States policy concerning homosexuality in the Armed Forces, referred to as Don't Ask, Don't Tell and codified as section 654 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. BACHMANN (for herself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ISSA, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. KING of Iowa):

H.R. 4903. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, House Administration, Appropriations, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 4904. A bill to prohibit the use of funds for implementation or enforcement of any Federal mandate to purchase health insurance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself and Mrs. BIGGERT):

H.R. 4905. A bill to guide and provide for research activities at the Department of Energy Office of Science, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. GORDON of Tennessee:

H.R. 4906. A bill to reauthorize the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. CARNAHAN (for himself, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. GIFFORDS):

H.R. 4907. A bill to establish Energy Innovation Hubs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 4908. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to support fire safety education programs on college campuses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. BACHMANN:

H.R. 4909. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2168 7th Avenue in Anoka, Minnesota, as the ''Richard K. Sorenson Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 4910. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and enact the Empowering Patients First Act in order to provide incentives to encourage health insurance coverage; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Education and Labor, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Rules, the Budget, Appropriations, House Administration, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 4911. A bill to repeal specific provisions in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HALVORSON (for herself, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. GIFFORDS):

H.R. 4912. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the required reduction in the amount of combat-related special compensation paid to disabled combat-related uniformed services retirees retired under chapter 61 of such title whose disability is attributable to an injury for which the members were awarded the Purple Heart; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself and Mr. KLEIN of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 256. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that any official within the Government of Iran at the level of deputy minister or higher or officer within the Iranian Revolutionary Guard is presumptively ineligible for a travel visa to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 40: Mr. NADLER of New York.

H.R. 211: Ms. JENKINS, Mr. HARE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 413: Mr. COOPER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 450: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 836: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 952: Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 1020: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1074: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1132: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1210: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1250: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1351: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1352: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. PETRI, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. ADLER of New Jersey.

H.R. 1362: Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 1398: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 1430: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1796: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1829: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 1835: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1879: Ms. GRANGER and Ms. GIFFORDS.

H.R. 1956: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 2156: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 2308: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 2485: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 3070: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 3156: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 3407: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 3764: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 3936: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. SCHOCK, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Ms. SUTTON, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 4021: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 4090: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 4122: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. POLIS of Colorado.
H.R. 4241: Mr. BOREN and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 4392: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 4396: Mr. SKELTON.
H.R. 4402: Mr. POLIS of Colorado.
H.R. 4415: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 4430: Mr. AKIN.
H.R. 4538: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 4543: Mr. HONDA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STARK, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. COSTA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DREIER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. CHU, Ms. WATSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WATERS, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. BACA, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HUNTER, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 4603: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 4615: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4684: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4709: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 4755: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 4800: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4806: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 4812: Mr. HINOJOSA and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 4815: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 4856: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 4864: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 4865: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 4894: Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 4896: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. LATTA.
H.J. Res. 79: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.J. Res. 80: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. CLAY.
H. Con. Res. 252: Mr. BACA and Mr. LAMBORN.
H. Res. 173: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. HILL.
H. Res. 252: Mr. MAFFEI.
H. Res. 763: Mr. PENCE and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H. Res. 859: Mr. RUSH.
H. Res. 913: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. RUSH.
H. Res. 992: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H. Res. 1016: Mr. OLVER and Mr. FATTAH.
H. Res. 1033: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. MCCARTHY of California.
H. Res. 1060: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. MACK.
H. Res. 1116: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. MCCARTHY of California.
H. Res. 1121: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ISSA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LINDER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H. Res. 1181: Mr. LAMBORN.
H. Res. 1191: Mr. SOUDER.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Appropriations in H.R. 4899, the Disaster Relief and Summer Jobs Act of 2010, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 4899, the Disaster Relief and Summer Jobs Act of 2010, do 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.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 22, 2010 No. 44

Senate

(Legislative day of Friday, March 19, 2010)

The Senate met at 2:01 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable MARK WARNER, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, Father of mercies, we praise You for Your goodness and kindness to us and humanity. Give strength to the Members of this body as they toil in these fields of time. Cleanse and correct their vision so that they can see the transient in the light of the everlasting. Lord, infuse them with a serenity to meet a sometimes agitated environment with unruffled kindness, thereby reflecting Your image and character. May they be more interested to know the truth about themselves than about others. Keep them ever near to You.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable MARK WARNER led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will be in a period for the transaction of morning business until 3 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

At 3 p.m., the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1586, the Federal Aviation Administration legislation. At 5:30 p.m., the Senate will proceed to a series of up to three rollcall votes in relation to the FAA bill. Senators will be notified when we know exactly how many rollcall votes will be necessary before we complete action on the bill tonight.

TRIBUTE TO STEWART UDALL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, our country has lost a friend, a patriot, and an environmental pioneer, Stewart Udall. Stewart Udall did more to preserve and protect the American landscape than probably anyone else. He died this weekend. Our thoughts are with his family and many friends.

On my last trip to New Mexico, I had the good fortune of being able to sit and talk with Stewart Udall for about an hour. It was a wonderful experience for me. I had never met him. I had served with his brother in the House of Representatives, but this was the first conversation I ever had with him. It was wonderful. He was physically a little impaired, but his mind was sharp as a tack. We talked about things that had happened or things that were happening. He was in great spirits and good humor. That is how I will always remember him.

The last surviving member of President Kennedy's original Cabinet, Stewart Udall served as Secretary of the Interior for nearly the entire 1960s. In that position for both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, the man who asked us to not spoil our natural surroundings left an indelible imprint on our land.

His legacy as Secretary of the Interior includes four national parks, six national monuments, eight national seashores, nine national recreational areas, 20 historic sites, and 50 wildlife refuges. That is hard to comprehend.

He was a versatile, talented, and very accomplished man. He served our Nation in the Army Air Corps, later to become the Air Force. He served in Europe during World War II. He was a significantly good basketball player at the University of Arizona. He was an All-Conference guard. He taught students at Yale and wrote books that have been read by millions.

He reached the summits of Mount Kilimanjaro and Japan's Mount Fuji. At 84, he was still rafting the Colorado River and hiking in the Grand Canyon.

Before he was Secretary Udall, he was Arizona's Congressman Udall. Decades later, as I indicated, I served with his famous brother, Mo Udall. Now we are all privileged, we Senators, to serve with Secretary Udall's son and his nephew, TOM and MARK. What a great legacy—two cousins now serving in the Senate. A lot of people do not know their first cousin is Gordon Smith, a former Senator from Oregon. It is an accomplished family.

As a dedicated steward of our environment, Stewart Udall's guiding principle was that our resources are not limitless. They are scarce, he reminded us, and they should be sincerely treasured, always protected, and never taken for granted. The same can be said of Stewart Udall.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the House of Representatives deserves the appreciation of the entire Nation for what it did last night. A clear majority of Congressmen and Congresswomen voted in favor of the bill that a supermajority of Senators passed on Christmas Eve a few months ago. Tomorrow the Senate will begin to put the final touches on this enormous effort.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Last night's vote took both courage and common sense. Their votes were momentous. They were historic. They were right.

After a century of working and waiting, going back to the days of Theodore Roosevelt, real reform will become the law of the land, not in a matter of years or months or weeks but in a matter of hours. In the very near future, various parts of this bill will take effect and improve the life of millions. Soon insurance companies will no longer be able to refuse to cover children with preexisting conditions. They will no longer be able to drop your coverage just because you get sick.

Small businesses that today cannot afford to cover their employees will soon get tax credits to help them right that wrong. Tens of thousands of small businesses will benefit in Nevada alone—24,000 to be exact.

Reform means that if you have a preexisting condition and no health insurance, you soon will be able to finally afford the care you need to get and stay healthy.

If you are stuck in the prescription drug doughnut hole, you will soon get a check to help pay for your medicine. That will help seniors stay healthy while we completely close that loophole, once and for all, for nearly 60,000 Nevada seniors and millions more across the country.

Also, starting this year, no insurance company will be able to impose a lifetime limit on your benefits.

Those changes are just a tip of the iceberg. They are only some of the benefits that will kick in almost immediately—some in 3 months, some in 6 months but none longer than what I am going to talk about today—just a fraction of what this bill will do over the long term for the health of our Nation, our economy, and, most importantly, our citizens.

When all is said and done, more than 600,000 Nevadans will be able to access affordable coverage. More than 300,000 Nevadans will get tax credits to help them buy health coverage from the private market. Another 300,000 seniors in the State of Nevada will get free preventive annual services, such as physicals and checkups.

Nevadans who buy insurance on their own will also save money. Because of this bill, their premiums will go down as much as 20 percent, which means Nevada families can save more than $2,000 a year.

This bill will also save our country money and lots of it. Over the next 10 years, it will slash our deficit by $143 billion; in the next 10 years, a $1.3 trillion deficit reduction.

Many Senators deserve credit for getting us this far, and many will help us cross the finish line this week.

I thank especially Chairman BAUCUS, who oversaw the financial aspect of this bill that will bring down health care costs and vastly reduce our deficit; Chairman DODD, who oversaw the parts of reform that will ensure more healthy Americans, and they did that in the HELP Committee. Not only will it allow people to stay healthy, it will allow them to stop being sick in the first place. Our friend, Ted Kennedy, must surely be proud of this work. Chairman HARKIN, who has led the HELP Committee down the home stretch, deserves our thanks for the work he has done to make college more affordable. Chairman CONRAD, who is head of the Budget Committee, will continue to guide us through the budget reconciliation process—a fiscally responsible final piece that will further reduce the deficit, ensure more Americans can afford more health insurance, and fully close the doughnut hole.

I know the other side watched the House vote last night, as we did. As they did, I hope they finally learned that a strategy of delay, myths, and fear might slow progress, but it cannot stop it. I hope this week, when we take up the final revisions of what will soon be the long overdue law, our Republican friends will finally act in the interests of their constituents and not just in the interests of the insurance industry or their political party.

The other side has made it clear they will try to stop progress based on a technicality. But without substance, they are powerless. What this budget process is all about is simply making a good law that we passed on Christmas Eve even better.

The other side is still talking about the number of pages in the bill, but we will not stop talking about the number of lives it will save.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, last night marked a turning point in our politics and in our Nation.

On a Sunday night in March, with the Nation howling in opposition, a bare majority of Democrats in the people's House ignored the people to claim a win for their party, and then they celebrated. The American people watched all this in utter disbelief.

Here is what the Democrats voted for last night: a vast expansion of the entitlement state that we cannot afford, massive cuts to Medicare, higher taxes, higher health care costs, worse care, taxpayer-funded abortions. Do not believe the spin that this was not a party-line vote. Yes, not a single Republican voted for the bill, but a whole lot of Democrats voted against it as well.

The fact is, the so-called Senate version of the health care bill that passed the House last night could not even pass the Senate today. Why is that? Because this bill is so deeply unpopular that the voters in the most liberal State in the country just elected a Republican to the Senate for the first time in nearly four decades in order to stop it.

Democrats want to pretend this did not happen. They want to pretend New Jersey and Virginia and Massachusetts simply did not happen. They want to pretend the views of the people who sent us here do not matter. They want to pretend we can afford a $2.5 trillion entitlement in the middle of a recession, when we cannot even meet the obligations we already have. They want to pretend future generations will not have to bear the burden of their actions. They want to pretend our actions today will not affect the American dream tomorrow.

They are living in a fantasy, and today that fantasy becomes even more absurd. As if the bill they voted on yesterday was not bad enough, now they want to make it even worse. That is what is going to happen in the Senate. That is what is going to happen in the Senate this week.

Democratic leaders now want us to take the bill that passed the Senate back in December and that the House voted on last night and make the tax hikes even higher and the Medicare cuts even deeper. They want us to endorse a raft of new sweetheart deals that were struck behind closed doors just last week so this thing could limp over the finish line last night.

Americans said they did not want this bill. Democrats passed it anyway. They said they did not like the deals and they did not like the giveaways. Democrats struck them anyway. Now they want to make this bill even worse. They want to add more deals on top of the other ones. Well, I have a message for our Democratic friends: Enough is enough. No more tax hikes, no more Medicare cuts, no more dealmaking, no more backroom deals.

Democrats may have won their vote last night, but they lost the argument and they have lost the trust of the American people. Americans know you don't drive down the cost of health care by spending another $2.5 trillion on health care. They know we can help people with preexisting conditions without slashing Medicare to do it. They know we can do all these things without crippling the economy or forcing taxpayers to pay for abortions. Americans see through the false choices they have been handed by the Democrats here in Washington.

Democratic leaders may have gotten their votes, they may have gotten their win, but today is a new day. Already we are seeing Democrats in the Senate distancing themselves from this effort to make a bad bill worse. So we already know that reconciliation is guaranteed to have bipartisan opposition. Democrats were hoping they could silence the voices of the American people last night, but starting today those voices are going to be heard. Senate Republicans are going to make sure those voices are heard.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in a period of morning business until 3 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally controlled and divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. BEGICH. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Senator BEGICH pertaining to the introduction of S. 3150 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

REMEMBERING STEWART UDALL

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I was talking with the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Wyoming about Stewart Udall, whom the majority leader also talked about a little earlier. He is the father of Senator TOM UDALL and the uncle of MARK, and a great, distinguished American. He lived 90 long, good years, and did so much in our country to focus on conservation and the outdoors. So we remember and celebrate his life and send from our family, and I am sure from the entire Senate, our best wishes to our colleagues TOM and MARK and to their families.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I have been in and out of public life a long time, and I have never had anything affect me in a personal way like the health care debate. I got up this morning in West Millers Cove in Blount County and drove to the Knoxville airport, and almost every single person with whom I talked on the way into the airplane had something to say to me about the health care debate. When I get on the plane, here comes another fellow right down the aisle, hands me a note, and says: Thanks for all your hard work. None of them are for the health care bill passed last night. They are all deeply concerned and deeply worried about it, and they see it as I see it. They see it as a historic mistake.

Unlike the Social Security bill, the Medicare bill, the Medicaid bill, the civil rights bills of 1957 and 1964 and 1968 and later, all those bills passed with significant bipartisan support. But the bill last night was a completely partisan act. The only thing bipartisan about it is the opposition to it. I think it is important that we continue to say why that is true.

The fundamental mistake is that the bill basically expands a health care delivery system that we all know is too expensive at a time of enormous concern about the national debt. In the middle of a great recession, we are expanding a health care delivery system that we know is too expensive; instead of focusing our attention and working together to set as a goal of reducing the cost of the health care delivery system so more Americans can afford to buy insurance. That is the basic difference of opinion.

The Democrats believe we should expand the system we have now. Of course, they make some changes, but basically it is an expansion of a system that is too expensive, and they make it more expensive. We believe what we should do, instead, is to reduce the cost of the American health care delivery system, and by doing so make it possible for more Americans to be able to afford health insurance.

Here is what the bill does now, as we see it. It imposes even larger taxes on job creators in the middle of a recession. It will mean Medicare cuts and premium increases for millions of Americans. The Medicare cuts, it is said, are alright because there is some fraud and abuse in Medicare. We agree with that. But what we are saying is that Medicare, according to its trustees, is going broke by 2010, and every penny of savings in Medicare ought to go to Medicare to help make it stronger. This bill spends almost all the money on a new entitlement, and the bill last night cuts Medicare even more deeply.

Some say: Well, it only hurts providers and hospitals. Well, those hospitals are the ones that may announce, as some are announcing, that we are not going to accept Medicare patients anymore because we are already being reimbursed so little. But it also cuts Medicare beneficiaries' benefits. The Congressional Budget Office says that fully half of those who have Medicare Advantage—and that is one out four Medicare beneficiaries in the country—will see their benefits cut. That is what this bill does.

As far as premium increases go, the President and I had a little friendly discussion about that at the health care summit. I said: For millions of Americans, individual premiums would go up. He said: No, they won't. I said: With respect, Mr. President, the Congressional Budget Office says yes, they will, by 10 to 13 percent, on the average. He said: Oh, no, oh, no, they will be getting a better policy. But that is like saying: If the government requires you to buy a better car and it is more expensive, it may be better but it is still more expensive. For a variety of reasons individual premiums are going to go up, and one is the government requirement that you buy a better policy.

Senator COLLINS, who was the insurance commissioner in Maine, has surveyed her State, and her conclusion is that 87 percent of the individual policies there will be more expensive under this bill. It is true that maybe half of those persons would get subsidies—paid for by taxpayers—but that still leaves maybe 40 percent of the individual policies in Maine where individual premiums will go up. They will go up because we are dumping more people into Medicaid—the State program for low-income Americans—and we don't reimburse physicians and hospitals adequately for those patients.

Today, one-half of doctors won't see new Medicaid patients. So what do hospitals and the doctors do when they do see a Medicaid patient? They transfer part of the cost of seeing that patient—that Medicaid patient—on to someone who has private insurance. So that forces premiums to go up.

When you have a provision in the bill, as this bill does, which says that my policy can't go up much when compared with my son's policy, well, that might keep my policy from going up so much, but my son is going to be paying a lot more. So younger Americans are going to be very surprised as the cost of their policies goes up. Then the provision in the bill with the requirement to buy policies was weakened, and because it is weak, a lot of young people especially may not join the policy. When they do not, that will leave sicker and older people within the system, and that will help drive premium costs up as well. So for all those reasons, for millions of Americans, it is accurate to say that premiums will go up.

I was at the University of Tennessee this morning—a tremendous university. Dr. Chu, the President's Energy Secretary, is visiting there today and tomorrow. I wish I could be with him to talk about the work they are doing, between the Oak Ridge National Laboratory and the university and its science program. Senator BINGAMAN has visited there before. But one of the undercurrent stories in America today is the condition of America's public higher education. State funding for public higher education has been flat for the last 10 years.

Why is that? Because Medicaid costs continue to rise. Governors can't control those budgets or control those costs, and the reason they can't is because we write the program up here and then send them about a third to 40 percent of the bill. They cannot afford it, so what do they do? They cut the amount of money that goes to the University of Virginia or the University of Tennessee or the University of New Mexico or the University of Wyoming and then what happens? Either quality goes down, fewer students are served, fewer faculty are attracted or tuition goes up, which is why the students are protesting in California about the 34-percent increase in tuition at the University of California. They probably didn't even imagine the reason for that

is the Federal Government is causing Medicaid costs to continue to rise and Governors, therefore, make cuts and tuition goes up. This bill will make that worse.

Then, on top of that, you have the last-minute takeover of the Federal student loan program. Suddenly, 19 million students—well, 15 million of those 19 million will go to the Federal Government to get their loan, beginning in July, instead of to 2,000 lenders across the country. The Government is saying we are going to save money. That may be true. But guess what the Government is going to do with its money. They are not going to say: Because the Government can borrow the money at 2.8 percent it is going to cost us less to operate the program, therefore, we are going to give students the savings. They are going to spend the savings. So they are going to borrow it at 2.8 percent and loan it to the students at 6.8 percent. That is overcharging America's students to help pay for the health care program.

These students are not Wall Street financiers. They are working people, some of them pretty grown up, in their thirties and forties, going back to Walter State Community College. They often have a job. They are not going to be very happy when they find out they are paying higher interest. The estimate that we have made in our office is it might be $1,500–$1,700 dollars over 10 years in more interest. That is the amount the Governor is going to be overcharging them to pay for other government programs, including health care.

The action that is being taken may be historic. But we believe that it is a historic mistake and that throughout the rest of this year the debate will not end about health care; but it will change. It will be larger than just health care.

As the President himself said last year, the health care debate is a proxy for a larger debate about the role of government in America's life. We believe that is a debate our country should have, and we believe the country will soundly reject a policy of more taxes, more spending, more debt, and more Washington takeover.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I heard my colleague's comments about health care. I will plan to return to the Senate floor to discuss health care in some detail in the next couple days.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico.

REMEMBERING STEWART UDALL

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about a great American who has inspired me and countless others with his leadership and commitment to public service. That great American is Stewart Udall.

At the outset, I extend my condolences to my friend and colleague, Stewart's son, TOM UDALL, and his wife Jill; his nephew, my friend and colleague, MARK UDALL, and his wife Maggie; and all the Udall family for this enormous loss. In several conversations I had with Stewart in recent years, it was clear that TOM's own exemplary public service and I'm sure MARK's as well, were a source of great pride for him.

Stewart Udall is best known for his lifetime of service in preservation of our public lands. His accomplishments as Secretary of the Interior under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson are legendary. Those accomplishments were recounted yesterday in the New York Times. It said:

> . . . he presided over the acquisition of 3.85 million acres of new holdings, including four national parks Canyonlands in Utah, Redwood in California, North Cascades in Washington, and Guadalupe Mountains in Texas—six national monuments, nine national recreation areas, twenty historic sites, fifty wildlife refuges and eight national seashores.

I ask unanimous consent that the obituary from the Times be printed in the RECORD, after my comments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[See exhibit 1.]

Mr. BINGAMAN. His commitment to and achievements in conservation and preservation are unequaled in our country. He was a moving force behind all of the landmark environmental legislation of the 1960s, including the Clean Air Act of 1963, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1965, the Wilderness Act of 1964, the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, the Endangered Species Act of 1966, the National Trails System Act of 1968, and the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968. Long after leaving public office, he was instrumental in securing the enactment of the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act of 1990 which I was proud to support.

But his commitment to our public lands was part of a larger lifetime commitment, a commitment to public service.

With all the rancor and heated rhetoric that surround us in Washington today, it is easy to lose sight of what is good about our system of government. And one of the very best things about our great country, and our system of government, is that it has attracted to public service many of the best among us to devote their lives to work for us all.

Stewart Udall was one of those people. He devoted his life to pursuing the common good the greater good and left this Nation a better place because of it.

Stewart cared deeply about the people of this great country and that caring was evident in each encounter that he had. My wife Anne has fond memories of heartfelt conversations she had with Stewart where he spoke forcefully about the challenges we face. I myself was fortunate to always hear from him words of encouragement and constructive advice whenever we would visit.

Stewart Udall set the highest standards for public service and for decency as a human being. As Ben Jonson said of Shakespeare, ''he was not of an age, but for all time.'' Stewart Udall had, as he urged his grandchildren to have, ''a love affair with the wonder and beauty of the earth.'' We are all the richer for it.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Mar. 20, 2010]

STEWART L. UDALL, 90, CONSERVATIONIST IN KENNEDY AND JOHNSON CABINETS, DIES

(By Keith Schneider)

Stewart L. Udall, an ardent conservationist and a son of the West, who as interior secretary in the 1960s presided over vast increases in national park holdings and the public domain, died Saturday at his home in Santa Fe, N.M. The last surviving member of the original Kennedy cabinet, he was 90.

Mr. Udall had been in failing health after a fall last week, according to a son, Senator Tom Udall of New Mexico.

Though he was a liberal Democrat from the increasingly conservative and Republican West, Stewart Udall said in a 2003 public television interview that he found in Washington ''a big tent on the environment.''

The result was the addition of vast tracts to the nation's land holdings and—through his strong ties with lawmakers, conservationists, writers and others—work that led to landmark statutes on air, water and land conservation.

President Obama said in a statement Saturday night that Mr. Udall ''left an indelible mark on this nation and inspired countless Americans who will continue his fight for clean air, clean water and to maintain our many natural treasures.''

Few corners of the nation escaped Mr. Udall's touch. As interior secretary in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, he presided over the acquisition of 3.85 million acres of new holdings, including 4 national parks—Canyonlands in Utah, Redwood in California, North Cascades in Washington State and Guadalupe Mountains in Texas—6 national monuments, 9 national recreation areas, 20 historic sites, 50 wildlife refuges and 8 national seashores. He also had an interest in preserving historic sites, and helped save Carnegie Hall from destruction.

''Republicans and Democrats, we all worked together,'' Mr. Udall said in a television interview with Bill Moyers. But by the time of that interview, Mr. Udall added that Washington had been overtaken by money and that people seeking public office fought for contributions from business interests that viewed environmental protection as a detriment to profit at best.

In his years in Washington, he won high regard from many quarters for his efforts to preserve the American landscape and to educate his fellow Americans on the value of natural beauty, points he made in his 1963 book ''The Quiet Crisis.'' The book, whose aim, he wrote at the time, was to ''outline the land and people story of our continent,'' sold widely.

It was Mr. Udall who suggested that John F. Kennedy invite Robert Frost to recite a poem at Mr. Kennedy's inauguration. Mr. Udall accompanied Mr. Frost to the Soviet Union in 1962, a trip meant to foster better ties with Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev.

Mr. Udall also held evenings at the Interior Department with the poet Carl Sandburg and the actor Hal Holbrook. In addition, he invited the Pulitzer Prize-winning author Wallace Stegner to be the department's writer in residence. It was Mr. Stegner's presence that prompted Mr. Udall to write ''The Quiet Crisis.''

Mr. Udall was also an early supporter of Rachel Carson, the biologist whose book ''Silent Spring'' brought attention to the environmental hazards of pesticide use.

Mr. Udall stepped onto the national stage in 1954, when he was elected to Congress from Arizona. In the hotly fought Democratic presidential primary of 1960, he urged his fellow Arizona Democrats to support Kennedy. When Kennedy won the White House, he nominated Mr. Udall as interior secretary.

After Kennedy was assassinated in 1963, Mr. Udall was kept on by Lyndon B. Johnson.

''I think probably part of that was Lady Bird,'' Mr. Udall said, referring to Mr. Johnson's wife, with whom he collaborated on beautifying the nation's capital and similar projects. ''She treasured me, and we were wonderful friends,'' he added.

Roger G. Kennedy, who was director of the National Park Service in the 1990s, said Mr. Udall ''escaped the notion that all public land was essentially a cropping opportunity—the idea that if you cannot raise timber on it or take a deer off it, it wasn't valuable.'' On the other hand, Mr. Kennedy said, Mr. Udall understood that public lands like parks enhanced the economic value of privately held land nearby.

This lesson was sometimes communicated with difficulty. For example, in the 1960s, when the Kennedy administration, with Mr. Udall in the lead, began efforts to establish the nation's first national seashores, people in regions including Cape Cod in Massachusetts, Cape Hatteras in North Carolina, and Point Reyes in California objected that taking coastal land out of private hands would ruinously inhibit economic development.

Instead, the parks have been beacons for lucrative tourism.

On this and other fronts Mr. Udall pushed with a formidable combination of political acumen and political allies—including his younger brother Morris K. Udall, who succeeded him in Congress and in 1976 ran for president in a campaign that his older brother managed. Many of the significant environmental and land-protection statutes that became law in the 1970s and '8os, including the Endangered Species Act, bore their stamp and influence.

''That was a wonderful time, and it carried through into the Nixon administration, into the Ford administration, into the Carter administration,'' Stewart Udall said. ''It lasted for 20 years. I don't remember a big fight between the Republicans and Democrats in the Nixon administration or President Gerald Ford and so on. There was a consensus that the country needed more conservation projects of the kind that we were proposing.''

Stewart Lee Udall was born on Jan. 31, 1920, in St. Johns, Ariz., a small community in Apache County in the northeast, into a family with strong ties to the Mormon Church. His mother, Louise Lee Udall, was a granddaughter of John Doyle Lee, who was executed in 1877 for his involvement in the Mountain Meadows Massacre in Utah, in which a wagon train of California-bound migrants were killed in 1857.

Mr. Udall served as a Mormon missionary in Pennsylvania and New York. During World War II, he was a gunner in the 15th Army Air Forces, serving in Europe.

He received bachelor's and law degrees from the University of Arizona. After graduating from law school in 1948, he started his own law practice in Tucson, where he and Morris later became partners.

After leaving Washington, he taught at Yale, practiced law and wrote several books, including ''The Myths of August,'' an account of the effects of uranium mining and nuclear weapons work in the Western desert.

That grew out of his representation of thousands of uranium miners, nuclear weapons industry workers and citizens exposed to radiation from atomic weapons manufacturing and testing in the West.

Though he won the first case in 1984 in Federal District Court, an appeals court overturned the ruling and the United States Supreme Court declined in 1988 to hear arguments. Mr. Udall then turned to Congress, working with lawmakers of both parties, particularly Senator Orrin Hatch, Republican of Utah, and Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts, who died in August.

In 1990, President George Bush signed the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act. The law, administered by the Justice Department, provided up to $100,000 for those sickened by radiation exposure, and issued a formal apology for harm done to those who were ''subjected to increased risk of injury and disease to serve the national security interests of the United States.''

Throughout his life he relished physical challenges. He was an all-conference guard on the University of Arizona basketball team and he climbed Mount Kilimanjaro, in East Africa, and Mount Fuji, in Japan, while heading American delegations to both regions. When he was 84, at the end of his last rafting trip on the Colorado River, Mr. Udall hiked up the steep Bright Angel Trail from the bottom of the Grand Canyon to the south rim, a 10–hour walk that he celebrated at the end with a martini.

Mr. Udall's wife, the former Irmalee Webb, died in 2001. Besides his son Tom, he is survived by his other sons, Scott, Denis and Jay, and his daughters, Lynn and Lori, as well as eight grandchildren.

At his death, Mr. Udall was a senior member of one of the nation's last and largest political dynasties—in the West it was often said there were ''oodles of Udalls'' in politics. His grandfather David King Udall served in the Arizona Territorial legislature; his father, Levi Udall, was for decades an elected judge in the Arizona Superior Court and later a justice and chief justice of the Arizona Supreme Court; Morris Udall was followed to Washington by his son Mark Udall, elected in 2008 as a senator from Colorado, the same year that Tom Udall was elected.

But Tom Udall said that in recent years his father had become greatly concerned over the state of politics in the country, worrying ''we were losing the bipartisanship in the environmental area.''

He added that Mr. Udall had recently written a letter to his grandchildren, urging them to focus on ''trying to transform our society to a clean energy and clean job society.''

RECONCILIATION

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the reconciliation legislation the Senate will be considering later this week. Similar to many of my colleagues, I first read this legislation when it was hot filed in the House last week. One of my first thoughts was, what a difference 15 months makes. This week the Senate will debate legislation that will increase health care costs for working Americans and wipe out a successful bipartisan 45-year-old student loan program without a single committee hearing or even a markup.

This bill is an attempt to fix what is perceived to be the problem with health reform legislation that the Senate passed on Christmas Eve of last year. These fixes are being considered because the American people overwhelmingly opposed that legislation. Unfortunately, this bill, the reconciliation bill, does nothing to fix the problem that prompted this opposition. Nothing in the bill we are going to be considering will prevent $½ trillion from being cut from the Medicare Program to create a brandnew entitlement program for the uninsured. If this bill is passed, millions of Medicare beneficiaries will lose the extra benefits they currently receive. In fact, this bill will actually make matters worse, cutting even more money than the provisions in the Senate bill. One out of every four Medicare beneficiaries is already enrolled in a Medicare Advantage plan, and every one of them will see their benefits reduced.

If this bill is passed, the care of Medicare beneficiaries across the country will still be put at risk because of the unsustainable payment cuts to hospitals and nursing homes. The President's own Chief Medicare Actuary said these costs could jeopardize Medicare's beneficiaries' access to care. He said, as a result of these cuts, roughly 20 percent of all hospitals and nursing homes in the country would become unprofitable which, of course, could lead them to end their participation in the Medicare Program. It is either end it or go broke.

If you can't go to a hospital or get a doctor to treat you, you do not have health care. But this bill does nothing to fix the Medicare payment cuts in the Senate health reform bill passed on Christmas Eve. This bill will still cause health insurance premiums to increase. The Congressional Budget Office said the Senate bill would increase premiums by 10 percent to 13 percent for individuals. They said that 10 percent to 13 percent increase is above what would happen if we do absolutely nothing. Yes, escalating health care costs are a problem, but this bill passed by the House last night, with these supposed fixes that are in here, will increase premiums 10 percent to 13 percent for individuals over what would have been done if nothing would have happened. It does not sound like a solution to me. There are solutions out there.

The bill also contains provisions that will increase premiums for 85 percent of Americans who already have health insurance. This bill does nothing to stop health care costs from increasing our national debt. The CBO estimates of the bill are required to ignore the issue of Medicare payments to physicians. Let's see, how many times have we ignored the Medicare payments to physicians? That is right, never. How do we fix it? We just need to come up with 300 billion more dollars. We had a chance to do that through the bill, keeping Medicare money for Medicare. But no, we took the Medicare money, and we decided to put that into new programs, new programs for the uninsured.

There are solutions out there for making sure the uninsured are covered, too, and it did not have to come out of Medicare.

The CBO estimates of the bill are required to ignore the issue of Medicare payments to physicians. The bill also does nothing to fix the scheduled Medicare payments to the other health providers. Does the majority believe the Medicare payments to doctors will be cut 21 percent later this year? Not if history keeps itself up. But let me tell you, that $132 billion that it is supposed to reduce the deficit in the first 10 years in the Senate-passed bill is ignoring the need for $300 billion to fix the doctors. If we fix the doctors, we are $170 billion in the hole. The President did not visit China and Secretary Geithner, on a separate trip, didn't visit China to go see the Great Wall. They were told to come over there by China so they could explain how we were ever going to pay for our bonds. Last month, they dropped about $38 billion in our bonds, and I noticed today we have this clamor that we want them to adjust their yuan, the value of their money compared to our money, and they said: You have to be kidding me, we own you. They didn't say it in quite those words, but that is what they meant.

In addition to assuming massive reductions in Medicare payments to doctors, the health care reform bill also relies on budget gimmicks and other unsustainable payment cuts to allow its sponsors to argue it will not increase the deficit. As Ruth Marcus wrote recently in the Washington Post, claims that the bill will reduce the deficit are ''premature at best and delusional at worst.''

Rather than creating this new entitlement, we should be using the savings from Medicare to pay to fix Medicare's problems. These payments issues are not going away, and this, or a future Congress, is going to have to pay for them or increase the debt.

We have maxed out our credit cards already. People coming in—this is the season for it—they come in and ask for increases in the programs they already have or they ask for new programs and the funding to go with that program because, of course, the Federal Government is known as the great piggy bank in Washington, and they know we just print money. They didn't know there could be a limit to how much money we print. I suggest those people kind of save their travel money and use it in their program because we are going to have to tell people that not only is the money not there to expand programs and to add new programs, we are going to actually have to cut programs. We are going to have to cut programs to stay solvent.

They are looking at changing our bond rating. That means it would be less favorable for people to buy U.S. bonds.

The reconciliation bill that will be before us this week, also raises taxes by $569 billion. If you can believe it, that is $50 billion more in new taxes than the original Senate-passed bill. So the ''fix-it'' bill we will have in front of us, will put even more pressure on small business owners and entrepreneurs who could help lead our Nation's economic recovery.

This bill also does nothing to stop the billions of dollars in new job-killing taxes created by the Senate health reform bill. Unfortunately, the policies in this bill will only make this situation worse for workers and for businesses across America. This bill increases to $52 billion the new taxes imposed on employers, which will eliminate millions of American jobs and reduce wages for millions of other American workers.

The Nation's unemployment rate is 9.7 percent. Millions of Americans have lost their job and millions more go to work every day worried about keeping the job they have. Businesses of all sizes are struggling to keep their doors open and are finding it harder and harder to make ends meet.

We have shed more than 3.5 million jobs since January of last year and the average work week is now down to 33 hours for the American worker. Yet the bill we will have before us will actually make that situation worse. The Congressional Budget Office has told us that new job-killing taxes in the Senate bill will lower wages across this country.

Rather than addressing the issue and enacting reforms that would lower health insurance costs, the majority's health care bill instead increases the taxes these businesses will have to pay, taking money away from hiring new workers.

When I am home in Wyoming, which is almost every weekend, my constituents are asking me: What does health care reform mean for me?

Unfortunately, I have to tell them when the Senate bill becomes law, their jobs and their paychecks will be in danger. I also found it ironic that on the day the President signed a so-called jobs bill, Speaker PELOSI released a reconciliation bill that contained $52 billion in job-killing taxes.

These problems are the real reasons the American people oppose the Senate health reform bill. Unfortunately, the bill that will be before us fails to address any of the fundamental problems with that bill. If the legislation we are about to debate is enacted, taxes will still be raised by $569 billion, $525 billion will still be cut from the Medicaid Program, wages will still be reduced, and jobs eliminated for millions of Americans. Health insurance premiums will still be driven up—driven up more than if we did nothing at all—and 23 million people will still be left without insurance coverage. We need to do better than that. I believe we can.

While most of the discussion this week will focus on health care, we must not forget that the reconciliation bill drastically alters decades of education and labor policy.

Specifically, I am speaking about eliminating the 45-year-old family friendly bank loans for education program, called FFEL. I put initials on when it has something to do with government. This is one that works through the banks, which has successfully helped millions of Americans realize the dream of a college education, and the shift to a Washington-run direct loan program. This radical change is happening without a single Senate hearing, or a single markup in the HELP Committee, where I serve as ranking member, or any other committee.

The administration and the majority have been promising students since the beginning of this Congress that their Pell grants would be increased dramatically so that college would be affordable. Even with this bill, this promise rings hollow. What does the transfer of $36 billion to the Pell grant program get for students? Yes, $36 billion.

First, it kicks the can down the road by only partially filling the unmet Pell obligation for this year which was promised in the so-called stimulus bill. The remainder only modestly increases the maximum Pell grant awarded by $50 a year. How much do you think tuition is going up?

The Senator from Tennessee explained that every time we add people to Medicaid, that costs the States, and the only place the States have to cut is tuition, college tuition. If college tuition is cut, the board of the college has to raise the tuition. I will have a chart out here one of these times that will show what the difference is between how fast college tuition is rising compared to health care costs, compared to the cost of living.

So we are going to kick the can down the road and only increase the maximum Pell grant by $50 a year. In exchange, students are forced into the one-size-fits all, government-run direct loan program while Congress continues to do nothing about the real problem, which is the runaway cost of college education.

Schools have had the choice of switching to the direct loan program for nearly 20 years, but most, just over 4,000 as of March 1, have chosen to remain in the family friendly bank loan program for education. Why? Because the family friendly program provides services that meet individual student needs far better than the cookie-cutter approach of a government-run direct loan program.

We have enough things the government is running, more this last year. This rushed and dramatic shift puts at risk the availability of guaranteed loans for thousands of students this fall. Under the terms of this bill, all 4,000-plus institutions of higher education, the family friendly program will be required to participate in the bureaucratic direct loan program as of July 1, 2010, a few months away, less than 4 months from today.

I do not believe these schools or the Department of Education have the time or capacity to successfully meet that deadline, and the experts at the Department seem to agree. According to a February 20, 2010, Department of Education procurement document, schools need between 4 and 6 months to successfully switch to the direct loan program.

As a result, many schools will not have in place what it takes to get needed aid to students this fall. Yes, it is true that reconciliation has been used to affect student loans in the past. However, in those instances, it was used to level the playing field between the two loan programs and provide greater access by students to loans.

This bill is nothing more than a government takeover that will turn the Department of Education into one of the largest banks in the Nation—probably not under the financial reform requirements either—and transfer billions of dollars from middle-class students and taxpayers to pay for only a modest expansion of the Pell grant program which does nothing to lower the cost of a college education.

I will propose amendments that address out-of-control education costs, that give schools time to thoughtfully switch to the direct loan program, that make transparent the actual costs of the direct loan program, that fund an authorized and proven access and completion program, and put real money toward debt reduction.

The majority will tell you what they are doing is being done at no cost to the taxpayer. Do you think America believes that? I, as the accountant in the Senate, disagree with this assertion. In the family friendly program, private lenders provide the capital necessary to fund billions of dollars to student loans each year. With the direct loan program, the Treasury will provide all the capital for these loans, which amounts to nearly $100 billion a year. Where does the money come from? It comes from increasing the public debt of the American taxpayers, many of whom do not have a college education. Shifting the financial burden from those who directly benefit from a college education raises concerns about equity, and again does nothing to address the larger problem of rapidly increasing costs for college education.

This bill also removes safeguards against fraud and abuse from the Black Lung Benefits program. The Black Lung Benefits Act provides monthly payments and the cost of medical treatment to coal miners disabled from pneumoconiosis, black lung, arising from their employment in or around the Nation's coal mines, and provides monthly payments to surviving spouses and other dependents. This bill will establish a retroactive presumption of causation and entitle individuals to lifelong benefits which will be paid for by the employers, insurers and, in cases where the employer is already out of business, by the taxpayers directly.

Taxpayers have already paid more for this program than they expected. The estimated benefits costs when it was enacted in 1975 were $3 billion. However, by 2004 the Federal Government had paid out over $42 billion. Last year, the taxpayers kicked in another $6.5 billion to refinance the program. The changes in this bill will send the program back into a debt spiral by eliminating any need to prove causation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from three prominent West Virginia doctors who also oppose the provision because it ''does not take into account the current state of diagnosis and treatment of Black Lung.''

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICES OF THE INSURANCE COMMISSIONER, STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
Charleston, WV, November 6, 2009.

JANE L. CLINE,
Commissioner, WV Offices of the Insurance Commissioner, Charleston WV.

COMMISSIONER CLINE: We are writing this letter to comment on the changes proposed in the health care reform bill regarding the Federal Black Lung benefits program. We are concerned that the proposed changes to the benefits program do not have sound medical basis and are inconsistent with the stated purpose of the bill. The bill is intended to improve access to health care for all Americans, to improve quality of care and to reduce cost by emphasizing preventive care, management of chronic diseases and utilization of the principles of evidence-based medicine.

The proposed Federal Black Lung changes would reinstate a rebuttable presumption regarding the diagnosis of Black Lung based on tenure in the mines and X-ray criteria. The proposed changes would also restore the rebuttable presumption related to death attributable to Black Lung as it affects surviving spouse benefits.

We have concerns about the proposed amendments because they do not take into consideration the current state of diagnosis and treatment of Black Lung and other diseases. It is very clear that our medical knowledge and expertise in diagnosis and treatment have expanded dramatically in the past 25 years. Our understanding of dust-related disease end other pulmonary conditions has evolved significantly. Today chronic diseases like diabetes, coronary artery disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and renal failure have become a major focus of medical attention because they claim so many lives. One in three individuals develops some type of cancer. While the rebuttable presumption could have been appropriate many years ago, our many advancements in diagnosis and treatment render it unnecessary today and into the future.

The West Virginia rules governing the medical care of workers with occupational pneumoconiosis have increasingly relied on functional parameters (like forced vital capacity, expiratory volumes and diffusion capacity) in determining the need for medical services. We still consider the exposure data and ILO B-reading a critical piece of the picture; but we view function as the issue that matters most to the affected worker. We strive to apply sound medical evidence to assure that all miners who have contracted Black Lung receive prescribed benefits and that the funds are preserved for those claimants. The inclusion of a rebuttable presumption will hinder the achievement of that goal.

In our opinion, changes in the Federal Black Lung benefits program should take into account advances in our understanding of the science and medicine of the disease, Black Lung. We are most interested in seeing strong programs to prevent disease through safety controls and education. Access to medical services is critical for those already affected. Though the diagnosis of Black Lung is statutorily defined, there is an indisputable logic to basing the diagnosis on the medical facts as we currently understand them.

We recommend consideration of significant changes in the wording of this section of the bill to make this document more than just a change in benefits programs. Ideally, it can be a medically sound and forward looking document, consistent with the issues of health care reform in general.

Thank you for considering our comments.

JAMES BECKER, MD,
Medical Director, West Virginia Offices of the Insurance Commissioner.

DOMINIC J. GAZIANO, MD,
Board Certified Pulmonologist, Chairman of the Permanent Total Disability Board, State of West Virginia.

JACK L. KINDER, MD,
Chairman of the Occupational Pneumoconiosis Board, West Virginia.

While everyone supports providing these benefits to qualified miners and their families, we should not strip out safeguards against fraud, waste and abuse in this program that were specifically added to the program by Congress with overwhelming bipartisan support.

I have said numerous times during my tenure in public service that the first role of the government is to do no harm. While I know many people are well versed on the intricacies of how these programs operate, I have studied these issues in depth for years, and have a track record of legislative success on both the health and education front, because I first listen to my colleagues and regularly work across party lines. This legislation falls short on many fronts, has not been the subject of Senate hearings, is being jammed through this institution too quickly, and should be rejected by the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business for approximately 10 minutes, not more than 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. I come to the floor to obviously comment on the events of the last couple of days in the other body. The Nation watched as the process went forward and the votes were

cast. My understanding is, according to the media reports, champagne was poured and the celebration went on inside the beltway.

Outside the beltway, in the homes and offices and all of the residences and places where people gather across the country, there is a sense of outrage, and a sense of betrayal because, for the first time in history, we have enacted a major reform on a strictly partisan basis about which the process has angered the American people as much as the product.

The deals that were made behind closed doors for individuals, the names of which we have all become familiar with—the ''Cornhusker kickback,'' the ''Louisiana purchase,'' the ''Gator aid,'' and also the purchases made of the various entities in the health care industry in America—most egregious probably is that of Pharma, but the list goes on, the AMA, the Hospital Association, it goes on and on.

Americans are disillusioned and are angry and Americans are not going to forget it. There seems to be an inside-the-beltway liberal media view that, well, it is done, the American people will forget about it; they will appreciate it; and what a magnificent victory this is. It may be in the view of some a victory for the President of the United States. What it is is a defeat of the American people, because the overwhelming majority of American people, by 2-to-1 margins, said stop and start over. They said they did not want this and they did not like this process. They do not like the behind-the-closed doors foolishness that went on, that, in many peoples' minds represented an unsavory sausage-making process.

This morning's Wall Street Journal opinion is entitled: ''Inside the Pelosi Sausage Factory'' and ''Michigan Rep. Bart Stupak Sold His Anti-abortion Soul For a Toothless Executive Order.''

> Never before has the average American been treated to such a live-action view of the sordid politics necessary to push a deeply flawed bill to completion. It was dirty deals, open threats, broken promises and disregard for democracy that pulled ObamaCare to this point, and yesterday the same machinations pushed it across the finish line.

Then this same article goes on to describe how.

> For those who needed more persuasion: California Rep. Jim Costa bragged publicly that during his meeting in the Oval Office, he'd demanded the administration increase water to his Central Valley district.

By the way, a move that I strongly favored.

> On Tuesday, Interior pushed up its announcement giving the Central Valley farmers 25 percent of water supplies, rather than the expected 5 percent allocation. Mr. Costa, who denies there was a quid pro quo, on Saturday said he'd flip to a yes.
>
> Florida Rep. Suzanne Kosmas (whose district is home to the Kennedy Space Center) admitted that in her own Thursday meeting with the president, she'd brought up the need for more NASA funding. On Friday she flipped to a yes. So watch the NASA budget.

Democrats inserted a new provision providing $100 million in extra Medicaid money for Tennessee. Retiring Tennessee Rep. BART GORDON flipped to a yes vote on Thursday.

The list goes on and on. And those are the ones we know about. Those are the ones that have been publicized. We know about Pharma. We know about the deal they got and about $100 million or so that they have spent on advertisements and paid ads touting this legislation, which will get them billions of dollars in profits, the same Pharma that changed the administration position on reimportation of drugs from Canada that is in direct contradiction of the position that then-Senator Obama had, that we should be able to reimport drugs from Canada, the same administration that supported competition amongst pharmaceutical companies for Medicare enrollees and now changed that position as well. There will be months, even years, where we will find out what went on behind closed doors, either in the majority leader's office, the Speaker's office, or the White House.

There are those who believe the attention span of the American people is rather short. I disagree. I was back in my home State of Arizona on Saturday, two townhall meetings, hundreds of people packed into the townhall meetings.

Every one of them is angry about what this will do, what this will do to companies and corporations such as Caterpillar that announced it would cost them, in only 1 year, $100 million in additional taxes.

People have figured out the gimmickry of imposing taxes and cutting benefits for 4 years before a single beneficiary receives any help, the myth that we will actually cut 21 percent from doctors' payments for treating Medicare enrollees that will take place this fall. Is there anyone who believes we are going to cut doctors' payments by 21 percent? If so, I would like to meet them and hear from them. We are not. The word is out: Don't worry. We will fix it. And they will fix it because we can't do that to physicians. But yet they use that $271 billion reduction in physicians' payments for treatment of Medicare enrollees as a way to disguise the true deficit. In fact, that alone would show that this legislation would have resulted in an increase in cost rather than a decrease.

I haven't got that much time except to say that I want to make clear that the people I represent in Arizona are not going to sit still for this. They are going to want this repealed. We will challenge this in the courts. We will challenge this in the towns. We will challenge this in the cities. We will challenge this on the farms. We will challenge this all over America. The will of the people will be heard. They do not like this process, and they do not like this product. We will prevail over time. I am confident of that.

I yield the floor.

(Disturbance in the Visitors' Galleries)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Expressions of approval or disapproval of statements on the floor are not permitted.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

TAX ON BONUSES RECEIVED FROM CERTAIN TARP RECIPIENTS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1586, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> A bill (H.R. 1586) to impose an additional tax on bonuses received from certain TARP recipients.

Pending:

> Rockefeller amendment No. 3452, in the nature of a substitute.
>
> McCain amendment No. 3527 (to amendment No. 3452), to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to develop a financing proposal for fully funding the development and implementation of technology for the Next Generation Air Transportation System.
>
> McCain amendment No. 3528 (to amendment No. 3452), to provide standards for determining whether the substantial restoration of the natural quiet and experience of the Grand Canyon National Park has been achieved and to clarify regulatory authority with respect to commercial air tours operating over the park.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 4:30 p.m. will be for debate only, with the time equally divided and controlled between the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Texas.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, this evening, there is a vote scheduled on the Ensign amendment, which would amend an archaic regulation, called the DCA perimeter rule, that has limited competition and travel options for those who fly in and out of Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport or DCA, as it is called.

More specifically, the DCA perimeter rule restricts the departure or arrival of nonstop flights to or from airports that are beyond 1,250 miles from DCA. This restriction effectively forces passengers who are coming from the Western States or going to the Western

States to use Dulles International Airport or to connect in some other city and then come on in. Obviously, this is inconvenient and discriminatory.

The rule was first codified as a Federal statute in 1985. But actually it goes back to 1962. It first had existed as a Federal rule in its various iterations since the 1960s when Dulles was first built. The original purpose of the DCA perimeter rule was to establish Dulles as the long-haul airport serving the Washington area, and that has worked.

In 1962, Dulles only served about 52,000 passengers. But today Dulles is thriving. In 2009, the airport served approximately 23 million passengers. According to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority:

> Dulles has emerged as one of the fastest growing airports in the world and a major East Coat gateway for domestic and international travelers as well as cargo activities.

Given the success of Dulles and the improvement in technology, including quieter jet engines, over the years, Congress has granted a limited number of exemptions to the DCA perimeter rule because the traveling public is eager for air travel options. Yet, today, there are only a dozen nonstop flights between Ronald Reagan National Airport and the entire Western United States. There are four to Denver, three to Phoenix, two to Seattle, one to Las Vegas, one to Los Angeles, and one to Salt Lake City. That is it.

To put that number in perspective, that is 12 flights beyond the perimeter at DCA out of approximately 400 flights daily. The beyond-the-perimeter flights represent 3 percent of all daily domestic operations at DCA. Just 3 percent of all flights out of DCA serve our Nation's largest cities such as Phoenix, Los Angeles, Las Vegas, and San Antonio.

A 1999 study by the Transportation Research Board found that perimeter rules ''no longer serve their original purpose and have produced too many adverse side effects, including barriers to competition.'' The study found, further, that such rules ''arbitrarily prevent some airlines from extending their networks to these airports'' and that ''they discourage competition among the airports in the region and among the airlines that use these airports.''

There is also recent legislative precedent that supports the argument that the DCA perimeter rule should be repealed. The Wright Amendment of 1979 was a Federal law restricting flights at Dallas's Love Field Airport. It originally limited most nonstop flights from Love Field to destinations within Texas and neighboring States. In 2006, Congress passed the Wright Amendment Reform Act, which issued a full repeal of the Love Field perimeter rule with certain conditions. Lifting the restrictions at Love Field gave the traveling public more flight options. It also cut prices and made traveling more efficient.

The Ensign amendment would amend the DCA perimeter rule by allowing any carrier which currently holds slots at DCA to convert those flights—flights now serving large hub airports inside the perimeter—to flights serving any airport outside the perimeter. This is referred to as ''the slot conversion provision;'' in other words, no more flights simply converting a flight that exists to go to a different city. The Ensign amendment would cap the number of flights that could be converted to 15 roundtrip flights per carrier.

The slot conversion provision ensures that service to small and medium hub airports within the perimeter would not be affected. There is no restriction, however, on converting a flight that currently serves a large hub airport within the perimeter to a small or medium hub airport beyond the perimeter. So presumably the Ensign amendment could expand service to small and medium hub airports beyond the perimeter. Indeed, I know some of the airlines do intend to use some of these conversion slots to go to their hubs outside the perimeter.

It is also important to note that the amendment would not alter the slot regulations at DCA or increase the number of allowable flight operations at the airport. The number of flights currently serving DCA would remain the same. Residents around the airport would not hear an increase in noise from takeoffs or landings and would not see larger planes operating at DCA. The only change is that a few of the planes would have a different destination.

Let me speak to how this amendment would or would not affect Dulles. As I mentioned, the conversion provision is capped at 15 roundtrip flights per carrier. It is expected that only 5 carriers could take advantage of this provision, making the total maximum number of new flights that could go beyond the perimeter to 75. But not all of the 5 airlines will make full use of all 15 slots. It is estimated that the 5 eligible airlines would only convert to perhaps 30 flights.

So how could flights, say, 30, at DCA that go beyond the perimeter affect Dulles? Well, according to the latest figures from the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, Dulles has 401 daily flights. So 30 additional beyond the perimeter would have a negligible effect on the operations at or demand for service at Dulles.

According to a recent GAO study:

> GAO did not find evidence in passengers or fare data that would indicate that the new service between Reagan National and the six beyond perimeter cities——

The current 12 exemptions that exist——

> had substantially affected service from Dulles or Baltimore-Washington International airports to these cities.

There is no reason to believe that 30 additional beyond the perimeter flights would be any more consequential to Dulles Airport.

The bottom line is, the Ensign amendment is not about changing the character of Dulles International Airport as to the long-haul airport for the region or increasing the amount of flights at DCA. It simply would allow a limited number of direct flights out of DCA to reach the Western States so that passengers have more choice. It would also allow more tourists and business travelers from around the country another option for visiting the Nation's capital and its surrounding States, such as the State of Virginia.

My colleagues realize a lot has changed in 50 years, and they realize the need that has previously existed to protect Dulles Airport has lessened due to its own success. Thanks to a recognition of this fact, and some assurances that have been made by Senators DORGAN and the Acting President pro tempore, the Senator from Virginia, a vote on the Ensign amendment may not be needed tonight. Instead, it is my understanding that Senator DORGAN and other conferees will make a good-faith effort to modify the DCA perimeter rule when the FAA reauthorization bill is conferenced with the House. I know my friend from North Dakota intends to pursue this matter in conference, and I appreciate what he has said on this matter.

I also very much appreciate the spirit by which the Acting President pro tempore has approached this issue. As his predecessors have done, he has very much acted out of concern both for the traveling public and also the airports in his State of Virginia, and I would expect him to do nothing less. But I appreciate the open mind he has in trying to deal with an issue that we out West have that, hopefully, could be worked out in such a way that it would be a win-win and recognize the fact that times have changed since the early 1960s.

Mr. President, unless the Senator from West Virginia has anything, I will suggest the absence of a quorum, and I do.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IN PRAISE OF MARY KLUTTS, DONNA SCHEEDER, AND RONALD O'ROURKE

Mr. KAUFMAN. Mr. President, I rise to share the stories, once again, of some of our Nation's great Federal employees.

All throughout March, libraries across America have been celebrating

National Reading Month. Children from coast to coast have been learning about the importance of books, and schools have been promoting literacy as a tool for academic advancement.

This month-long celebration of reading—from Dr. Seuss's classic ''The Cat in the Hat'' to Joyce's ''Ulysses''—reminds us not only of the joy found in the written word but also of the critical role libraries play in all our communities.

Libraries have long been a staple of American life, dating back even to our early colonial days. In the decades before the Revolution, America's first libraries enabled the dissemination of the very ideas that inspired our founding patriots. In the eighteenth century, the athenaeums of New England and the shareholder libraries of Benjamin Franklin served as precursors to our robust, modern network of free public libraries.

In 1800, our predecessors in the Sixth Congress established a research library to help those in government carry out their work with access to scholarly volumes on every subject. Today, the Library of Congress is the largest library in the world, and its ornate reading room remains an awe-inspiring cathedral of learning.

I have chosen today to honor three public servants who work at the Library of Congress.

Mary Klutts began her Federal career as a U.S. Marine. In 1990, she came to the Library of Congress as a budget analyst, and in her 20 years there she has become an expert in every aspect of the Library's operating budget.

Since 2007, when Mary was named budget officer, she has set out to transform the way the Library's budget proposals and funding justifications are formulated. Her work has helped make the Library's budget and operations more transparent, and its funding proposals are more concise. Now Library of Congress budget proposals are often cited as the model for the legislative branch. As a result of Mary's efforts, the Library received strong support from Congress in appropriations for the last two fiscal years.

During this time of economic challenges, Mary has helped demonstrate where every dollar of taxpayer money for the Library goes and why.

Another outstanding Library of Congress employee is Donna Scheeder, who has worked there for over 40 years. Having worked in a number of roles throughout her career at the Library, Donna was an early champion of integrating computers into libraries, and she introduced the idea of electronic briefing books for Congress.

She is recognized as a leader in the information management field, and she has guest-lectured around the world on the topic of legislative library management. Donna is also a former president of the Special Libraries Association.

Until recently, Donna was serving as the Acting Law Librarian of Congress, and she was awarded the Federal Librarians Achievement Award in 2009.

An active member of the Washington, DC, community, she serves as Chair of the Eastern Market Community Advisory Committee and on the Board of the Old Naval Hospital Foundation. When not spearheading innovative initiatives at the Library, Donna spends time relaxing at her home on the Delaware shore.

One of the branches of the Library of Congress most familiar to those of us who serve in this chamber is the Congressional Research Service, or CRS. This nonpartisan office houses scholars who prepare reports on every policy issue and the effects of proposed and enacted legislation. They are our ''go-to guys'' for information on every topic, and they are truly great at their jobs.

The third person I am honoring today has been an analyst with the CRS since 1984.

When Ronald O'Rourke joined the CRS as a naval analyst, he arrived with an impressive background as a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the Johns Hopkins University. He was also valedictorian of his class at the Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, where he obtained his master's degree.

At CRS, Ronald quickly distinguished himself as a leading expert on naval strategic and budgetary issues, and he frequently briefs members of Congress and their staffs on defense programs and appropriations. He has even been called to testify as an expert at congressional hearings.

Though he already had a busy schedule as a specialist in naval affairs, he stepped in when the CRS's expert in military aviation passed away suddenly last year. Ronald took responsibility for that portfolio in addition to his own, and his reports on high-profile aviation programs proved invaluable during the congressional debates on defense spending in the 2010 budget.

Mary Klutts, Donna Scheeder, and Ronald O'Rourke continue their work in public service at the Library of Congress to this day. They are just three of the many talented and dedicated men and women whose work benefits not only those of us in Congress but also the tens of millions who access resources from community libraries throughout our Nation.

I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing the important contribution made by the employees of the Library of Congress.

They are all truly Great Federal Employees.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3528

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the McCain amendment No. 3528. I understand we are scheduled to consider that amendment in a series of votes beginning at 5:30 p.m. The amendment deals with commercial air tours over Grand Canyon National Park. I wish to take a few minutes to explain the reasons for my opposition.

The Grand Canyon, of course, is one of the crown jewels of the National Park System. It is one of the earliest areas that was set aside for conservation purposes—originally in 1893 as a forest reserve; later designated as a national monument by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1908; and in 1919, it was designated by Congress as a national park. The Colorado River winds its way over 275 miles through the park, forming one of the most spectacular series of canyons anywhere in the world.

The park is one of the most heavily visited sites in our country, with just under 4.4 million visitors last year. Visitors come not only to see the awe-inspiring views or to float down the Colorado River but also to experience the quiet and the solitude that much of the park offers.

In recent years, however, experiencing the natural quiet has become more difficult as noise associated with aircraft flights over the park has resulted in increased noise on the ground in the park.

Recognizing this fact, in 1987 Congress enacted the National Parks Overflight Act. This law included a finding that ''noise associated with aircraft overflights at Grand Canyon National Park is causing a significant adverse effect on the natural quiet and experience of the park . . .'' The 1987 Park Overflight Act directed the Secretary of the Interior to submit to the Federal Aviation Administration ''recommendations regarding actions necessary for the protection of resources in the Grand Canyon from adverse impacts associated with aircraft overflights.''

It also went on to say:

> . . . and shall provide for substantial restoration of the natural quiet and experience of the park and protection of the public health and safety from adverse effects associated with aircraft overflight.

Importantly, the act also directed the FAA to implement the Secretary's recommendations unless the FAA Administrator determined doing so would adversely affect aviation safety.

In response to the 1987 law, the National Park Service developed recommendations which were implemented by the FAA and which remained in place for several years. However, by 1996, both the Park Service and the FAA concluded that the policies in place were not achieving the goal of restoring the natural quiet in the Grand Canyon. In addition, the projected increase in commercial air tours over the park would result in even more noise at the park.

Since then, the agencies attempted to finalize new rules to improve noise

conditions in the park, but those rules were challenged in court, both by air tour operators who thought the rules were too restrictive and by environmental groups who thought the rules did not go far enough to limit aircraft noise. The challenges went to the court of appeals on two separate occasions. This is in the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals.

Following clarification of the law from the court in its most recent decision in 2002, the agencies refined key definitions and have worked with affected stakeholders to be able to finally implement a rule that will achieve the congressional directive to restore the natural quiet in the Grand Canyon. I am told that currently the National Park Service and the FAA expect to have the draft environmental impact statement for the proposed rule ready this summer and the final environmental impact statement completed and a record of decision implemented sometime next year.

That is a lot of history. It has been 23 years since the National Parks Overflight Act was enacted. I appreciate the frustration all parties have with the fact that a final rule is still not in place that meets the goals and requirements of the 1987 law. However, as evidenced by the history of the process I have described, the delays are not the result of inaction or of inattention to the law; rather, they are the result of the difficulty establishing accurate models for acceptable noise standards, as well as the multiple legal challenges that have occurred.

I have several concerns with the amendment Senator MCCAIN has proposed. My principal objection is, however, that I do not believe it makes sense to legislatively enact new standards when the National Park Service is close to putting out its new recommendations, especially since it has taken so long to get to this point. I believe the better action would be for us to wait and see what the agencies actually propose. Then, if there is disagreement with the new proposed rule, we can enact legislation to correct it.

Besides the fact that I believe the timing of the amendment is premature, I also have concerns about many of the specific provisions the amendment would legislate. Some of these get somewhat detailed.

Let me indicate that there is a concern I have with the definition in this legislation for ''substantial restoration of the natural quiet.'' What does that mean? The legislation would establish a certain definition of that which is significantly different from what has been assumed and worked with for a long time by a great many people.

The amendment also prohibits the National Park Service from considering aircraft sound from sources other than commercial tour operators, which will significantly limit the ability to control aircraft noise over the park.

The amendment prohibits the allocation for commercial air tours over the Grand Canyon from being reduced, notwithstanding any other provision of law, regardless of the noise effects over the park. It goes even further and directs that the FAA begin a rulemaking to increase the flight allocations over the park.

Because the proposal has not been through a standard committee process—as, to my knowledge, there have not been hearings on this proposal—and input from affected agencies and stakeholders have not been solicited, the potential impact of several other provisions in the amendment remain unclear, at least to this Senator. For all these reasons, I believe we should not proceed with this amendment, and I would urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Let me mention also a very good editorial on this issue that appeared in the Arizona Republic yesterday. It is entitled ''Congress Should Not Foil Process,'' and its first couple of sentences say:

> The plan to reduce aircraft noise at the Grand Canyon is finally wrapping up. Suddenly, there's an attempt in Congress to make a last-minute end-run around the process. This makes no sense. The draft environmental document is weeks away from being released. Multiple stakeholders have weighed in. After years of work, we are on the verge of a plan to restore natural quiet to one of the most majestic places on Earth.

Then it goes on to discuss, in very substantial detail, what the amendment of Senator MCCAIN would try to do. It ends by saying:

> Congress should hold off. A plan to restore quiet at the Grand Canyon is so close to completion. Let the process go forward.

That sums up my sentiments exactly. I hope we will heed the good advice contained in the editorial, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article from the Arizona Republic.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arizona Republic, Mar. 21, 2010]

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT FOIL PROCESS

The plan to reduce aircraft noise at the Grand Canyon is finally wrapping up. Suddenly, there's an attempt in Congress to make a last-minute endrun around the process. This makes no sense. The draft environmental document is weeks away from being released. Multiple stakeholders have weighed in. After years of work, we're on the verge of a plan to restore natural quiet to one of the most majestic places on Earth.

But last week, Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., introduced legislation that would unilaterally set out rules for air-tour operations at the Grand Canyon.

The measure, an amendment to another bill, was co-sponsored by his fellow Arizona Republican, Jon Kyl, and Nevada's senators, Democrat Harry Reid and Republican John Ensign.

McCain has been a longtime champion of park tranquillity. He helped pass the National Park Overflights Act in 1987, which directed the Federal Aviation Administration and the National Park Service to reduce noise from low-flying aircraft at the Grand Canyon.

Since then, the process of adopting a noise-management plan often seemed to move at the same geological pace as the forces shaping the Canyon. As 23 years rolled by, McCain repeatedly expressed impatience. And we agreed.

But now is not the time for Congress to step in. The draft environmental-impact statement, which will identify a preferred noise-reduction strategy, is expected to be out by the beginning of May. It will address such issues as the number of flights, requirements for quieter aircraft and hours of operation.

The public will have a chance to comment before a final choice is made. The Federal Aviation Administration will then adopt rules, which should be in place by early 2011.

We must achieve a delicate balancing act at the Grand Canyon: giving visitors access, including by air, while preserving as much of its wild solitude as possible.

Many groups and individuals from all sides have contributed countless hours to the process, hunting for the best balance.

The amendment would ignore their efforts and set into law such issues as operating hours, air-corridor routes and flight allocations.

It would prohibit reducing the number of flights currently allowed. It would exclude any consideration of noise from regular commercial air traffic. It would decree that natural quiet is restored if for at least 75 percent of the day, 50 percent of the park is free of sound from authorized air tours.

Years of work on the environmental review may indicate that different rules or more flexibility are in order. But if the amendment passes, anything that doesn't conform to it will go into the waste basket.

In his floor statement in the Senate, McCain said the amendment reduces excessive aircraft noise ''without waiting another 23 years for progress.''

But we don't have years to wait anymore. We'll see a noise-management proposal within weeks.

Why the rush? Are air-tour operators—with a heavy presence in Las Vegas—pushing to get rules to their liking in place, trumping whatever is in the environmental-impact statement?

Congress should hold off. A plan to restore quiet at the Grand Canyon is so close to completion. Let the process go forward.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAUFMAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, as we approach a final vote on the FAA reauthorization, which we are doing slowly—that will take place at about 5:30—I wish to talk briefly about why I think this is so important. I see my distinguished colleague from Texas is here, whom I am going to praise so much in my final comments, but she will have to wait for that. I wish to discuss why we have spent so much precious time in the middle of a national debate on health care and jobs and the economy to work on this bill, which we have been doing now for several years. As I have often pointed out, it was sort of pushed forward 11 times without a final resolve. We want a final resolve

this evening, and we believe we are going to get one.

We are here today because FAA reauthorization is about so much more than aviation. It has everything to do with safety for our people, it is about jobs, it is about our economy, it is about, frankly, our self-esteem as a nation in the world of aviation. Fifty percent of all the flights that take place in the world are American planes, but we are behind, in some ways, and we shouldn't be. The Congress has allowed us to be behind because we haven't been able to put attention on this because time is hard to get on the floor. So I appreciate Leader REID's willingness to give us this time, even as these momentous matters are going on.

To me, this is all about improving commercial aviation air service to small and rural counties, communities. You would expect that from me. I represent my State. But as chairman of the committee, I represent the country, too, as does my distinguished ranking member. It is also very much about establishing better consumer rights protections for the people who fly, whom we call passengers and whom we also call consumers. But ultimately it is about improving safety and about modernizing our system, which I have taken very seriously for years and about which we have done precious little. In other words, it is about people's lives every day.

I can remember years ago I could say a relatively few percentage of the folks from my State flew. They just didn't fly. I mean a lot did but most didn't. That has changed now. You can't do business in West Virginia, and West Virginians can't do anything without getting on an airplane, if you can find one to get on and if you cram yourself into one—which would be a problem for the Presiding Officer as well as the present speaker. In other words, our utmost priority always has to be safety in the skies and for the passengers and their families. They have to trust us to get this right.

There is a lot that goes wrong. There is a lot that isn't noticed that goes wrong, but we do notice and we haven't corrected it and we have a moral obligation to correct it. So let me say a word about safety.

Statistically, as everybody says, we have the safest air transportation system in the world. I always bridal a little bit when I hear that. It is true. Our airlines talk about it, politicians talk about it. But it is so much less safe than it could easily be if we were to be a bit more farsighted and energetic. We have done that in the Commerce Committee, and we have put forward a bill which does that and creates a much more wholesome story and I will get into that.

It has been a little more than a year since the tragic crash in Buffalo, NY, of flight 3407 that took the lives of 50 people. It is clear we need to take serious steps to improve pilot training, to address flight crew fatigue, which seems to be an esoteric subject until you look at it. Senator BYRON DORGAN, who is the chairman of our subcommittee, had some charts which brilliantly showed what pilots in some of these commuter airlines have to go through to get to work and sometimes then go two nights with no sleep before they fly. Well, it doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out that is dangerous. And then you have chatter in the cockpits. We have even had one instance of an 8- or 11-year-old kid helping to land a plane. I mean it is ridiculous. It is pathetic. It exists. We are trying to get rid of all that.

Our bill does a lot to address these problems. We need to have resources for all our airports, both large and small. This legislation is about equality among airports and economic stability among airports. We have to provide adequate resources to airports, both large and small, both urban and rural. When people think of California, they think of San Francisco and Los Angeles, but they don't think of the dozens of places in between and above and below that are rural or the inner part of California, where people need air transportation but have a hard time.

The continuing economic crisis has hit the U.S. airline industry very hard. That is easy to say, but it has been devastating for our legacy airlines. They have been in and out of bankruptcy, mergers have taken place, and they are always on the edge. I remember at one point they were showing how they were going to move the seats about an inch closer to each other and there was an uproar. So the pillows disappeared and the pretzels and the potato chips disappeared and we have come to understand that. They are not doing that because they want to treat us badly. They are doing that because every penny is desperate for them, and they have overwhelming problems with the recession. Even before the recession, they were having overwhelming problems.

That is the whole question with the deregulation of airlines. A lot of things happened, not all of them good. I can remember—and I hope my ranking member will indulge me—when I went to West Virginia in 1964, and I drove there, actually, but there were Eastern Airlines jets, there were United Airlines jets, there were American Airlines jets, and all the big jets at that time. Within 3 weeks of deregulation, they were all gone. Now I take my 6 feet 6½ inches and pray I get an exit row. I am a master at working the exit system, should that ever be necessary, but I have to have that exit row, which is always No. 7, or else I am in big trouble.

The continuing economic crisis has hit the U.S. airline industry extremely hard and this affects the future of hundreds of our communities and particularly rural communities because the rural communities are always at the end of the food chain. When you are at the end of the food chain, it is akin to being at the end of the line. You are the one who is cut out. No more seats in the house, you are cut out, cut off. I have witnessed that a lot in West Virginia and it hurts. It hurts. I have seen, time and time again, how important a lifeline it is for local communities, and therefore it continues to hurt.

The Federal Government needs to provide additional resources and tools for small communities to attract adequate airline service. That is possible. It is not just a matter of the Federal Government supplying a certain amount of money or the essential air service, it is a matter of the local airports taking themselves very seriously as a product. We discovered that in West Virginia. Others have discovered it, perhaps before us or after us, but it makes no difference, you have to market yourself. An airport is not just a place where planes land, it is a consumer product and it has to be marketed.

It used to be that lots of our people drove to Cincinnati and took Southwest, and there was nothing we could do about it. Of course, there was something we could do about it, and that was to market our airport in Charleston, WV, and we did that. They marketed on the air, in the newspapers, and they marketed it in every way possible. Gradually, the people who had been going to Cincinnati stopped going to Cincinnati because they discovered they didn't have to spend the money on gasoline and the overnight motel rooms. They could simply go to Charleston, to Yeager Airport, and get to Huntington or Parkersburg or wherever it was.

So it is a tough fight for local communities. It is easy if you are in a big city. It is hard if you are in a small State, and the Presiding Officer is familiar with that. So our legislation accomplishes this business of new resources by building on the existing programs and strengthening them.

There are some very good programs. I will not go into all of them now, but there are some very good programs. The Airport Improvement Program was started a number of years ago. It is absolutely superb at what it does. It allows airports to expand, to build parking garages, to expand runways, and build those sort of off-ramp safety places, as they do for trucks, so that when they are speeding too much and suddenly there is something which shoots up the hill. Airports have something called EMASS, which is the same thing. At the end of a runway, if the plane lands on a short runway—because most of our airports are on the tops of hills—and they overshoot a little bit, they can end up in an EMASS and they are safe. It is soft concrete blocks. We had 34 lives saved in the last month and a half because of that EMASS system which happened to be there, and that has to be utilized all over the country.

Consumer rights. This bill also strengthens passenger protections by

incorporating elements of the Passenger Bill of Rights to deal with the most egregious flight delays and cancellations. We are rather specific about that. You never know exactly how things work out, but we have set some rules. We have said nobody can wait more than 3 hours without food, without medical attention, without bathroom facilities. They have to take the passengers back, get them to unload so you don't have these 9-hour, 8-hour, 7-hour waits that always become national stories whenever they happen. That is not a question of being practical, it is a question of being humane. It makes sense. It takes away people's anger, and it makes them more likely to want to fly.

Passengers, frankly, have really had it with endless delays—they really have had it. They do not like the way they are being treated, especially when they are stuck on a tarmac in the summertime. People feel bad sometimes when they are just in an airplane—the white-knuckle syndrome even if they are not flying, just being in an airplane. The air is not always so good. People can come close to a point of panic. You don't want that. We deal with that in this legislation. We do have a responsibility to bring their rights back into the equation and take them seriously.

Modernization. Our system is outdated. It is strained beyond its capacity. I feel very passionate about this one and I have for years. America's air traffic control system is literally using a World War II technology. We are the only ones in the industrialized world who do that. It is embarrassing beyond belief, it is costly beyond belief, it is climate-unfriendly beyond belief, and it is dangerous beyond belief because everything is based on radar. It is ancient, World War II. We have not changed. Everybody else has. Mongolia has done it. We have not.

On the committee, we decided we were going to get into it in a very big way. The Next Generation Air Transportation System, called NextGen—that is what we call it—will save our economy billions by creating additional capacity and more direct routes, allowing aircraft to move more efficiently. Why? Because it will be GPS, it will be digitalized, and it will be real-time streaming of where airplanes are. It will help the ground controllers. They will have to put equipage in the airlines themselves so the pilots and the ground-control people will know exactly where they are at all times. That means maybe they will be able to bring planes closer together and can land more often or fly a little closer together—things that cause the whole system to purge itself of inefficiencies, but not unsafely but safely because you are using a digitalized system which the rest of the world is already using.

It has the further advantage, which I have indicated, of reducing carbon emissions and noise emissions. Noise emissions are very important. The noise emissions can be overestimated by some; nevertheless, if people feel strongly about it, they feel strongly about it, and people do feel strongly about it. You see that in our local area here. So we want to be helpful on that.

A modern air traffic control system will provide pilots and their air traffic controllers with a better situational awareness—I have said that, but it is so important—giving them the tools to see other aircraft, both at the same time, both streaming information real time. Also, the weather maps, so they have precise knowledge—not just visual knowledge of where there might be a thunderstorm but precise knowledge.

This kind of modernization requires sustained focus and substantial resources. We have worked that out in our bill, and we will have a nationwide system by, I believe it is, 2025. It seems like a long way off, but considering where we are starting—we only have one in place, in the gulf, which is working. We have to do the whole system. It costs money, both by the Federal Government and by airlines—which are not going to love that, but it is part of the deal. This authorization takes steps to make sure we begin all of this now.

In closing, we have to move boldly. This is a huge subject. It is a huge part of our economy. I guess 700 million people fly today, each year. In the next 10 years, it will go over 1 billion, maybe 1.2 billion people in the air over the course of a year. At any given moment, there are 36,000 planes in the skies. How do you keep track of them all? How can you be sure that they are safe, that they are not going? How do you shut off the chatter business where pilots are just talking to each other about things. How far do you go on that without invading privacy rights? On the other hand, if you don't go far enough, you are invading consumer and passenger safety, and I lean in that direction.

Last week, I spoke a little on the floor about the main four goals we set out to achieve with this bill. No. 1 is to address critical safety concerns. No. 2 is to establish a roadmap to implement NextGen, that is, the modern system, so we can catch up with Mongolia and accelerate the FAA's key modernization programs. No. 3 is to invest in airport infrastructure. It is so important. If you look at what is happening at Dulles Airport—that is sort of an extreme example because that is preparing for the 23rd century, not for the 21st or 22nd. But they have it right, they have all the land out there, they have bonding authority, and they can do what they want. They have a good board. It works very well for them. It needs to work for other airports, also, in small communities as well. No. 4 is to continue improving small communities' access to the nation's aviation system. You know I will never deviate from that, coming from the State of West Virginia.

Frankly, I am proud of how far we have come and prouder still that we got here in a truly bipartisan fashion. It is refreshing. It was quite wonderful, working with Senators—obviously Senator HUTCHISON being the key; Senator DORGAN, a terrific chairman of the aviation subcommittee, absolutely terrific; also, Senator DEMINT—toward a vibrant, strong aviation system so fundamental to our country.

I urge my colleagues to give the FAA the tools, the resources, the direction, and the deadlines to make sure the agency can provide effective oversight of the aviation industry. This is a big-ticket item that appears not so dramatic as events of the recent days, but over the course of our country, it is extraordinarily dramatic.

I will at the proper time urge my colleagues to support reauthorization. As I say, we have put this off now 11 different times. This will last for 2 years after conference—it may be 3 years. I would take more than that, myself. But we cannot afford to wait any longer.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3528, WITHDRAWN

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 3528 be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, let me say that I know Senator ROCKEFELLER and I will have a little time toward the vote to do a summation of the bill. But while we are at this stage, I do wish to say that I think we have taken a major step forward in FAA reauthorization. As many who have worked on this project know, we have had 11 extensions of FAA reauthorization since 2007—short-term extensions because we have not been able to get the agreements that are necessary to propel this bill from the floor.

There are some very important provisions of this bill that I hope we will eventually have final passage and that we can all support. However, we are not there yet. We are at the stage of getting it from the Senate floor, but there are still some issues that will have to be resolved even before we go to conference.

I think before we appoint conferees there will have to be some agreements that have not yet been clearly reached. One of those is the perimeter rule. I am going to talk a little bit more about that when my colleague, Senator ENSIGN, comes because his amendment is the pending amendment on that on the bill. But besides the perimeter rule, there are issues that are addressed in this bill that are so important, that

will take us a major step forward for the traveling public in our country.

There are safety provisions in this bill addressing issues throughout all sectors of the aviation community. I think they are major improvements in our airline safety, although we know we have the safest system we have ever had. There are very few accidents. But I do think the accidents we have had are still teaching us what can be done in the area of fatigue of pilots and human factors, which has always been the hardest part of the aviation system to address. We do have some standards and a way forward that I think will improve aviation safety because none of us wants to have anything less than 100 percent aviation safety. That is what we are striving for.

The bill will also modernize our air traffic control system. Our air traffic control system is using technology that is probably based back in the 1960s. It is time for us to have a satellite-based system. This is going to be expensive. Having the startup of this NextGen system is essential for our country to stay in the forefront of efficient use of our air traffic control system, and also eventually, hopefully, when it is all in place, we will also be able to open more airspace so we can better utilize our air traffic control system.

The bill will provide infrastructure funds for our airports. That is one of the reasons we need to get this bill from the floor and assure our airports that the airport trust fund money is available, it is stable, and they can count on the funds flowing from the airport trust fund in an orderly way so that the improvements to our airports can be done.

The bill will improve rural access to aviation through the Essential Air Service Program. This is a very important part of our whole system. Not only do we have a great general aviation community, which does so much for capabilities for volunteers and recreational pilots to use our airspace, but also the business aviation—the smaller aviation facilities that are private but also very important. And then, of course, our regional airlines are a very important part of our overall air service, and we will have improvements in those sectors.

The bill will improve passenger and consumer protections. There is no doubt that the Passenger Bill of Rights is long overdue, and I think we have come to a good place to protect passengers from sitting on the tarmac for 5 hours without the ability to get off an airplane. Issues such as that that have cropped up are being addressed in our new Passenger Bill of Rights. It will strengthen aeronautics and aviation research as well.

There is a lot that is good in this bill, and we still have a long way to go to finish it, but I do look forward to working through tonight, getting the bill passed from the Senate, and then working on these issues that are not yet completely agreed to before we go to conference. Then, from there, I hope we can take the next step, which is not going to be an easy one, and that is resolving the differences between the House and Senate bills. The differences are pretty big, so I think we are going to have our jobs cut out for us. It means we are not anywhere close to being finished yet, but we are certainly in a better place than we have ever been since 2007 when FAA reauthorization, the previous bill, lapsed, and we have been doing short-term extensions since then.

I look forward to more after wrap-up and more of a discussion of the perimeter rule as soon as Senator ENSIGN arrives.

I yield the floor.

BOISE TERMINAL RADAR APPROACH CONTROL

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Commerce Committee have created an Air Traffic Control Modernization Board and tasked it with reviewing and evaluating the Federal Aviation Administration facility and service realignment proposals.

The Idaho delegation has been raising serious concerns with the FAA's proposed transfer of the Boise Terminal Radar Approach Control, TRACON, for several years. Despite the years of requests for transparency and detailed cost and safety data, the agency has failed to clearly demonstrate that the radar transfer would result in improved air traffic control services for Boise air traffic users. In fact, the evidence that the Idaho delegation has seen continues to indicate that services would be diminished and efficiency and operational costs could also be impacted.

The Idaho delegation requested the Department of Transportation's Office of the Inspector General to initiate a study of the costs associated with this radar transfer. In addition we have asked the Air Traffic Safety Oversight Service, AOV, to determine whether FAA safety risk management procedures have been followed in the proposed move.

The Idaho delegation remains unconvinced that physically relocating the radar would be cost effective and question the assumptions that have driven the FAA's proposal. Because these concerns have not been adequately addressed, we believe the consolidation should be halted until the new Air Traffic Control Modernization Oversight Board completes its recommendations for realignment.

As I read the new section 308 language, the bill will halt the consolidation of the Boise TRACON into the Salt Lake City TRACON until after the board completes its recommendations for realignment even though the FAA has sent an article 46 notification to move the Boise TRACON to Salt Lake City. At this point, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, NATCA, that agrees with this position.

The letter follows.

NATIONAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS ASSOCIATION, AFL–CIO,
Washington, DC, March 18. 2010.

DEAR SENATORS CRAPO AND RISCH: We write today to thank you for your continued leadership in the U.S. Senate on behalf of the air traffic controllers in Idaho.

As you know, the National Air Traffic Controllers Association has a strong track record of support of consolidations that do not compromise safety. Unfortunately, the FAA has failed to collaborate with the controller workforce during its most recent round of facility and service realignments, including the agency's intentions to remove local radar services from Boise. Your support for the controllers in Idaho during this dispute has been critical and has not gone unnoticed.

The language in Section 308 of the substitute amendment to H.R. 1586, legislation to reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, will protect the Boise TRACON and the city's air traffic control facilities from the FAA's current plans to transfer these services to Salt Lake City despite the FAA's Article 46 notification of its intent to move forward with the proposed transfer.

This language will ensure the local radar services will remain at Boise until the Air Traffic Control Modernization Oversight Board's recommendations are complete, or with the full participation of and collaboration with the air traffic controllers at Boise. Similarly, we at NATCA will not move forward with negotiations with the FAA on the Boise TRACON transfer without full cooperation with the Idaho Congressional Delegation and other key stakeholders. Full collaboration will ensure that this and all future ATC facility and service realignments will only be considered if the proposals serve the public good by improving safety, efficiency and service.

The inclusion of this provision in the substitute amendment is a direct product of your tireless efforts to compel the FAA to work collaboratively with the air traffic controllers and other vital aviation stakeholders in Boise. On behalf of the air traffic controllers in Boise and throughout the country, we want to thank you for your continued leadership on this issue.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA GILBERT,
National Executive Vice President.

MARK GRIFFIN,
President, Boise NATCA Local.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I completely agree with the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho, and I associate myself with his statements fully. Senator Crapo and I want to confirm with the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Commerce Committee that section 308 prohibits the FAA from proceeding with the consolidation of the Boise TRACON into the Salt Lake City TRACON until after the board completes its recommendations concerning all air traffic control facility realignments and consolidations nationwide. From where we stand, it is necessary to have a thorough review of the Boise consolidation and an independent determination of the cost effectiveness of transferring the Boise TRACON to Salt Lake City.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Yes, that is correct. The FAA article 46 notification of its intent to move forward with the proposed transfer would be stopped if section 308 is enacted into law, unless the affected employees execute a written agreement regarding the proposed realignment.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I concur with the Senator from West Virginia. No realignments will be allowed to continue before the completion of the board's recommendations, unless the affected employees and the FAA agree in writing to do so.

Mr. CRAPO. Per this colloquy, Senator Risch and I will follow up with the FAA that it is the clear intent of the Senate for the FAA to halt its consolidation of the Boise TRACON until after the new board completes its recommendations for realignment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, FAA authorization expired in Octobeer of 2007.

For more than 2 years, we have been operating on short-term extensions.

I thank Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Senators HUTCHISON, DORGAN and DEMINT for working together to bring this bill to the floor.

The bill before us will improve the safety of air travel, modernize our air traffic control system, boost the economy and create thousands of jobs.

Senator DORGAN and Senator ROCKEFELLER have had many hearings over the last few years on aviation but each hearing had one theme: safety.

This bill will improve safety by creating an Aviation Safety Whistleblower Investigation Office that can catch problems before they result in serious accidents.

The bill also requires the FAA Administrator to re-evaluate flight crew training and certification.

We also require FAA to establish safety standards for training programs for flight crew members and aircraft dispatchers.

Another key component of this bill is NextGen.

NextGen is the term we use to describe our transition to a more modern, satellite-based air traffic control system.

NextGen will give pilots and air traffic controllers the ability to ccurately pinpoint aircraft in the sky—to avoid problems, to monitor traffic, to move things more smoothly, safely and efficiently.

The FAA released its aviation forecast study last Tuesday.

Last year, we saw 704 million passengers carried on U.S. airlines. Soon, hose numbers will increase significantly. The FAA reports we will see more than 1 billion air passengers by 2023 and more than 1.2 billion passengers by 2030. We just do not have the capacity with our current air traffic control sstem to handle this increase in traffic. But with NextGen, we hope to triple the capacity of our national aviation system.

This technology will allow planes to fly the straightest, quickest route from point A to point B. And with more precise information and better communication between the ground and the cockpit, we can fit more planes safely in our airspace. Doing so will save airlines at least 3.3 billion gallons of fuel a year or more than $10 billion annually by 2025. NextGen should also reduce airport delays significantly.

Chicago's Midway Airport was ranked dead last in January for on-time departures among the nation's 29 busiest airports. Chicago's O'Hare airport has won that dubious distinction more than once. One of the main reasons for these delays is the lack of capacity in airspace. Fully implementing NextGen should reduce delays by half.

This is a great investment. This bill will help airports and air travelers in Illinois and nationwide save time and money.

In Illinois, we are in the middle of the largest airport expansion project in U.S. history at O'Hare airport.

This $6.6 billion project will completely reconfigure the runways at O'Hare to make sure we can move more traffic in and out of Chicago more efficiently. Moving this project along means a lot to the people of Chicago and Illinois. O'Hare already generates 450,000 jobs and $38 billion in economic activity for the Chicago region and the State of Illinois. The O'Hare modernization project will create 195,000 more jobs, and another $18 billion in annual economic activity. This bill will allow O'Hare to keep moving forward by streamlining the passenger facility charge application process.

And it isn't just O'Hare. Airports in Illinois will benefits from more than $4 billion per year for the airport improvement program, AIP.

Last year, airports in the Quad Cities, Rockford, Decatur and Springfield all used AIP funds to make critical improvements to their airfields.

Keeping this funding flowing will allow these airports to handle the traffic of today and the future increases of tomorrow.

The bill helps rural areas keep the commercial air service they have now and attract new service in the future. For a long time, the Essential Air Service, EAS, program was relegated to the back bench at the Department of Transportation.

In Illinois, two air carriers provided subpar service for too long.

In 2007, the EAS carrier providing service from Quincy, Decatur and Marion, IL, to St. Louis was shut down by the FAA. The next carrier promised each community four round-trips each day and codeshare agreement with a major airline. That carrier broke those promises and left town as soon as they could. This administration is taking a different approach and so is this Congress.

This bill fully funds the EAS program and puts in place important reforms so the Department of Transportation works with businesses, local communities and the airline industry to start and retain quality air service to rural communities.

Without a robust EAS program, many rural communities would have no commercial air service at all, and residents of smaller cities would have to travel significant distances for flights. But with reliable and safe commercial air service, communities can retain and attract businesses.

The bill also helps smaller airports gain new commercial air service by increasing funding for the Small Community Air Service Grant program.

This program has helped airports in Illinois, including Rockford and Springfield, bring new routes to their cities.

I want to thank Senator ROCKEFELLER for including the Essential Air Service and Small Community provisions in this bill and for creating an Office of Rural Aviation within DOT to make sure rural areas are not forgotten.

Safety, efficiency, capacity and even the connectivity in smaller communities—all of these aspects of the FAA reauthorization also generate jobs.

The FAA estimates commercial aviation is responsible for 5.2 percent of gross domestic product and generates $1.142 trillion in economic activity.

The aviation industry provides $346 billion in earnings and 10.2 million jobs.

And this bill will help grow those numbers. In 2010, DOT estimates this legislation will support 150,000 jobs. The economist Mark Zandi said, ''Aviation is the glue that keeps the global economy together.''

This bill will boost our economy now and lay the foundation to keep the United States competitive in the global marketplace moving forward.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise in support of this legislation to modernize our Nation's aviation system and I am especially pleased that it includes Senate Amendment No. 3534 to protect the pristine beauty and quiet of Crater Lake National Park.

This amendment offered by Senator MERKLEY and I would bring an end to the bureaucratic stalemate that exists between the Federal Aviation Administration and the National Park Service over implementation of the National Parks Air Tour Management Act of 2000.

That act required the FAA and the Park Service to work together in regulating air tours over national parks. Unfortunately, that is not happening. After nearly a decade, these two agencies have yet to complete a single required air tour management plan for those parks with air tours.

Meanwhile, parks where air tours applications are pending are in limbo over whether tours will operate and where. Efforts to provide adequate safeguards to protect the parks' resources have stalled, leaving places such as Oregon's Crater Lake National Park—the 6th oldest national park in the Nation—lingering in needless uncertainty. In short, the law is not working as it was intended and providing no benefit to anyone.

When an air tour company applied last year for permission to fly tours

over Crater Lake National Park, the public outcry in my state and elsewhere was swift and dramatic—and for good reason. Anyone familiar with Crater Lake knows that it is one of the crown jewels of the Nation's system of national parks. It is a place that my constituents care deeply about. It is visited by countless Oregonians and tourists alike every year who come to see its deep-blue lake, dramatic lava flows, towering trees and, perhaps most of all, to experience its quiet.

While we cannot agree on what to do about air tours over every single national park, we can agree that if we are going to ban them anywhere it should be Crater Lake. Such a ban will guarantee future generations the same pristine solitude that exists today.

Since Crater Lake represents one of the few places to escape the din of everyday life, I and many others have serious concerns over what the proposed helicopter over flights would do to that tranquility.

Yet that concern isn't able to be considered by the FAA and the Park Service under the requirements found in the current National Park Air Tour Management Act of 2000. Parks such as Crater Lake must go through the costly and time-consuming process of attempting to craft an air tour management plan before being able to deny an application for air tours. As no such plans have been completed for any park in 10 years, there is little prospect of getting any certainty any time in the near future. This is uncertainty for air tour operators and for parks visitors alike. Will there be over flights or won't there? The way things work now, we'll never know and our treasured parks don't get the certain protection they need.

My amendment would provide needed clarity regarding the responsibilities of the FAA and the National Park Service so that air tour management plans can finally be completed. It will speed implementation of the act by ensuring that air tour management plans are not required at Crater Lake, where it is clear that having them would be unacceptable to park resources or visitor experiences.

I am pleased that Senator ROCKEFELLER has worked with me to include this amendment in the managers' package. I thank my colleagues Senator MERKLEY who cosponsored this amendment and Senator ALEXANDER who also lent his support. This amendment will help ensure that our parks' resources are protected.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased the Senate will vote on final passage of the FAA Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act. This 2-year reauthorization of FAA's programs provides important funding increases and program improvements that will enhance the safety and efficiency of our Nation's aviation system. In so doing, it makes key investments in our Nation's aviation infrastructure and creates jobs with these investments.

Our global economy depends on the smooth and efficient movement of goods, services, and people from city to city and across international borders. A safe and efficient aviation system goes hand in hand with a strong economy. We are fortunate to have the best aviation system in the world, and we must continue to make the necessary investments and upgrades to keep it as such. The FAA reauthorization bill helps us to do this by addressing problems of capacity, congestion, and delays that have emerged to ensure our aviation system can adequately handle the projected growth in airlines passengers.

The FAA reauthorization bill will create much needed jobs by providing the funding and directives for safety improvements at our airports and in the aviation industry. For instance, the FAA is building two new air traffic control towers in Michigan: at Kalamazoo and Traverse City. The FAA is also repaving two runways and various taxiways at Detroit Metropolitan Wayne County Airport. The FAA is also constructing a new terminal building at Kalamazoo/Battle Creek International Airport, and it is designing a new building for aircraft rescue and firefighting and snow removal equipment at Pellston Regional Airport in Emmet County. These are much needed upgrades and will make flying into and around Michigan safer and easier.

A key component of this bill is to modernize our air traffic control system by building the Next Generation Air Transportation System, NextGen, of satellite-based navigation. The NextGen system will be more accurate and more efficient than the current radar based air traffic control system. It will also result in significant fuel efficiencies and time savings by allowing aircraft to fly more direct routes. This is good for the environment, good for air carrier's bottom line, and good for the flying public. This bill accelerates the process and moves the NextGen modernization process forward. The bill also provides flexibility to airports regarding how Airport Improvement Program funds can be utilized as well as studying ways to raise revenue for airport projects through a pilot program.

I will vote in support of the FAA reauthorization bill, and I urge its quick adoption and enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. VITTER. I stand to talk about health care on this significant day, the day after the House passed the ObamaCare bill and the day before the reconciliation bill comes here to the Senate.

Needless to say, I am deeply disappointed by the House's action for all of the reasons I and so many others have raised, the concerns we have raised previously on the Senate floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, could I ask the Senator to yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. VITTER. Yes, I will yield.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I wanted to ask my colleague from Virginia, because he has been on the floor, I think seeking recognition, and I wanted to make sure that we ask him—that we protect his place following Senator VITTER—how much time does the Senator from Virginia want to use?

Mr. WEBB. I thank the Senator for inquiring. I wish to speak for up to 10 minutes about the Ensign amendment.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks by the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from Virginia be recognized for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, it was my understanding that the Ensign amendment was going to be called up at 4:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WEBB. Would that not be the proper topic of discussion on the floor? I have been waiting since 4:15 when I was slated to speak.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I would be happy to call up the Ensign amendment, after which Senator VITTER had had the floor, and did give me the right to protect you. So, if possible, I wish to call up the amendment, ask that Senator VITTER be allowed to speak up to 10 minutes, and then, following that, I wish to protect the Senator from Virginia's time.

Mr. WEBB. May I ask for a courtesy from the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Louisiana? I have a commitment I cannot break back in my office that was supposed to begin at this moment. Would you feel it appropriate if I were to ask that my statement be printed in the RECORD at this point with respect to the Ensign amendment, once you called it up?

Mr. VITTER. I have no objection.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Let me ask the Senator from Louisiana, would he be able to allow the Senator from Virginia to go forward?

Mr. VITTER. I am afraid I cannot for exactly the same reason. I am late for a meeting in my office. But I certainly would have no objection to placing his comments in the RECORD and regaining the floor at a future time.

Mr. WEBB. I appreciate that courtesy. If there is opportunity for me to come back later, I will try.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, if the Senator does come back, I will do everything I can to give him a chance to speak, because I know this is very important to his State, and I wish for him to have his views known.

Senator ENSIGN is on his way, and I will do everything possible to give him some time.

Mr. WEBB. I also wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding for this exchange.

AMENDMENT NO. 3476, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON], for Mr. ENSIGN, proposes amendment numbered 3476, as modified, to amendment No. 3452.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 279, after line 24, add the following:

SEC. 723. PRESERVATION AND EXPANSION OF ACCESS TO THE NATIONAL CAPITAL FOR SMALL COMMUNITIES.

Section 41718 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) SLOT USAGE.—Notwithstanding section 49109 or any other provision of law, any air carrier that holds or operates air carrier slots at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport (DCA) as of January 1, 2010, pursuant to subparts K and S of part 93 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, which are being used as of that date for scheduled service between DCA and a large hub airport may use such slots for up to 15 round trip flights between DCA and any airport located outside of the perimeter restriction described in section 49109.''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, again like so many Americans, I was deeply disappointed by last night's House vote. At its core, that health care reform legislation will put the government between us and our doctors. It will raise health care costs significantly. That is not me saying that, that is nonpartisan sources such as the Congressional Budget Office.

It will try to be ''paid for'' through a $½ trillion raid on Medicare, another $½ trillion set of tax increases. And, of course, that is the cause of pushing up health care costs. Then, to add insult to injury for so many Americans, including so many Louisianans, it will provide taxpayer funding of abortion.

It was truly a sad day for our country, in my opinion. But I take the floor today not so much to focus on that but to focus on the continuing fight and to focus on the future. My message is very simple. Speaking for one Senator, for myself, this fight is not over by a long shot. I will be on the floor regularly all this week fighting the separate reconciliation bill. Certainly, if any House Democrats thought all aspects of that bill would pass into law, to ''fix'' certain portions of the underlying Senate ObamaCare bill, I think this week they will be sadly disappointed.

There are many aspects of that bill that are subject to serious challenges that will require 60 votes, and will not get them here on the Senate floor. We will have a number of important debates and amendments.

I will also continue the fight to try to repeal this very counterproductive legislation. Today at 2 o'clock, as soon, as absolutely soon, as it was in order, I filed a bill to repeal ObamaCare, to repeal what has passed already through the process. I am joined with so many other Members, so many other Americans across the country to fight to that end, however long it takes. It may not be this Congress, but I believe that day will come, because the great majority of Americans, certainly including the great majority of Louisianans, want that to happen. They want us to act instead in a focused, positive way, attacking real problems with real solutions, not a 3,000-plus-page bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If neither side yields time, the time will be equally charged to both sides.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent the time be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STEWART L. UDALL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, when we reflect on the great families in American politics—we have had our fair share—we certainly think of John Adams and John Quincy Adams and what they gave to America. In our time one thinks of the Kennedy family and how much those brothers gave to this Nation. Some of us were honored to serve with Ted Kennedy and the sons and daughters of those great Senators of the past. But there is another family from the West who has given so much to us. That would be the Udall family.

I was blessed to serve in the House of Representatives with Morris Udall. He was a joy, not only a great man of principle but a great sense of humor. It was fun to be around Mo Udall. He had an ill-fated run for the Presidency which probably generated more one-liners than any race in American political history. But he was one of two brothers, Stewart Udall being his brother before him who had served as well in the House of Representatives from the State of Arizona and backed a man for President named John Kennedy in 1960. Because of his early support of John Kennedy, when President Kennedy was elected, he called on Stewart Udall to serve as his Secretary of the Interior.

Last Saturday, Stewart Udall passed away. I came to the floor this afternoon to say a few words about this great man and the great contributions he made to America. He was one of the first real activists as Secretary of the Interior. I want to read, if I may, some of the things he managed to achieve in the time he served as Secretary of the Interior under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson: the acquisition of 3.85 million acres of new holdings, four national parks—Canyonlands in Utah, Redwood in California, North Cascades in Washington State, Guadalupe Mountains in Texas—six national monuments, nine national recreation areas, 20 historic sites, 50 wildlife refuges, and eight national seashores. He had an interest in preserving historic sites and helped to save Carnegie Hall from destruction. What an amazing legacy Stewart Udall left as the leader of America's efforts toward conservation.

He was an extraordinary man too, a real Renaissance man in his interests. He held evening meetings at the Interior Department and invited the likes of Carl Sandburg and the actor Hal Holbrook, as well as Wallace Stegner, the Pulitzer Prize-winning author, who he invited to become the Department's writer in residence.

It was Stewart Udall who suggested that John Kennedy invite Robert Frost to recite a poem at Mr. Kennedy's inauguration, which is one of the most celebrated moments in history in the last century when Robert Frost stood before that frozen crowd on Inauguration Day for John Kennedy.

I think back too of his work when it came to the environment. In the early days Rachel Carson was the inspiration for many. Her book ''The Silent Spring'' inspired Stewart Udall to look beyond conservation to protecting the world we live in.

He did so many things that were ahead of their time. Under the Kennedy administration, he began efforts to establish the Nation's first national seashores, and it wasn't welcomed by a lot of the people affected. People living in Cape Cod, MA, Cape Hatteras in North Carolina, and Point Reyes in California objected to taking coastal lands out of private hands, saying it would ruin the local economy. Exactly the opposite occurred. When these became protected areas, they drew more tourism and more economic development than anyone had ever before realized.

Stewart Lee Udall was born on January 31, 1920, in St. Johns, AZ, a small community in Apache country. His family had strong ties to the Mormon Church. They used to say that you could find Udalls all over the political history of the West. His brother Morris, of course, represented the State of Arizona for so many years. I remember one story I read recently in Sports Illustrated. I mentioned it to TOM UDALL, his son, who now represents the State of New Mexico. It is a story that isn't well known, and it goes back to the early 1960s, when Stewart Udall, as Secretary of the Interior, decided to challenge the Washington Redskins football team. It turned out in the early 1960s it was an all-white team, and the man who owned the team, Mr. Marshall, took great pride in the fact there were no black players on the Washington Redskins football team. Stewart Udall contacted the President and said: Mr. President, it turns out the Federal Government has the lease on the stadium that Mr. Marshall is using for his football games, and we want to make it clear to him that he better integrate that team.

Well, Mr. Marshall wouldn't hear anything about that. He was going to

fight him all the way. There were pickets and protests and demonstrations and harsh words back and forth. But in the end, Stewart Udall and President Kennedy prevailed. The Washington Redskins were integrated. In fact, some of their first Black players ended up in the Hall of Fame. Interior Secretary Udall did the Washington Redskins and their fans quite a favor. That was in the early 1960s. Those who know the fight song for the Washington Redskins may be surprised to learn that the refrain that talks about ''fight for old DC'' before this battle used to say ''fight for old Dixie.'' Things have changed in the capital city, and Stewart Udall was part of that change.

In his life too he was a man who relished physical challenges, as his son still does, my colleague Senator TOM UDALL and his cousin MARK UDALL of Colorado. He was an all-conference guard on the University of Arizona basketball team, climbed Mount Kilimanjaro and Mount Fuji, headed up American delegations to many regions. At the age of 84, Stewart Udall, at the end of his last rafting trip on the Colorado River, hiked up the steep Bright Angel trail from the bottom of the Grand Canyon to the south rim, a 10-hour walk at age 84. And it says in the New York Times:

. . . he celebrated at the end with a martini.

What an amazing man, an amazing life, a great contribution to America. His passing is a reminder of some of the greats who have served in so many different ways and have left a mark, an indelible legacy, and a heritage.

Stewart L. Udall was one of those men, and among his legacy items would include not only a great family but a great colleague in the Senate, his son, Senator TOM UDALL of New Mexico. We should honor his service, note his passing, and remember his inspiration. His leadership made America a better place. His legacy in conservation will serve generations to come. We need more like Stewart Udall.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I want to thank Senate leadership for bringing this bill to the floor. Our Nation's air traffic control systems are in serious need of modernization, and this bill is the right step forward in addressing those challenges. Improved safety, a reduction in flight delays and more efficient routes resulting in less fuel burned are all possible with a modern, 21st century air traffic control system. I commend Chairman ROCKEFELLER, Ranking Member HUTCHISON and the Senate Commerce Committee for their commitment in addressing these issues.

I want to take a few moments today to talk about an issue that is important to me, the communities near Washington Reagan National Airport and those communities throughout America who currently have reliable service to the Nation's Capital. I am deeply concerned with any attempts to modify the current agreement on the perimeter and slot rules that currently apply to Reagan National Airport.

In 1987, Congress created the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority to run Reagan National and Washington Dulles International Airports. The creation of the Airports Authority established a professional organization to operate the airports efficiently and represented a commitment to the surrounding communities regarding aircraft noise and traffic. I think that bears repeating. Congress made a commitment to the residents of Alexandria, Arlington and Fairfax County on the operation of Reagan National Airport when it transferred authority to the Airports Authority. Those commitments were codified by Congress in the so-called perimeter and slot rules. Changes to these rules threaten to seriously degrade service to Reagan National, Dulles International, and Baltimore-Washington International airports. And they break the commitment made to our surrounding communities.

The amendment that the Senator from Nevada has offered seeks essentially to do away with the existing 1,250 mile perimeter rule that governs flights into and out of Reagan National Airport. The Senator from Arizona, Mr. KYL, has argued that this will have a limited impact on existing flights at DCA. On the contrary, if this amendment passes, up to 75 existing flights that currently fly from DCA to other large cities within the perimeter could be lost. Shifting these flights would not only have a direct impact on the cities that stand to lose the routes they currently have, but it would also have follow-on effects to flights in smaller markets, as well as flights that now service Dulles and BWI.

Furthermore, the flights that would be added at Reagan National would be long-haul flights, which means bigger planes and more passengers. That in turn means more congestion around and inside the airport: worse traffic, longer lines at security, more difficulty parking large planes at already crowded gates.

There are basic physical constraints at Reagan National Airport that cannot be ignored, and the original slots and perimeter rules were carefully crafted to take that into consideration. If you have ever tried to fly out of Reagan National Airport during peak hours, you know that parking can be impossible, ticket counters can be incredibly congested and the number of gates for jets to park is limited.

More than 10 years ago, the Airports Authority rebuilt much of Reagan National Airport, transforming it into one of the most efficient airports in the Nation as the facilities constructed were matched to the number of flights established by law. It did so with the slot and perimeter restrictions in mind. Any significant change in those rules will overburden critical airport facilities and infrastructure, causing serious disruptions. New flights will create more demand for parking where none is available. At the same time, gate access at Reagan National Airport is limited, as airlines are currently sharing gates in some areas. Flights coming and going would be delayed, an important issue we happen to be addressing in this bill. We have laid out policies to reduce the inconvenience of delays and sitting in grounded aircraft because of air traffic congestion in this very bill.

These are significant issues that the Senate must consider before making any changes to the perimeter rule. When members consider this issue in the context of additional flights for them to get back to their constituents, keep in mind there is a significant risk of greater delays and, for many Senators here, a possible reduction in services to their communities. With a change in the current structure at Reagan National Airport, there will be potential impact for communities inside the perimeter who could see their access reduced or eliminated. Flights to cities like Miami, FL; Chicago, IL; New York City; and Boston, MA could lose many of the flights they now have. Communities like Charleston, WV; Des Moines, IA; Jackson, MI; Lexington, KY; Madison, WI; Manchester, NH; or Omaha, NE; could eventually lose their access as well, as airlines backfill their flights to more profitable routes.

It strikes me that the desire to change the slot and perimeter rules at Reagan National Airport is not being driven by market demand, but rather by a few airlines seeking a competitive advantage over others. Allowing airlines to swap flights from hub airports inside the perimeter to hub airports outside of the perimeter could be seen as a special interest earmark for a select group of carriers, as the pool of beneficiaries is identifiable and limited. By allowing existing rules to be altered for a select class, Congress will be allocating this scarce resource for the convenience of a few rather than the larger community need. This is fundamentally anticompetitive behavior and we need to end this periodic and detrimental practice.

Congress added 24 new slots in 2000 and another 22 slots in 2003. If we get rid of the perimeter rule, or modify it in such a way that causes loss of service or diminished service to communities inside the perimeter, the affected communities will be back before Congress seeking more slots to make up for lost service. The communities of Northern Virginia should not have to continually suffer for the convenience of a relative few. We have seen examples of service in other congested airspaces where reasonable slots restrictions have controlled or reduced growing delays in flight times.

The convenience of Reagan National comes at a heavy price for many airport neighbors in the form of aircraft noise and airport related traffic in Arlington, Alexandria and southern Fairfax County. Changing current law only

further breaks the bond that was created with the neighbors of the airports and unfairly burdens them for the sake of the convenience of others. With some foresight in this body, we can avoid any greater congestion whether in the air, on the tarmac or on our roads. The position that the Senators from Maryland, Mr. WARNER, and I hold is consistent with local communities groups of Northern Virginia and that of many previous Governors of the Commonwealth.

With regard to the perimeter rule, its value is evident in the development taking place at Dulles Airport today. Because Dulles is better situated to handle the demands of long-haul flying, Congress wisely established the perimeter rule to move long-haul traffic to Dulles where the space exists to handle the necessary parking and infrastructure expansion. The multibillion-dollar Dulles Development program, and the investments in rail service to Dulles, are all predicated upon Congress keeping its word on the perimeter rule. Eliminating or changing the perimeter rule will not only overburden capacity at Reagan National Airport by overwhelming the facilities but would significantly change the infrastructure improvements needed at Dulles International Airport, many of which are already under construction. Sizable business interests have located their operations in Fairfax and Loudoun Counties based on their proximity to Dulles and on assumptions about the stability of the slot and perimeter rules.

Service will suffer, infrastructure will be strained and the communities surrounding the airport will face more noise and more traffic. That is the last thing we need for Northern Virginia, or the Nation's Capital.

I have laid out only the most significant arguments against changes to the slot and perimeter rules. But here is one more: it is not appropriate for Congress to meddle and manipulate the airports in my home State. Congress no longer maintains this kind of silent hand in the operations at any airports in my colleagues' home states. Let us let the Airports Authority run Washington's airports as Congress agreed to. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Ensign amendment and reject changes to the perimeter rules at Reagan National Airport.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a March 17, 2010, letter to me from the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AIRPORTS AUTHORITY,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2010.

Hon. JAMES H. WEBB,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WEBB: The Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (Airports Authority) is aware of several proposed amendments to H.R. 1586, the legislative vehicle for the Federal Aviation Administration Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act, which address flight rules at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport (Reagan National). The Airports Authority would like to reiterate our commitment to maintaining the current High Density Rule (or ''Slot'' Rule) and ''Perimeter Rule'', which direct the allocation of a very scarce resource—take offs and landings—at Reagan National.

Congress initially mandated the Slot and Perimeter rules in 1987, balancing the physical limitations of Reagan National with the growth potential of Washington Dulles International Airport (Dulles International) and Baltimore/Washington Thurgood Marshall International Airport (Baltimore/Washington). Over the years, Congress has made modest changes to these rules, and Reagan National has been able to operate with a high degree of arrival and departure reliability. Over the past two decades, tremendous capital investments have been made at Dulles International, as annual air traffic has grown substantially.

Reagan National's facilities were rebuilt in the 1990s, at a cost of $1 billion, to match the capacity established by Congress in the Slot and Perimeter rules. Drastic changes to the Slot and Perimeter rules that are currently under discussion will add significant flight activity with the potential to result in surface traffic congestion, passenger delays, and security screening back-ups. Further, increases in flights and passenger volumes could stress the air traffic control system during poor weather, ground facilities, baggage, gate and other terminal services. The Airports Authority is also concerned about the possible, or perceived, noise-related impact on the region resulting from additional flights at Reagan National.

The Airports Authority urges the Congress to reject the temptation to add flights to Reagan National without regard to the ability of Reagan National to absorb this increase, or to the impact on the neighboring community, and Dulles International and Baltimore/Washington Airports.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. BENNETT,
President and Chief Executive Officer.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, as we conclude this debate on this reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration, I wish to thank my colleagues for their hard work, and I wish to do so with some specificity.

First, I thank Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, the ranking member of the Commerce Committee. Senator HUTCHISON and I, in a sense, kind of grew up together on the Commerce Committee. We have worked together, in my judgment, entirely successfully on aviation issues. For much of the last decade, Senator HUTCHISON and I have served as either chair or ranking member of the Aviation Subcommittee. In 2009, I assumed the chairmanship of the Commerce Committee, and she assumed the ranking member position on the committee.

But, more importantly, we have a long history of producing strong, bipartisan aviation legislation and working well, generally, starting with the landmark AIR 21 bill in 2000—which greatly increased funding for our aviation system—through the chaotic days after September 11, 9/11—which culminated in the Aviation and Transportation Security Act—to this important reauthorization we are considering today.

I am profoundly proud of our work together over the years. I respect her professionally. I respect her personally. I think our work is a legacy we both can be very proud of. I know I am. She is an extraordinary Senator who is deeply committed to making sure the United States has the finest aviation system in the world. She has many other interests, but that is one of them. Our Nation's aviation system is demonstrably safer and more secure because of her efforts.

I also thank my good friend, Senator BYRON DORGAN. In 2009, Senator DORGAN became the chair of the Aviation Subcommittee—just a year ago—but he has attacked it with such ferocity and intensity, typical of him, that it seems like much longer than that. He has been a magnificent chairman of that subcommittee. His laserlike focus on making our aviation system safer has become a cornerstone of this bill. He held, for example, eight hearings on aviation safety over the last 15 months. Eight hearings in 15 months does not seem like a lot, but given our schedule around here, it is. He was totally focused, such as on what happened in Buffalo and all other aspects.

As with every issue in which he is engaged—and there are many of them—he has made a lasting contribution. I personally regret he has chosen to retire at the end of this year. Not only will I miss him as a friend, but the people of North Dakota and this country will lose one of their most passionate and effective advocates. He should be enormously proud of his work on this bill. I know I am.

I also recognize the work of Senator DEMINT, who has championed a number of important safety provisions and has been a strong advocate of moving this bill forward. It is important to say, very important to say.

Senator BAUCUS worked hard to develop a revenue title for this bill. Through his efforts, the aviation system will have resources it needs to build the modern digital air traffic control system our Nation demands. We will be spending about $500 billion a year.

As with every bill that moves through this body, much, much, much of the work is done by our staff who put in extraordinary hours.

First and foremost, I would like to recognize, among other people, Gael Sullivan of my staff. Gael has served as a professional staff member for the Aviation Subcommittee for almost a decade. For 3 years, Gael has worked tirelessly on this bill. It would not be a reality without his efforts.

I would also like to recognize Rich Swayze and Adam Duffy of my staff, in addition to Jim Conneely, a detailee from the FAA, as it turns out, to the Commerce Committee. He has been of invaluable assistance.

I would like to thank Jarrod Thompson and Ann Begeman of Senator HUTCHISON's staff. They are true and total professionals, without whose work the bill would not be possible.

I would also like to thank Margaret McCarthy of Senator DORGAN's staff, who worked seamlessly with the committee staff.

As always, Senator BAUCUS's staff was critical to getting the revenue title in place.

Finally, I would be kind of remiss if I did not mention the hard and constant work of Ellen Doneski, the staff director of the Commerce Committee, who was my legislative director in a former life; Mr. James Reid, who sits beside me, my deputy staff director; and the Commerce Committee press team, Jamie Smith and Jena Longo.

The staff never gets enough credit. We talk about it. We say it. I think they know we mean it. I wonder if they can guess how much we do mean it—the hours they put in; their selflessness; their willingness to work together; their willingness to work across party lines, where sometimes their Members cannot as easily. So I am fortunate to have so many talented people working with me and with Senator HUTCHISON.

But most of all, I thank Senator HUTCHISON.

Mr. President, I want to say just a few words about two very important programs at the Federal Aviation Administration, FAA—the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise and the Airport Concessions Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Airport Improvement Programs.

These programs have been critically important in helping to level the playing field for minority and women owned businesses in the airport industry and continue to be instrumental in addressing ongoing discrimination. While it is true that our nation has made tremendous progress against discrimination in the past five decades, there continues to be a good deal more work to do.

Discrimination in the lending, bonding, and bid process, as well as disparities in the treatment of DBE subcontractors once a contract is awarded are real life problems faced by these businesses. For this reason, I strongly support the provisions in this bill to improve the DBE program, including provisions to adjust the personal net worth cap for inflation and to require certification training for those who review DBE applications.

We must not forget the true impact of DBE firms on the economy. Minority and women owned businesses not only improve the vitality of the airport industry, but they are important economic contributors to their communities.

The statistical and qualitative evidence of discrimination is clear and has been compiled in disparity studies that are conducted by state and local governments around the country. These studies are well constructed third party examinations that shed light on whether qualified DBE firms in the area are being utilized, examine the contracting and business activities of the state or local government, review the corresponding private markets in the same geographic area, and analyze anecdotal reports about discrimination from actual stakeholders.

These studies, many examples of which were received during the Commerce Committee's May 2009 hearing, and during a hearing in the House of Representatives in March 2009, demonstrate that progress has been made and that our efforts here in Congress are still necessary.

For example, studies have showed that airports operated by Denver, CO, Phoenix, AZ, and the State of Maryland all have made progress, but that significant hurdles remain. These studies demonstrate that discrimination continues to exist in both the public contracting process and in the private sector, such as in access to credit markets.

The inclusion of the DBE provisions in the bill will provide an important on-the-ground benefit to businesses by helping to level the playing field and enabling fairer competition. I am pleased that Congress has recognized the continued need for these programs and these new provisions as integral to the reauthorization of the FAA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, let me say how much I appreciate the remarks of the chairman. It has been truly delightful working with the chairman on this bill. He and I used to be the chairman and ranking member of the Aviation Subcommittee. Now we are the chairman and ranking member of the full committee. So I think our views on aviation—its importance, the importance of the NextGen air traffic control system, the importance of safety, the Passenger Bill of Rights—are one and the same, and I appreciate working with him.

I do have some closing remarks, but I wish to let Senator ENSIGN talk about his amendment. It is the pending business. So I think I am going to put my remarks to the side for now and let Senator ENSIGN speak on his amendment. I do have comments, following his comments, on his perimeter amendment. Then, if we have time, I would like to make my closing statement. But if not, in order for us to stay on time, I will stay and do it after the vote.

With that, I yield to the Senator from Utah—I am sorry, the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, tourism is the backbone of the economy of my State of Nevada. It has taken a nosedive over the last year with the crash of the Nation's economy. More than ever, the industry has needed a lifeline that was recently given to my State when the legislation I authored with Senator DORGAN, the Travel Promotion Act, was signed into law by the President. Our legislation will revitalize the tourism industry across our country and in my State of Nevada by reintroducing our rural class destinations to people all over the world.

On the piece of legislation before us, I have offered two important amendments to the FAA bill that will also help tourism in my State and will create jobs in this important industry.

Last week, Senator REID and I sponsored an amendment that will encourage more construction on land around McCarran International Airport in Las Vegas, which will ultimately create more jobs for the area. Our legislation lifts an outdated deed restriction for land surrounding McCarran International Airport which previously prevented development on this land because of an agreement with the Bureau of Land Management that enforced noise mitigation for airlines flying overhead.

However, because of technology, aircrafts are not as noisy as they were 10 years ago, when this restriction was put in place. While our amendment does not alter the noise threshold in the area, it does broaden the types of buildings that can be constructed on the land because airline noise no longer threatens to violate the threshold.

Clark County can now sell the lands to be used for hotels, arenas, auditoriums, and concert halls. Not only are we making this land more attractive and more valuable, we are creating jobs by increasing construction in the area and increasing the use of the land. I was happy this amendment was accepted by both the majority and the minority.

The second amendment Senator MCCAIN has been working on for a long time, as well as myself, Senator REID, and others was unfortunately pulled, but it deals with the issue of flights—helicopter flights, especially, and fixed-wing flights—over the Grand Canyon, which is something I have been working on since I was in the House of Representatives. I thought we were close to getting this amendment finalized because it is very important not only for tourism, but it is also important for those who cannot necessarily hike the Grand Canyon, who cannot experience the wonderful aspects of it—those in wheelchairs, the elderly—and this amendment would have made sure they would have continued to have access.

I hope we can work on that and get that amendment either in conference or in some other way. It is not only good for the economy, but it is also good for those who are disabled or those who for other reasons cannot go and enjoy the Grand Canyon such as hikers and others can.

AMENDMENT NO. 3476, AS MODIFIED

The last piece I wish to talk about is the amendment we have before us today. It is called the DC perimeter amendment. Once again, this is something I have been working on for many years. The initial rule was put into place in 1966, to put a limit on how far flights could fly out of Reagan, then

known as Washington National Airport. It was to divert air traffic over to the new Dulles Airport, basically making National a short-haul and Dulles a long-haul airport.

To carry out this purpose, there was a restriction of 1,250 miles put from National Airport. While Congress has granted certain limited exceptions to the perimeter rule over the years, the rule continues to place arbitrary limits that restrict air traffic between the airport and the Western United States. Today, there are only a dozen nonstop flights between Reagan National and the entire Western United States. I encourage my colleagues to work on this amendment in conference. In a little while, we are probably going to be withdrawing the amendment, but we want to work on it in conference so that more areas, more places in the United States will have direct access to Reagan National Airport, which is much more convenient to use than Washington Dulles or the Baltimore airport.

I will say this: It really is a matter of fairness. Should only the east coast or the Midwest have access to Reagan National or should the rest of the country have the convenience of flying into Reagan National?

My amendment actually would not have increased the number of landing slots available. My amendment would have allowed airlines to take the slots. They fly from certain airports, the large hub airports, and transfer those to other slots that work better for their business plan as well as gives other people in America the right to fly into Reagan National Airport, which is, as I mentioned, so much more convenient.

So after 40 years of implementation of the perimeter rule, it is outdated. The last time I checked—and I fly Dulles all the time—Dulles is thriving. As a matter of fact, it is packed. I circled for over an hour today because of the number of flights coming into Dulles. It is an extremely busy airport. I don't think we have to make sure Dulles stays busy any longer. It has more than it can actually handle. But it is time to scale back the perimeter restrictions at Reagan National.

So I really hope in conference we can get together and work on reasonable changes to the DC perimeter rule that will give other Americans, other than those living within the perimeter rule today, access to the closest airport to our Nation's Capital.

With that, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their willingness to work with us on this amendment as well as generally. This is important legislation they have worked on. We have a lot of outdated technology in our current FAA system, and this is a very important piece of legislation. I applaud the efforts they have made in bringing the legislation to this point.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, expanding air service to metropolitan airports is always a very contentious issue. I believe it is important that we give due consideration to local interests when considering the addition of slots, particularly at National Airport. Senators WARNER and WEBB have significant reservations about moving forward on any changes to existing policy at this time, and I have worked to address these concerns.

I believe the agreement reached between Senators DORGAN, WARNER, HUTCHISON, KYL, ENSIGN, and DEMINT is a reasonable way forward. It will allow us to balance the desire for additional slots against the opposition from local residents.

Pursuing a more abrupt policy change such as eliminating the perimeter rule altogether has significant implications for competition, small community air service, congestion, and delay. Going forward, we need to make sure there are not unintended consequences from such changes and that service to small communities is preserved. Obviously, service to small communities is very important to me.

I also wish to make clear that the Federal Government's role in this process is specific. Air carriers sometimes treat airport slots as though they are their own property. It is not. It is their privilege. The air transportation system is operated for the benefit of the public interest, not for the private interests. Too often, the air carriers abuse the rights they have been granted. They schedule too many flights at congested airports, and the result is gridlock. This is part of the reason there is a cap on slots at National.

The air transportation network requires that capacity be managed carefully so the entire system functions rationally. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to make sure it operates well, and I take this role very seriously. If the air carriers cannot manage their slots in an effective manner, the Federal Government will have to step in and do it for them.

Crafting a bipartisan bill to reauthorize the FAA has been my long and difficult journey, together with the ranking member, Senator HUTCHISON. I recognize that many of my colleagues have a strong interest in expanding service at National. I appreciate the work they have done. But I do believe that what has been discussed here and will be discussed later in conference is a balanced approach. I look forward to working with my colleagues in a conference with the House that will achieve an appropriate agreement that is acceptable to everybody.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleagues for their work on the Reagan National perimeter rule issue.

Last week, I sat down with several interested colleagues in an effort to try to find a path forward on this issue, and the result is the modified Ensign amendment before us. I wish to say a few words about the intent of the amendment.

I sympathize with the concerns of my friend from Virginia, Senator WARNER, who is also a member of the Senate Commerce Committee, and our colleague, Senator WEBB. While in a somewhat different position in the past, I have had similar issues raised concerning my home State of Texas with Love Field and DFW Airport, and I recognize the impact of dealing with the decision to change the status quo. It is difficult.

I also recognize the views of western State Senators concerned about the few opportunities for their constituents to have direct access to Reagan National Airport. There are now only 12 flights a day. That really should be expanded, but it needs to be expanded in a way that does not have the harmful effects on National and the Virginia residents who live in and around the airport.

With that in mind, I think we have come up with a compromise proposal that meets the concerns of the western State colleagues and others, as well as addressing the concerns of the Virginia Senators. The modified Ensign amendment is a simple solution that allows air carriers with existing inside-the-perimeter large hub airport slots into Reagan National the ability to convert those slots to any community outside the perimeter, with each air carrier being kept at 15 roundtrip operations eligible for conversion. By utilizing the conversions, we don't add any new flights at all to the airport, but we do give the air carriers the opportunity to better utilize their networks. I am hopeful we can take that concept and message to the House in the next round of the legislative process on this bill.

I thank Senators ENSIGN and KYL, Senators DEMINT, BOXER, MCCAIN, ROCKEFELLER, DORGAN, and WARNER for their work on this very important issue. I remain hopeful that the final version of this FAA reauthorization bill will include a consensus agreement on this issue that allows the opportunity for direct service to our Nation's Capital for a number of our communities that are eager for that service. It is time for some expansion, but I think we can do it in a way that will not impact the quality of life in and around Washington National Airport.

I also wish to take a moment to commend my colleagues who have worked so hard on this bill. We are coming to the point when we will pass this bill out of the Senate. We have been able to accommodate the amendments that have been offered, both relevant to the bill as well as those that are outside the purview of the bill. It has been an open process. It has been a whole week, but we have been able to make slow progress and accommodate the amendments that have been offered, and I think we are at a very good place now with everyone's cooperation.

I mentioned that it has really been a very good experience working this bill because we have been able to work out some of the problems that are on both sides of the aisle, and I think in a constructive way.

With the passage of this bill, we will now go to work with the House. We are very different from the House in many respects, but in FAA reauthorization we are in many more respects very different from the House in that they have passed a bill and we are getting ready to pass a bill that is very different. So we still have a long way to go on this legislation. But I think we can do it. With the same cooperation we have seen in the Senate, I hope we can get a bill agreed to that the Senate will approve as well as the House.

I thank Senator ROCKEFELLER and his staff. They have been very diligent in this process. As I said, we have worked since 2007 to get this bill done. I think we are in a very good position now. Ellen Doneski has been great, his chief of staff of the committee; James Reid, Gael Sullivan, Rich Swayze, Jim Conneely, and Adam Duffey on Senator ROCKEFELLER's staff are to be commended.

Senator DORGAN, the chairman of the aviation subcommittee, has been great. I appreciate all he has done on this bill to keep it moving, to work with both Senator ROCKEFELLER and myself and Senator DEMINT. I appreciate Senator DORGAN's work and his commitment to this. When he leaves the Senate at the end of the year, I hope he will have this significant FAA reauthorization as one of his achievements he can claim. His staffer, Margaret McCarthy, has been also very helpful.

Senator DEMINT is the ranking member of the aviation subcommittee, and he, too, has been very constructive in this effort, moving the bill forward along with his staff and Tom Jones, who has really helped move the ball forward on this bill that is right out of their subcommittee.

On my staff, Jarrod Thompson has been wonderful. He knows this issue backward and forward and has worked on many of these aviation reauthorizations through the years on the Commerce Committee. I look to him for the knowledge he has gained over the years in all facets of FAA, including safety, NextGen, and all of the relevant issues that come under this subcommittee and this bill. My chief of staff for the committee, Ann Begeman, has been solid as a rock, helping to move the ball forward, going through the different issues and settling many of them. She has been great, as well as Dan Neumann; Patrick Mullane, also in my office, who does all of my transportation work; Brian Hendricks, the general counsel of the Commerce Committee on our side, the ranking general counsel; and Matt Acock, my legislative director, who also is going to be leaving in a few weeks. This is something he has worked on and he knows about as much as any of us, and he has done a great job as well.

Having said all of that, I thank the distinguished chairman and look forward to having a vote in just a few minutes, as soon as we dispose of the Ensign amendment and move forward to final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what does the amendment do?

Mr. ENSIGN. The amendment allows any carrier which currently has slots at DCA to convert flights now serving large hub airports inside the perimeter into flights serving any airport outside the perimeter.

This would mean that more passengers travelling from the West could fly into and out of National, avoiding the inconvenience and additional expense associated with getting into the city from Dulles.

Mr. KYL. Does the amendment add any flights to DCA?

Mr. ENSIGN. The amendment does not reduce the number of flights between DCA and small cities within the 1,250-mile perimeter; it does not affect the slot regulations at DCA; it does not increase the number of allowable flight operations at the airport; and it does not impact the small and medium size airports inside the perimeter.

Rather, the amendment is a reasonable pro-competition solution that gives tourists and business travelers from around the nation another option for visiting the nation's Capital.

Mr. KYL. How many flights at DCA are currently exempted from the perimeter rule?

Mr. ENSIGN. There are only a dozen nonstop flights between Ronald Reagan National Airport and the entire western United States. To put that number in perspective, that is 12 beyond the perimeter flights at DCA out of approximately 400 flights daily. The beyond the perimeter flights represent just 3 percent of all daily, domestic operations at DCA.

Mr. KYL. Does Dulles need to be protected by the perimeter rule?

Mr. ENSIGN. No. In 1962, Dulles only served approximately 52,000 passengers. Today, however, Dulles is thriving. In 2009, the airport served approximately 23 million passengers. According to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, ''Dulles has emerged as one of the fastest growing airports in the world and a major East Coast gateway for domestic and international travelers as well as cargo activities.''

Mr. KYL. Is there any legislative language to support amending the DCA perimeter rule?

Mr. ENSIGN. Yes, the Wright amendment of 1979 was a Federal law restricting flights at Dallas' Love Field Airport. It originally limited most nonstop flights from Love Field to destinations within Texas and neighboring States. In 2006, Congress passed the Wright Amendment Reform Act, which issued a full repeal of the Love Field perimeter rule with conditions. Lifting the restrictions at Love Field gave the traveling public more flight options, cut prices, and made traveling more efficient.

Mr. KYL. How does the Ensign amendment affect service to small and medium hub airports inside the perimeter?

Mr. ENSIGN. The slot conversion provision ensures that service to small and medium hub airports within the perimeter would not be affected. There is no restriction, however, on converting a flight that currently serves a large hub airport within the perimeter to a small or medium hub airport beyond the perimeter. So, presumably the Ensign amendment could expand service to small and medium hub airports beyond the perimeter.

Mr. KYL. Does the Ensign amendment increase slot allocations at DCA?

Mr. ENSIGN. No. The number of flights currently serving DCA remains the same. Residents around the airport will not hear an increase in noise from takeoffs and landings and will not see larger planes operating at DCA. The only change is that a few of the planes would have a different destination.

Mr. KYL. Do you intend to withdraw your amendment?

Mr. ENSIGN. Yes, because Senator DORGAN and our other colleagues have agreed to address the DCA perimeter rule as the FAA reauthorization process moves forward.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong concerns over efforts to expand service at Washington-Reagan National Airport—National. I would first like to remind my colleagues that this Congress passed legislation in 1986 to create the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority so that a professional group of aviation experts would manage both National and Dulles airports. The Airports Authority has done its job well: Dulles has blossomed as an international gateway to the region and National remains an efficiently run airport.

I recognize the value of National Airport and the critical role it plays in serving our Nation's Capital. It is a key component of the transportation system in this region and it provides excellent access to the rest of the country for my colleagues.

At the same time, the citizens of my State are the ones who are most directly affected by National's operations, and we must take a balanced approach in considering any changes at the airport. My constituents are the ones who have to deal with the consequences of any decision—additional aircraft noise, growing traffic congestion, and airport emissions that will affect them on a daily basis.

I appreciate that some of my colleagues want direct service from National to destinations in their State, but we must be even-handed in moving forward on this issue. We must avoid making wholesale changes that would have an impact on the important economic balance between National, Dulles and BWI. The airport authorities

that manage these airports, and the airlines that fly to them, have made long-term investment decisions based on the current rules. Dramatic changes to the rules would have a negative financial and economic impact on those airports and the communities that depend on them for economic growth.

In addition, any new capacity must be allowed through a fair process that does not favor any one airline or class of airlines. The limited new capacity needs to be allocated in an open and transparent process that benefits the most potential passengers, promotes competition and does not tip the scales for any airline or class of airlines.

I believe strongly that the rules currently in place at National Airport serve my state and our region well. I also recognize and respect the interests of the sponsors of the Ensign amendment and will work with Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Ranking Member HUTCHISON to try to address them in conference.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Expanding air service to metropolitan airports is always a contentious issue and I believe it is important that we give due consideration to local interests when considering the addition of slots at National Airport. Senators WARNER and WEBB have significant reservations about moving forward on any changes to existing policy at this time, and I have worked to address these concerns.

I believe the agreement reached between Senators DORGAN, WARNER, HUTCHISON, KYL, ENSIGN and DEMINT is a reasonable way forward. It will allow us to balance the desire for additional slots against the opposition from local residents.

Pursuing a more abrupt policy—change such as eliminating the perimeter rule altogether—has significant implications for competition, small community air service, and congestion and delay.

Going forward we need to make sure that there are not unintended consequences from such changes, and that service to small communities is preserved. Service to small communities is critical to me, and I cannot support any proposal that will adversely affect such service.

I also want to make the Federal Government's role in this process clear. Air carriers treat airport slots like it is their own property—it is not—it is a privilege. The air transportation system is operated for the benefit of the public interest—not the private interest. Too often the air carriers abuse the rights they have been granted—they schedule too many flights at congested airports and the result is gridlock. This is part of the reason why there is a cap on slots at National.

The air transportation network requires that capacity be managed carefully so the entire system functions efficiently. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to make sure it operates well, and I take this role seriously. If the air carriers cannot manage their slots in an effective manner the Federal Government will have to step in and do it for them.

Crafting a bipartisan bill to reauthorize the FAA has been a long and difficult journey. I recognize many of my colleagues have a strong interest in expanding service at National. I appreciate the work they have done to reach a compromise on this issue.

It is a balanced approach and I look forward to working with my colleagues in conference with the House that will achieve an appropriate agreement that is acceptable to everyone.

Mr. DORGAN. The issue of slots and the perimeter rule at Reagan National Airport has a long and very complicated history. Many of my colleagues have interests on both sides of this debate. I have been pleased to work closely with Senator WARNER, a member of the Aviation Subcommittee that I chair, on this matter, which has the most immediate impact on his constituents in Virginia. I can also sympathize with my colleagues from Western States who would like the opportunity for their constituents to be able to access National Airport.

The FAA reauthorization bill that was approved by the Senate Commerce Committee and is before the Senate today does not make any changes at National Airport. However, the House FAA reauthorization bill does increase the number of slots at National Airport. So we know that this is an issue that will need to be addressed in conference with the House and that the end result will be some change to the status quo.

But after spending more than 5 days on this FAA reauthorization bill in the Senate, I fear that a protracted debate on this contentious issue will derail the good bipartisan bill we are so close to passing. A number of my colleagues have filed amendments on slots and the perimeter rule. We understand that the Senate position needs to address access for citizens outside the current perimeter.

We cannot forget that this bill is about the safety and modernization of our nation's aviation system. This legislation takes important strides to bring our air traffic control system into the 21st century with the Next Generation Air Transportation System, NextGen. It includes provisions to ensure one high level of safety across the entire industry. After 11 extensions instead of a reauthorization bill that addresses these issues, it is time for the Senate to pass this legislation.

Mr. DEMINT. The current perimeter rule at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport stands as an artificial and antiquated barrier to competition and an impediment to choice. I am strongly supportive of this amendment and others that provide travelers with more choices in air travel.

The Ensign amendment provides a needed improvement by allowing carriers traveling out of DCA to respond to market demands and provide their customers with the air travel choices they demand most, instead of being confined by an antiquated statutory restriction. I am optimistic that as this bill moves forward that we can keep customer choice at the forefront and continue to open the skies to competition.

AMENDMENT NO. 3476, AS MODIFIED WITHDRAWN

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment No. 3476, as modified, be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized following the vote on the legislation to speak briefly about the FAA reauthorization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from West Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 3527

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, notwithstanding the order of March 19, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 3527 not be withdrawn; that it be considered when the managers' package is presented.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3469, 3488, 3492, 3494, 3511, 3479, AS MODIFIED; 3483, AS MODIFIED; 3506, AS MODIFIED; 3514, AS MODIFIED; 3520, AS MODIFIED; 3538, AS MODIFIED; 3543, 3527, AS MODIFIED; 3541, AS MODIFIED; 3539, AS MODIFIED; 3532, 3525, AS MODIFIED; AND 3534, AS MODIFIED

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, pursuant to the order of March 19 regarding a managers' package of amendments, I send to the desk the managers' package, with the other provisions of the order with respect to the amendments remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The managers' amendment at the desk is agreed to, and the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3469

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Clark County, Nevada, certain public land for the development of flood mitigation infrastructure for the Southern Nevada Supplemental Airport in the State of Nevada)

At the end of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 7___. LAND CONVEYANCE FOR SOUTHERN NEVADA SUPPLEMENTAL AIRPORT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COUNTY.—The term ''County'' means Clark County, Nevada.

(2) PUBLIC LAND.—The term ''public land'' means the land located at—

(A) sec. 23 and sec. 26, T. 26 S., R. 59 E., Mount Diablo Meridian;

(B) the NE ¼ and the N ½ of the SE ¼ of sec. 6, T. 25 S., R. 59 E., Mount Diablo Meridian, together with the SE ¼ of sec. 31, T. 24 S., R. 59 E., Mount Diablo Meridian; and

(C) sec. 8, T. 26 S., R. 60 E., Mount Diablo Meridian.

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

(b) LAND CONVEYANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date described in paragraph (2), subject to valid existing rights, and notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), the Secretary shall convey to the County, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the public land.

(2) DATE ON WHICH CONVEYANCE MAY BE MADE.—The Secretary shall not make the conveyance described in paragraph (1) until the later of the date on which the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration has—

(A) approved an airport layout plan for an airport to be located in the Ivanpah Valley; and

(B) with respect to the construction and operation of an airport on the site conveyed to the County pursuant to section 2(a) of the Ivanpah Valley Airport Public Lands Transfer Act (Public Law 106–362; 114 Stat. 1404), issued a record of decision after the preparation of an environmental impact statement or similar analysis required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(3) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the public land to be conveyed under paragraph (1) is withdrawn from—

(A) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(B) operation of the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws.

(4) USE.—The public land conveyed under paragraph (1) shall be used for the development of flood mitigation infrastructure for the Southern Nevada Supplemental Airport.

AMENDMENT NO. 3488

(Purpose: To allow aircraft owners and operators to accept reimbursement for voluntary medical transportation)

SEC. ———. CLARIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR VOLUNTEER PILOTS OPERATING CHARITABLE MEDICAL FLIGHTS.

In administering part 61.113(c) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall allow an aircraft owner or aircraft operator who has volunteered to provide transportation for an individual or individuals for medical purposes to accept reimbursement to cover all or part of the fuel costs associated with the operation from a volunteer pilot organization.

AMENDMENT NO. 3492

(Purpose: To provide a limited exemption from compliance with FAA and PHMSA standards for the air transportation within Alaska of cylinders of compressed oxygen, nitrous oxide, or other oxidizing gases without regard to the end use of the cylinders)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ———. CYLINDERS OF COMPRESSED OXYGEN, NITROUS OXIDE, OR OTHER OXIDIZING GASES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The transportation within Alaska of cylinders of compressed oxygen, nitrous oxide, or other oxidizing gases aboard aircraft shall be exempt from compliance with the requirements, under sections 173.302(f)(3) and (f)(4) and 173.304(f)(3) and (f)(4) of the Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration's regulations (49 CFR 173.302(f)(3) and (f)(4) and 173.304(f)(3) and (f)(4)), that oxidizing gases transported aboard aircraft be enclosed in outer packaging capable of passing the flame penetration and resistance test and the thermal resistance test, without regard to the end use of the cylinders, if—

(1) there is no other practical means of transportation for transporting the cylinders to their destination and transportation by ground or vessel is unavailable; and

(2) the transportation meets the requirements of subsection (b).

(b) EXEMPTION REQUIREMENTS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the transportation of cylinders of compressed oxygen, nitrous oxide, or other oxidizing gases aboard aircraft unless the following requirements are met:

(1) PACKAGING.—

(A) SMALLER CYLINDERS.—Each cylinder with a capacity of not more than 116 cubic feet shall be—

(i) fully covered with a fire or flame resistant blanket that is secured in place; and

(ii) placed in a rigid outer packaging or an ATA 300 Category 1 shipping container.

(B) LARGER CYLINDERS.—Each cylinder with a capacity of more than 116 cubic feet but not more than 281 cubic feet shall be—

(i) secured within a frame;

(ii) fully covered with a fire or flame resistant blanket that is secured in place; and

(iii) fitted with a securely attached metal cap of sufficient strength to protect the valve from damage during transportation.

(2) OPERATIONAL CONTROLS.—

(A) STORAGE; ACCESS TO FIRE EXTINGUISHERS.—Unless the cylinders are stored in a Class C cargo compartment or its equivalent on the aircraft, crew members shall have access to the cylinders and at least 2 fire extinguishers shall be readily available for use by the crew members.

(B) SHIPMENT WITH OTHER HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.—The cylinders may not be transported in the same aircraft with other hazardous materials other than Division 2.2 materials with no subsidiary risk, Class 9 materials, and ORM–D materials.

(3) AIRCRAFT REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) AIRCRAFT TYPE.—The transportation shall be provided only aboard a passenger-carrying aircraft or a cargo aircraft.

(B) PASSENGER-CARRYING AIRCRAFT.—

(i) SMALLER CYLINDERS ONLY.—A cylinder with a capacity of more than 116 cubic feet may not be transported aboard a passenger-carrying aircraft.

(ii) MAXIMUM NUMBER.—Unless transported in a Class C cargo compartment or its equivalent, no more than 6 cylinders in each cargo compartment may be transported aboard a passenger-carrying aircraft.

(C) CARGO AIRCRAFT.—A cylinder may not be transported aboard a cargo aircraft unless it is transported in a Class B cargo compartment or a Class C cargo compartment or its equivalent.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Terms used in this section shall have the meaning given those terms in parts 106, 107, and 171 through 180 of the Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration's regulations (49 CFR parts 106, 107, and 171–180).

AMENDMENT NO. 3494

(Purpose: To correct an error related to Amtrak security in the enrollment of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010)

At the end of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 723. TECHNICAL CORRECTION.

Section 159(b)(2)(C) of title I of division A of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010, is amended by striking clauses (i) and (ii) and inserting the following:

''(i) requiring inspections of any container containing a firearm or ammunition; and

''(ii) the temporary suspension of firearm carriage service if credible intelligence information indicates a threat related to the national rail system or specific routes or trains.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3511

(Purpose: To require a semiannual report on the status of the Greener Skies project)

On page 98, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 325. SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON STATUS OF GREENER SKIES PROJECT.

(a) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the strategy of the Administrator for implementing, on an accelerated basis, the NextGen operational capabilities produced by the Greener Skies project, as recommended in the final report of the RTCA NextGen Mid-Term Implementation Task Force that was issued on September 9, 2009.

(b) SUBSEQUENT REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the Administrator submits to Congress the report required by subsection (a) and not less frequently than once every 180 days thereafter until September 30, 2011, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the progress of the Administrator in carrying out the strategy described in the report submitted under subsection (a).

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A timeline for full implementation of the strategy described in the report submitted under subsection (a).

(B) A description of the progress made in carrying out such strategy.

(C) A description of the challenges, if any, encountered by the Administrator in carrying out such strategy.

AMENDMENT NO. 3479, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To allow for the simultaneous inclusion of more than one General Aviation airport in the Military Airport Program)

On page 282, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

SEC. 219. DESIGNATION OF FORMER MILITARY AIRPORTS.

Section 47118(g) is amended by striking ''one'' and inserting ''three'' in its place.

AMENDMENT NO. 3483, AS MODIFIED

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 2 AIRPORT SUSTAINABILITY PLANNING WORKING GROUP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish an airport sustainability working group to assist the Administrator with issues pertaining to airport sustainability practices.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Working Group shall be comprised of not more than 15 members including.—

(1) the Administrator

(2) 5 member organizations representing aviation interests including: (A) an organization representing airport operators; (B) an organization representing airport employees; (C) an organization representing air carriers; (D) an organization representing airport development and operations experts; (E) a labor organization representing aviation employees.

(3) 9 airport chief executive officers which shall include: (A) at least one from each of the FAA Regions; (B) at least 1 large hub; (C) at least 1 medium hub; (D) at least 1 small hub; (E) at least 1 non hub; (E) at least 1 general aviation airport.

(c) FUNCTIONS.—

(1) develop consensus-based best practices and metrics for the sustainable design, construction, planning, maintenance, and operation of an airport that comply with the guidelines prescribed by the Administrator;

(2) develop standards for a consensus-based rating system based on the aforementioned best practices, metrics, and ratings; and

(3) develop standards for a voluntary ratings process, based on the aforementioned best practices, metrics, and ratings

(4) examine and submit recommendations for the industry's next steps with regard to sustainability

(d) DETERMINATION.—The Administrator shall provide assurance that the best practices developed by the working group under paragraph (a) are not in conflict with any federal aviation or federal, state or local environmental regulation.

(e) UNPAID POSITION.—Working Group members shall serve at their own expense and receive no salary, reimbursement of travel expenses, or other compensation from the Federal Government.

(f) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Working Group under this section.

(g) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment the Working Group shall submit a report to the Administrator containing the best practices and standards contained in paragraph (c). After receiving the report, the Administrator may publish such best practices in order to disseminate the information to support the sustainable design, construction, planning, maintenance, and operation of airports.

(h) No funds may be authorized to carry out this provision.

AMENDMENT NO. 3506, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To ensure that all consumers are able to easily and fairly compare airfares and other costs applicable to tickets for air transportation, including all taxes and fees)

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 407. NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO THE SALE OF AIRLINE TICKETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Office of Aviation Consumer Protection and Enforcement of the Department of Transportation shall establish rules to ensure that all consumers are able to easily and fairly compare airfares and charges paid when purchasing tickets for air transportation, including all taxes and fees.

(b) NOTICE OF TAXES AND FEES APPLICABLE TO TICKETS FOR AIR TRANSPORTATION.—Section 41712, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) NOTICE OF TAXES AND FEES APPLICABLE TO TICKETS FOR AIR TRANSPORTATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be an unfair or deceptive practice under subsection (a) for an air carrier, foreign air carrier, or ticket agent to sell a ticket for air transportation on the Internet unless the air carrier, foreign air carrier, or ticket agent, as the case may be—

''(A) displays information with respect to the taxes and fees described in paragraph (2), including the amount and a description of each such tax or fee, in reasonable proximity to the price listed for the ticket; and

''(B) provides to the purchaser of the ticket information with respect to the taxes and fees described in paragraph (2), including the amount and a description of each such tax or fee, before requiring the purchaser to provide any personal information, including the name, address, phone number, e-mail address, or credit card information of the purchaser.

''(2) TAXES AND FEES DESCRIBED.—The taxes and fees described in this paragraph are all taxes, fees, and charges applicable to a ticket for air transportation, consisting of—

''(A) all taxes, fees, charges, and surcharges included in the price paid by a purchaser for the ticket, including fuel surcharges and surcharges relating to peak or holiday travel; and

''(B) any fees for baggage, seating assignments; and

''(C) operational services that are charged when the ticket is purchased.''

(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out subsection (d) of section 41712 of title 49, United States Code, as added by subsection (b) of this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 3514, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose; To include the modernization, renovation, and repairs of buildings to meet the criteria for being high-performance green buildings as airport development)

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 219. INCLUSION OF MEASURES TO IMPROVE THE EFFICIENCY OF AIRPORT BUILDINGS IN AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.

Section 47101(a) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (12), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (13), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(14) that the airport improvement program should be administered to allow measures to improve the efficiency of airport buildings to be included in airport improvement projects, such as measures designed to meet one or more of the criteria for being a high-performance green building set forth in section 401(13) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17061(13)), if any significant increase in upfront project costs from any such measure is justified by expected savings over the lifecycle of the project.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3520, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To develop a monitoring system for flight service specialist staffing and training under service contracts for flight service stations)

On page 246, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

(d) ALASKA FLIGHT SERVICE STATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in conjunction with flight service station personnel, shall submit a report to Congress on the future of flight service stations in Alaska, which includes—

(1) an analysis of the number of flight service specialists needed, the training needed by such personnel, and the need for a formal training and hiring program for such personnel;

(2) a schedule for necessary inspection, upgrades, and modernization of stations and equipment; and

(3) a description of the interaction between flight service stations operated by the Administration and flight service stations operated by contractors.

AMENDMENT NO. 3538, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To conduct audits of certain small airports to analyze the accrual of annual passenger enplanements and to modify the method for apportioning amounts to airports for airport improvements)

On page 10, after the matter following line 5, insert the following:

(c) PASSENGER ENPLANEMENT REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall prepare a report on every airport in the United States that reported between 10,000 and 15,000 passenger enplanements during each of the 2 most recent years for which such data is available.

(2) REPORT OBJECTIVES.—In carrying out the report under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall document the methods used by each subject airport to reach the 10,000 passenger enplanement threshold, including whether airports subsidize commercial flights to reach such threshold.

(3) REVIEW.—The Inspector General of the Department of Transportation shall review the process of the Administrator in developing the report under paragraph (1).

(4) REPORT—The Administrator shall submit the report prepared under paragraph (1) to Congress and the Secretary of Transportation.

AMENDMENT NO. 3543

(Purpose: To authorize the FAA to provide financial assistance for NextGen equipage of aircraft)

At the appropriate place in title III, insert the following:

SEC. ——. FINANCIAL INCENTIVES FOR NEXTGEN EQUIPAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration may enter into agreements to fund the costs of equipping aircraft with communications, surveillance, navigation, and other avionics to enable NextGen air traffic control capabilities.

(b) FUNDING INSTRUMENT.—The Administrator may make grants or other instruments authorized under section 106(l)(6) of title 49, United States Code, to carry out subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 3527, AS MODIFIED

On page 84, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

SEC. 319. REPORT ON FUNDING FOR NEXTGEN TECHNOLOGY.

Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall submit to Congress a report that contains—

(1) a financing proposal that—

(A) uses innovative methods to fully fund the development and implementation of technology for the Next Generation Air Transportation System in a manner that does not increase the Federal deficit; and

(B) takes into consideration opportunities for involvement by public-private partnerships; and

(C) recommends creative financing proposals other than user fees or higher taxes and

(2) recommendations with respect to how the Administrator and Congress can provide operational benefits, such as benefits relating to preferred airspace, routings, or runway access, for all aircraft, including air carriers and general aviation, that equip their aircraft with technology necessary for the operation of the Next Generation Air Transportation System before the date by which the Administrator requires the use of such technology.

AMENDMENT NO. 3541, AS MODIFIED

At the end of title V, insert the following:

SEC. 564. STUDY OF AIR QUALITY IN AIRCRAFT CABINS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall initiate a study of air quality in aircraft cabins to—

(1) assess bleed air quality on the full range of commercial aircraft operating in the United States;

(2) identify oil-based contaminants, hydraulic fluid toxins, and other air toxins that appear in cabin air and measure the quantity and prevalence, or absence of those toxins through a comprehensive sampling program;

(3) determine the specific amount and duration of toxic fumes present in aircraft cabins that constitutes a health risk to passengers;

(4) develop a systematic reporting standard for smoke and fume events in aircraft cabins;

(5) identify the potential health risks to individuals exposed to toxic fumes during flight;

(6) determine the extent to which the installation of sensors and air filters on commercial aircraft would provide a public health benefit; and

(b) AUTHORITY TO MONITOR AIR IN AIRCRAFT CABINS.—For purposes of conducting the study required by subsection (a), the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall require domestic air carriers to allow air quality monitoring on their aircraft in a manner that imposes no significant costs on the carrier and does not interfere with the normal operation of the aircraft.

AMENDMENT NO. 3539, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To apportion amounts to airports for airport improvements in proportion to the amounts of air traffic at the airports and to limit aggregate apportionments to the aggregate amount apportioned for fiscal year 2009)

At the end of Title II, add the following:

SEC. ___. STUDY ON APPORTIONING AMOUNTS FOR AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT IN PROPORTION TO AMOUNTS OF AIR TRAFFIC.

(a) STUDY AND REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall—

(1) complete a study on the feasibility and advisability of apportioning amounts under section 47114(c)(1) of title 49, United States Code, to the sponsor of each primary airport for each fiscal year an amount that bears the same ratio to the amount subject to the apportionment for fiscal year 2009 as the number of passenger boardings at the airport during the prior calendar year bears to the aggregate of all passenger boardings at all primary airports during that calendar year; and

(2) submit to Congress a report on the study completed under paragraph (1).

(b) REPORT CONTENTS.—The report required by subsection (a)(2) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the study carried out under subsection. (a)(1).

(2) The findings of the Administrator with respect to such study.

(3) A list of each sponsor of a primary airport that received an amount under section 47114(c)(1) of title 49, United States Code, in 2009.

(4) For each sponsor listed in accordance with paragraph (3), the following:

(A) The amount such sponsor received, if any, in 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009 under such section 47114(c)(1).

(B) An explanation of how the amount awarded to such sponsor was determined.

(C) The average number of air passenger flights serviced each month at the airport of such sponsor in 2009.

(D) The number of enplanements for air passenger transportation at such airport in 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009.

AMENDMENT NO. 3532

(Purpose: To set the fee to be paid by commercial air tour operators that conduct commercial air tour operations over a national park at an amount sufficient to offset all of the costs incurred by the Federal Government to develop air tour management plans for national parks)

On page 250, strike line 12 and all that follows through page 251, line 18, and insert the following:

(e) COLLECTION OF FEES FROM AIR TOUR OPERATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall assess a fee in an amount determined by the Secretary under paragraph (2) on a commercial air tour operator conducting commercial air tour operations over a national park.

(2) AMOUNT OF FEE.—In determining the amount of the fee assessed under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall collect sufficient revenue, in the aggregate, to pay for the expenses incurred by the Federal Government to develop air tour management plans for national parks.

(3) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PAY FEE.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall revoke the operating authority of a commercial air tour operator conducting commercial air tour operations over any national park, including the Grand Canyon National Park, that has not paid the fee assessed by the Secretary under paragraph (1) by the date that is 180 days after the date on which the Secretary determines the fee shall be paid.

(f) FUNDING FOR AIR TOUR MANAGEMENT PLANS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall use the amounts collected under subsection (e) to develop air tour management plans under section 40128(b) of title 49, United States Code, for the national parks the Secretary determines would most benefit from such a plan.

AMENDMENT NO. 3525, AS MODIFIED

At the end of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 723. PLAN FOR FLYING SCIENTIFIC INSTRUMENTS ON COMMERCIAL FLIGHTS.

(a) PLAN DEVELOPMENT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with interested representatives of the aviation industry and other relevant agencies, shall develop a plan and process to allow Federal agencies to fly scientific instruments on commercial flights with airlines who volunteer, for the purpose of taking measurements to improve weather forecasting.

AMENDMENT NO. 3534, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To amend section 40128 of title 49, United States Code, relating to air tour management plans at national parks)

On page 246, strike lines 16 through 18 and insert the following:

(D) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (A)—

(aa) by striking ", in cooperation with" and inserting "and"; and

(bb) by striking "The air tour" and all that follows; and

(II) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C);

(III) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

"(B) PROCESS AND APPROVAL.—The Federal Aviation Administration has sole authority to control airspace over the United States. The National Park Service has the sole responsibility for conserving the scenery and natural resources in National Parks and providing for the enjoyment of the National Parks unimpaired for future generations. Each air tour management plan shall be—

"(i) developed through a public process that complies with paragraph (4); and

"(ii) approved by the Administrator and the Director."; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

"(D) EXCEPTION.—An application to begin commercial air tour operations at Crater Lake National Park may be denied without the establishment of an air tour management plan by the Director of the National Park Service if the Director determines that such operations would unacceptably impact park resources or visitor experiences."; and

(ii) in paragraph (4)(C), by striking "National Park Service" and inserting "Department of the Interior".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, is agreed to, and the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The clerk will read the bill for the third time.

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

The bill having been read the third time, the question is on passage of the bill, as amended.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from New Mexico, (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico, (Mr. UDALL) would vote "yea."

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 61 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Akaka	Ensign	McCaskill
Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Barrasso	Feingold	Menendez
Baucus	Feinstein	Merkley
Bayh	Franken	Mikulski
Begich	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Bennet	Graham	Murray
Bingaman	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Gregg	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Hagan	Pryor
Brown (MA)	Harkin	Reed
Brown (OH)	Hatch	Reid
Brownback	Hutchison	Risch
Bunning	Inhofe	Roberts
Burr	Inouye	Rockefeller
Burris	Johanns	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson	Sessions
Cardin	Kaufman	Shaheen
Carper	Kerry	Shelby
Casey	Klobuchar	Snowe
Chambliss	Kohl	Specter
Coburn	Kyl	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Lautenberg	Thune
Conrad	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Corker	LeMieux	Vitter
Cornyn	Levin	Voinovich
Crapo	Lieberman	Warner
Dodd	Lincoln	Webb
Dorgan	Lugar	Whitehouse
Durbin	McCain	Wyden

NOT VOTING—7

Bennett	Isakson	Wicker
Byrd	Sanders	
DeMint	Udall (NM)	

The bill (H.R. 1586), as amended, was passed, as follows:

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title amendment at the desk is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3555) was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: ''An Act to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide for modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.''

The Senator from West Virginia.

CORRECTED AMENDMENT NO. 3479, AS MODIFIED

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adoption of amendment No. 3479, as modified, it be corrected to reflect that the instruction line was modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3479), as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To allow for the simultaneous inclusion of more than one General Aviation airport in the Military Airport Program)

At the end of title II, insert the following:

SEC. 219. DESIGNATION OF FORMER MILITARY AIRPORTS.

Section 47118(g) is amended by striking ''one'' and inserting ''three'' in its place.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, the vote just taken was unanimous, which is interesting. We were able to work on this for 5 days here on the floor of the Senate. But I also want to say we always talk about good staff work. We do have an exceptionally fine staff at the Commerce Committee and I want to say that Senator ROCKEFELLER's work and Senator HUTCHISON's work was so important in order to move us in this direction to get this completed.

I think they would agree as well that the staff director Ellen Doneski, deputy staff director James Reid, Gael Sullivan, Rich Swayze on the Aviation Subcommittee staff, and I know Senator HUTCHISON's staff, Ann Begeman, staff director, Jarrod Thompson, and Tom Jones for Senator DEMINT, is a fine staff.

The reason I wanted to say a word about this piece of legislation—I just got off an airplane myself, just came back from North Dakota. But I wanted to say that this piece of legislation, while not getting the attention that some other pieces of legislation are getting these days, notably health care, among others, is a very important piece of legislation, and it has some very important critical changes that I think will be beneficial and will save lives. I wanted to mention a couple of them.

No. 1, for the irritants that exist in air travel these days, and there are a lot of them, this includes the Passenger Bill of Rights—a lot of people probably do not know that, but just common sense, sound thinking about what are the rights of passengers here.

We worked with the airlines and the passenger groups and so on. This includes the Passenger Bill of Rights, the 3-hour limit. If you are on an airline some place and they want to have you sit on the end of a runway or on the tarmac for 5 or 6 hours, it is not going to happen, not when this legislation passes. We have a 3-hour limitation. That is just the start of it. But the Passenger Bill of Rights is important.

Most important to me are the safety issues. I held a number of hearings on safety in our subcommittee, and I appreciate very much the work of Senator ROCKEFELLER. He was very interested in making sure that we pursue these safety issues in order that they can become a part of the FAA reauthorization bill.

A significant part of this bill is modernization of the air traffic control system. But this bill also is about aviation safety, and so I want to mention the safety provisions. We held a number of hearings to try to understand what could we learn from the tragedy that occurred at the Colgan crash in Buffalo, NY. We learned a lot, and a lot of things that were frankly, to me, very troubling. We have addressed a number of those provisions in this legislation.

Pilot training and experience. Frankly, were it not for the families of the victims of the Colgan crash who have witnessed here at every opportunity, in every circumstance, where there has been a hearing or something in which aviation safety was discussed, they were here pushing and prodding and asking the right questions.

We do advance the interests of aviation training and experience in this legislation. The FAA must revisit flight and duty-time limitations to address pilot fatigue in this legislation.

We do not yet and have not addressed the commuting issue which I think is an issue, but we have not yet addressed that, and could not in this bill, but that will continue to be an issue we will work on. We have an FAA-required report to the Congress now, annually every year, of all of the safety recommendations from the NTSB, and which have been followed and which have not.

This issue of the most-wanted list of safety recommendations, which in some cases has been on the list for 10 and 15 years, it is unforgivable that that has happened. We are not going to let that happen again.

Obviously, we prohibit the use of wireless communications devices and laptop computers in the cockpit that are not used for the purpose of the operation of the airplane. When I say obviously, an airplane that overflies its destination with a couple of pilots working on laptops, overflying the destination by 150 miles or so, does not make much sense to me that we do not have a prohibition in the FAA manuals to prohibit in every circumstance the use of these kinds of personal wireless communications devices for personal use in the cockpit during flight.

We enhance safety oversight of foreign repair stations, which is very important. It mandates two inspections per year by the FAA. A lot of people do not understand that a lot of the maintenance now is being done in some cases overseas, and in other cases, they are being done, farmed out and contracted out, to someone outside of the airline itself.

We require the disclosure of the airline operating flights. When a consumer buys a ticket on an airline, we want them to understand who is the company that is carrying them, not what is the brand on the airline, but what company is this, so they have some sense of who is in charge of that flight.

Access to all pilots records. You know regarding the captain in the Colgan flight, the CEO of Colgan Air said: Had I known the failures of that captain in certain exams and tests along the way, in certifying these various licenses, we would not have hired that captain. And yet the company did not know. That will not be the case in the future.

Those are just some, not all, of the safety issues. They are very important. I am convinced that lives will be saved. I do not suggest this is the entire set of issues that has to be resolved. More remains to be done and we will remain on the case to do that. We will continue even now with additional hearings.

Finally, I want to say on the issue of modernization, this too is so important. It relates to safety, but it relates to other things. It relates to the reduced use of fuel, more direct routing, better timelines for trips for passengers, because they will get to their destination more quickly; less spacing between airplanes in the sky. That is because, rather than fly to the old ground-based radar system, where you know about where an airline is, you only know about where it is when the transponder flashes a dot on that screen in front of the air traffic controller, and the next 7 or so seconds that airplane is somewhere else.

Well, using the GPS system which all of us, or at least some of us—I do not have, but many people use it in their car, use it on their cell phone. The common use of the GPS is all over the world these days, except we do not use it, by and large, for commercial airlines, and we should.

Air traffic control modernization means ground-based systems that need to be built, it means protocols that have to be developed, it means equipage in the cockpit. But we must get there not in 15 or 20 years, we must get there soon. So this piece of legislation dramatically advances those timelines.

Some talk about waiting and finishing this job in 15 years. We substantially truncated the time to say: No, let's get this done. So those are the significant issues.

Again, I want to thank Margaret McCarthy on my staff, along with the other staff I have previously mentioned.

I especially again want to say, I have served on the Commerce Committee for

a good many years, and we have worked on a lot of issues. It has such a wide jurisdiction, a wide range of interests and issues. Senator ROCKEFELLER assumed control of the Commerce Committee just this Congress, and I think has done an extraordinary job. I appreciate his leadership. I appreciate the fact that he gave us not only directions but the reins to work in the subcommittee, and then he and the ranking member worked very hard at the full committee to put this piece of legislation together.

It is rare indeed in this day and age to find a piece of legislation that passes the Senate in a record vote, that is a piece of legislation of great consequence, that deals with many issues, some of them controversial, to be passed by the Senate with no negative votes at all. Think of that. No negative votes cast on this bill today.

Would not it be nice if we could see more of that kind of togetherness, coming together on public policy that all of us think is good for this country and its future.

I wanted to again say how proud I am of this legislation and how important it is to this country. I am pleased that this is the next step, an important step, and then we would conference with the House and bring a conference report back, and it will be signed by the President. We will have all done something to advance safety and modernization in aviation in this country; not just for commercial aviation, but for general aviation, which is an increasingly important part of our aviation system.

Madam President, I also want to take this opportunity to say a few words about the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise—DBE—Program and the Airport Concessions Disadvantaged Business Enterprise—ACDBE—Program, or the DBE Programs. As the Senate is well aware, this program was originally enacted by Congress to level the playing field for minority and women contractors working in airport related businesses.

While we have made considerable progress toward that goal over the years, unfortunately a good deal more work remains. The Commerce Committee examined disparity studies documenting the existence of discrimination in public contracting while considering and drafting FAA reauthorization legislation. We concluded that the DBE Program remains necessary to thwart ongoing discrimination and determined that several improvements to the DBE Programs were necessary. I am pleased that the FAA Reauthorization bill includes provisions to adjust the personal net worth calculation for inflation, to require certification training of officials involved in the review of DBE applications, to prohibit excess bonding requirements, and to ensure that retirement savings are not included in the personal net worth calculation.

The evidence of discrimination included in disparities studies makes clear that discrimination against minority and women owned businesses is still a serious problem in airport-related businesses and beyond. This is unacceptable. The DBE and ACDBE Programs are the only current safeguard against the problems of business discrimination in the airport context. I am encouraged that this bill includes provisions to ensure the continued health of the program and to promote a level playing field within the industry.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SERGEANT JONATHAN J. RICHARDSON

Mr. PRYOR. Madam President, it is with a heavy heart that today I honor U.S. Army Sgt. Jonathan J. Richardson from Bald Knob, AR, and pay tribute to his life and service to our country.

Sergeant Richardson was a fire support specialist who lost his life from wounds suffered when his unit came under fire in Khost Province, Afghanistan. He was a member of the C Company, 1st Battalion, 187th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division, and had previously served in Iraq with the same unit. He was never afraid to go where the action was, knowing that the line of fire was where he was needed most.

Sergeant Richardson served both tours with courage and distinction, receiving awards including the Army Commendation Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Army Good Conduct Medal, and National Defense Service Medal.

Sergeant Richardson graduated from Bald Knob High School in 2004, where he was a talented student and excelled on the football team. His family and friends described him as an honorable man, devoted to his wife and family. These qualities were readily apparent on the battlefield, where his comrades called him ''the kind of leader soldiers strive to emulate.'' He was committed to serving others, and while he could have done a great many things with his young life, he chose to serve our Nation in the military. This commitment to serve is, to me, what makes Sergeant Richardson a true hero.

My thoughts and prayers are with Sergeant Richardson's wife Rachel, parents, Sharon and Jeffery, and all those who loved him during this heartbreaking time.

As John 15:13 states: ''Greater love has no one than this, that one lay down his life for his friends.'' Sergeant Richardson had the greatest love for his country, and his country will always remember his selfless service.

HEALTH CARE

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I rise to bring attention to the crucial role of health care professionals in providing quality health care across our Nation. Other than being a father, grandfather, and husband nothing has been more personally satisfying for me than meeting and caring for patients. As a practicing physician I have seen firsthand the importance of each and every health care practitioner—not just doctors and nurses—in meeting this country's diverse health care needs. I am thankful for the contribution that dedicated health professionals have made to not just my medical practice, but all of our communities.

These professionals are found not only in hospitals and doctor's offices, but everywhere from local schools to athletic training clinics, long-term care facilities to rehabilitation centers, and providing loving care in hospices and private homes. There are more than 100 distinct allied health professions including respiratory therapists, music therapists, athletic trainers, clinical laboratory scientists, radiologic technologists, medical assistants and many others. They provide expert care in a number of therapeutic, diagnostic and preventive services in a multitude of settings. These professionals practice expertise in disease prevention and control, dietary and nutritional services, mental and physical health promotion, rehabilitation, and health systems management. Approximately 6 million individuals are currently serving in allied health professionals, representing about 60 percent of the healthcare workforce. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 10 of the 20 fastest growing occupations for 2008—2018 are in the health professions.

As Congress continues to engage in a national debate on health care, I have consistently been offering patient-centered solutions that would allow individuals to access care tailored to their individual needs. Consumer choice, not government coercion, has made goods and services that were once scarce affordable and accessible. For instance, in the past 18 months the number of unique iPhone applications available to consumers has gone from 500 to more than 140,000—with 3 billion applications downloaded. If patients were empowered to take control of their health care spending, it would enable health care professionals to more freely exercise their immense talents—no

doubt putting Apple and the iPhone to shame.

Regardless of the outcome of the health care debate, these health care professionals will continue to make a difference in their patients' lives. I want to personally thank, and express my support for, these vital health care professionals. Our system could not function without their tireless efforts. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing this important group of individuals.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I am honored today to recognize the League of Women Voters for their 90 years of voter education and activism, and specifically want to congratulate the League of Women Voters of Northwest Riverside. County.

In 1920, when passage of the 19th amendment appeared to be imminent, members of the National American Woman Suffrage Association met to form the League of Women Voters. Carrie Chapman Catt first proposed the creation of a League to ''finish the fight'' and work to end all discrimination against women. While initially concerned with the status and rights of women, the League of Women Voters gradually expanded its interests to include issues affecting the whole community. I am sure suffragettes would be pleased that every issue became a women's issue.

Today, the League works at all levels of government to address a wide variety of concerns including health care, education, climate change, land use, ethics and election and campaign finance reform. Whether through voter guides or public forums, the League gives voters the information they need to play a critical role in our community and country.

For nearly 57 years, the League of Women Voters of Northwest Riverside County has made a difference—championing countless public policy challenges, hosting candidate forums and public information meetings, and distributing thousands of voter information guides.

The suffragettes who started the movement to give women the right to vote did not know if they would succeed. But, they persevered. Today, with over 850 local Leagues, 50 State Leagues and the National League, the League of Women Voters remains just as committed to improving our democracy and the quality of life for all our citizens.

Please join me in honoring the League of Women Voters for its dedication to the ideals of our great Nation.

CONFIRMATION OF JOHN G. LEVI

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, last Friday the Senate finally confirmed John G. Levi to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation. His nomination has been pending on the Senate Executive Calendar since October 21 when reported favorably by the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee.

Mr. Levi is a partner in the Chicago office of Sidley Austin LLP where he has spent more than 25 years specializing in employment litigation, executive compensation, and labor-management relations. Despite the demands of his legal practice, he has always found time to give back to the community.

In addition to leading his law firm's adopt-a-school program, where he oversees lawyers and staff involved in mentoring activities in public schools, Mr. Levi has been involved in juvenile justice and access of justice issues, serving on both the Cook County Citizens' Committee for the Juvenile courts, and the board of the Jane Addams Juvenile Court Foundation. He also serves on the advisory board for the Northwestern University Law School Center on Wrongful Convictions. He is the immediate past president and longtime trustee of the Francis W. Parker School in Chicago. He is the recipient of the 2004 Abraham Lincoln Marovitz ''Lend A Hand'' volunteer award, and was awarded a honorary diploma by the Parker School in 2003.

Considering Mr. Levi's strong commitment to public service, it is not surprising that President Obama has appointed him to the Board that oversees the vital work of the Legal Services Corporation, LSC. The LSC is the Federal agency that coordinates provisions to ensure that low-income Americans have access to adequate legal representation. The corporation employs lawyers who are experts in areas such as health care, housing, Social Security, consumer problems, welfare, and employment. These immensely important issues affect millions of Americans each year; many of whom are unable to afford legal assistance when they need it most. I know that in my own State of Vermont, LSC has provided legal assistance to many low income people in such matters and that local legal aid lawyers rely extensively on their national support centers.

The Legal Services Corporation plays a critical role in ensuring that justice is carried out in a manner consistent with the Constitution's promise, and when justice is served fairly, it benefits us all and strengthens the integrity of our legal system.

I will always remember the important service to the country provided by his father, Attorney General Edward H. Levi, at a difficult time in our Nation's history. His is a family of outstanding lawyers. They have made a significant contribution and make a significant difference to the people who need the protection of the law. John Levi is a strong addition to LSC's board of directors. I congratulate him and his family on his confirmation. I look forward to working with him.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM H. SATTERFIELD

• Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, today I pay tribute to William (Bill) Satterfield, counsel for Balch & Bingham LLP in Birmingham, AL.

Prior to his position at Balch and Bingham, Bill served as the general counsel of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and as the Associate and Deputy Solicitor of the U.S. Department of Interior in Washington, DC.

Bill has extensive experience with environmental, natural resources, energy, and public utility law on both the Federal and State levels and has been fighting the good fight for the State of Alabama on a myriad of environmental issues for over three decades. He has used his knowledge of the laws, regulations, and political climate to provide direction on environmental and natural resource issues to individuals, small businesses, and large corporations in Alabama.

In a big part of this work, he has been a great advocate for port and waterways issues in Alabama, serving as counsel to Alabama-Tombigbee Rivers Coalition. This organization is made up of 34 members and composed of business, trade associations, and state agencies in Alabama and Mississippi, and it led the charge to challenge the Fish and Wildlife's proposed listing of the Alabama sturgeon as an endangered species.

He is also the secretary and counsel of the National Waterways Conference, which focuses on commonsense water resources policies that maximize the economic and environmental value of our inland, coastal and Great Lakes waterways.

During his tenure as legal counsel for the National Waterways Conference, a volunteer position, he invested countless hours to ensure that the constitution and bylaws of the organization were preserved to ensure the ongoing integrity of the National Waterways Conference as the only water resources association representing the full spectrum of water resources stakeholders, and thanks to his tireless efforts, the National Waterways Conference continues to prevail as our Nation's leading multifaceted water resource organization.

The National Waterways Conference, which was founded in 1960, celebrates its 50th anniversary this year and bestowed on Bill Satterfield the title of Counsel Emeritus of the National Waterways Conference on March 9, 2010.

Through his work with the National Waterways Conference, he embodied the spirit of our nation's frontiersmen on many occasions. In the ceremony naming him counsel emeritus, he was presented a bronze statue with the following quote:

This bronze statue of ''The Trooper on the Plains'' by Frederic Remington is symbolic

of the attributes Satterfield exhibited in every situation he encountered throughout his career: Bravery, quick action, strength, courage, and endurance. With a yank of the reins, the rider in this statue is galloping full speed ahead through dangerous territory with a pistol pointed across his torso. The feet of his horse, in this scene, never touch the ground, as he is always moving. He charges towards the enemy camp, fearless and undaunted, with great courage and resolution. His one goal: Achieve the aims set forth by his commanding officer, and win ultimate victory for his army. Colonel Bill Satterfield is a true ''Trooper of the Plains.''

Bill is a great lawyer, a proven professional, a superb public servant, a man of high principle who understands and loves this great Republic which we serve and a good friend. I extend my heartiest congratulations upon his receipt of this special and most deserved honor.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:06 p.m., a message from the House, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2788. An act to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California.

H.R. 3644. An act to direct the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to establish education and watershed programs which advance environmental literacy, including preparedness and adaptability for the likely impacts of climate change in coastal watershed regions.

H.R. 3671. An act to promote Department of the Interior efforts to provide a scientific basis for the management of sediment and nutrient loss in the Upper Mississippi River Basin, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4003. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to evaluate resources in the Hudson River Valley in the State of New York to determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing the site as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4395. An act to revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4840. An act 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''.

H.R. 4887. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that health coverage provided by the Department of Defense is treated as minimal essential coverage.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 244. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of a National Day of Recognition for Long-Term Care Physicians.

At 3:21 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 3590. An act entitled The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the Vice President.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2788. An act to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 3644. An act to direct programs the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to establish education and watershed programs which advance environmental literacy, including preparedness and adaptability for the likely impacts of climate change in coastal watershed regions; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 3671. An act to promote Department of the Interior efforts to provide a scientific basis for the management of sediment and nutrient loss in the Upper Mississippi River Basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4003. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to evaluate resources in the Hudson River Valley in the State of New York to determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing the site as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4395. An act to revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4840. An act 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 Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4887. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that health coverage provided by the Department of Defense is treated as minimal essential coverage; to the Committee on Finance.

The following concurrent resolution was read, and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 244. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of a National Day of Recognition for Long-Term Care Physicians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mrs. BOXER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 479. A bill to amend the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 to provide for the continuing authorization of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network (Rept. No. 111–164).

S. 690. A bill to amend the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to reauthorize the Act (Rept. No. 111–165).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 1741. To require the Attorney General to make competitive grants to eligible State, tribal, and local governments to establish and maintain certain protection and witness assistance programs.

S. 1376. A bill to restore immunization and sibling age exemptions for children adopted by United States citizens under the Hague Convention on Intercountry Adoption to allow their admission to the United States.

S. 2772. A bill to establish a criminal justice reinvestment grant program to help States and local jurisdictions reduce spending on corrections, control growth in the prison and jail populations, and increase public safety.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. BURR, Mr. BROWNBACK, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 3146. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax credit to individuals who enter into agreements to protect the habitats of endangered and threatened species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 3147. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WEBB:

S. 3148. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of Department of Defense health coverage as minimal essential coverage; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NELSON of Florida:

S. 3149. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit certain executive compensation paid by systemically significant financial institutions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3150. A bill to increase the mileage reimbursement rate for members of the armed services during permanent change of station and to authorize the transportation of additional motor vehicles of members on change of permanent station to or from nonforeign areas outside the continental United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. LUGAR):

S. 3151. A bill to establish the Office for Global Women's Issues and the Women's Development Advisor to facilitate interagency coordination and the integration of gender considerations into the strategies, programming, and associated outcomes of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. WEBB, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. BURRIS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HATCH, Mr. KAUFMAN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 463. A resolution recognizing the cultural and historical significance of

Nowruz, expressing appreciation to Iranian-Americans for their contributions to society, and wishing Iranian-Americans and the people of Iran a prosperous new year; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LEMIEUX, Mr. RISCH, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DODD, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. REED, Mr. BAYH, Mr. KOHL, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. REID):

S. Res. 464. A resolution recognizing the 189th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating Greek and American democracy; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 448

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 448, a bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media.

S. 504

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 504, a bill to redesignate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps.

S. 653

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 653, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the bicentennial of the writing of the Star-Spangled Banner, and for other purposes.

S. 729

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 729, a bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to permit States to determine State residency for higher education purposes and to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain alien students who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children, and for other purposes.

S. 990

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 990, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to expand access to healthy afterschool meals for school children in working families.

S. 1343

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. BURRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1343, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve and expand direct certification procedures for the national school lunch and school breakfast programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1606

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1606, a bill to require foreign manufacturers of products imported into the United States to establish registered agents in the United States who are authorized to accept service of process against such manufacturers, and for other purposes.

S. 1611

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1611, a bill to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions.

S. 1683

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. LEMIEUX) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1683, a bill to apply recaptured taxpayer investments toward reducing the national debt.

S. 1741

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1741, a bill to authorize States or political subdivisions thereof to regulate fuel economy and emissions standards for taxicabs.

S. 1791

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1791, a bill to establish the Honorable Stephanie Tubbs Jones Fire Suppression Demonstration Incentive Program within the Department of Education to promote installation of fire sprinkler systems, or other fire suppression or prevention technologies, in qualified student housing and dormitories, and for other purposes.

S. 1820

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1820, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish national standards for discharges from cruise vessels.

S. 1966

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1966, a bill to provide assistance to improve the health of newborns, children, and mothers in developing countries, and for other purposes.

S. 2758

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2758, a bill to amend the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 to establish a national food safety training, education, extension, outreach, and technical assistance program for agricultural producers, and for other purposes.

S. 2870

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2870, a bill to establish uniform administrative and enforcement procedures and penalties for the enforcement of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act and similar statutes, and for other purposes.

S. 2876

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2876, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the capital gain or loss treatment of the sale or exchange of mitigation credits earned by restoring wetlands, and for other purposes.

S. 2975

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2975, a bill to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or distribution in commerce of children's jewelry containing cadmium, barium, or antimony, and for other purposes.

S. 3104

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3104, a bill to permanently authorize Radio Free Asia, and for other purposes.

S. 3123

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3123, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a program to assist eligible schools and nonprofit entities through grants and technical assistance to implement farm to school programs that improve access to local foods in eligible schools.

S. 3143

At the request of Mr. COBURN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) were added as cosponsors of S. 3143, a bill to provide that Members of Congress shall not receive a pay increase until the annual Federal budget deficit is eliminated.

S. RES. 409

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 409, a resolution calling on members of the Parliament in Uganda to reject the proposed ''Anti—Homosexuality Bill'', and for other purposes.

S. RES. 453

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from

Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 453, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''National Public Health Week''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3486

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3486 proposed to H.R. 1586, an act to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide for modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WEBB:

S. 3148. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of Department of Defense health coverage as minimal essential coverage; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, today I introduced a bill that speaks directly to the welfare of our military service members and their families. TRICARE, TRICARE for Life, and the nonappropriated fund health plans are the programs that provide health care for our men and women in uniform, their families, retirees, and other eligible individuals. These programs, as well as today's military veterans health care system, exceed the minimum essential coverage for individual health insurance required by the health care reform bill passed yesterday by the House of Representatives.

I am pleased to offer a companion bill to one introduced last week by my good friend, House Armed Services Committee Chairman IKE SKELTON, that explicitly protects TRICARE and NAF health plans. Representative SKELTON's bill, which passed Saturday by a vote of 403 to 0, makes it perfectly clear that no TRICARE or NAF health plan beneficiary will be required to purchase additional coverage beyond what they already have.

My companion legislation to Chairman SKELTON's provides a similar reassurance to our servicemembers and their families. It will amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in a way that stipulates that Department of Defense TRICARE health-care coverage will be treated as minimal essential coverage under the health care reform bill when it is signed into law by the President.

There has been a great deal of confusion over the past year surrounding the future of TRICARE and other military health care programs. False allegations have been raised, for example, that the administration planned changes to TRICARE for Life that would jeopardize its future or substantially raise its cost for beneficiaries. It is important to set the record straight.

In my capacity as the chairman of the Personnel Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I am committed to protecting the health care coverage programs in place for the military today.

Supporting this bill will reassure our service members that the coverage provided by TRICARE and nonppropriated health plans is properly protected in law as meeting the requirements for individual health insurance mandated by the new health care reform bill. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3150. A bill to increase the mileage reimbursement rate for members of the armed services during permanent change of station and to authorize the transportation of additional motor vehicles of members on change of permanent station to or from nonforeign areas outside the continental United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a bill entitled the Service Members Permanent Change of Station Relief Act—or PCS Relief Act. I am proud to introduce this legislation and thank my cosponsor Senator PATTY MURRAY. This bill will provide our servicemembers and their families much-needed financial relief during these hard economic times.

Like most families, our servicemembers are pinching their pennies too. Unfortunately, often they incur many unnecessary financial burdens related to their service and their sacrifice. For instance, right now, our servicemembers with spouses and children are only reimbursed for shipping one vehicle to or from Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam during a permanent change of station. This means if they get directed to move to a military base in Alaska from Texas, or to Texas from Alaska, they must pay to transport a second car themselves, or they must sell their vehicle and purchase a new car at the next location. This can be a costly option.

However, many military families cannot afford to ship a second vehicle or purchase another car. Without a second vehicle, spouses and children who accompany a servicemember on a permanent change of station may be unable to hold a job, run daily errands, or otherwise participate in their new communities. Many States have large military bases, such as Joint Base Elmendorf and Fort Richardson in Alaska. With housing on one end and base services on another, some families cannot even get to the grocery store or take their children to a doctor in an emergency.

Colleagues, it is unacceptable that we put our military families in a position where they have to make a choice between the inability to meet daily needs and take care of their family in an emergency, or pay more than $1,500 to ship a second vehicle. Under the PCS Relief Act, our military families will be able to ship a second car to and from Hawaii, Alaska, and Guam to ease the hardships and alleviate needless costs.

To further alleviate needless costs, the legislation will increase the gas mileage reimbursement rate during a permanent change in station. Currently, when our personnel drive from one military base to the next on their government-directed move, they are reimbursed less than half the amount they get under temporary duty assignments. The temporary duty reimbursement rate reflects the true cost of operating a vehicle. The current PCS reimbursement rate of 16 cents per mile does not, creating yet another financial burden for servicemembers.

It doesn't make any sense that gas mileage reimbursement rates are different amounts for PCS and TDY. Our servicemembers get official orders to move. It is not optional.

They are both official business expenditures. We already ask so much of our servicemembers and their families. They are fighting two wars. They move at the military services' direction, relocating themselves and their families to new military bases every few years. It is unfair we are asking them to pay out of pocket on these government-directed moves, or experience unwarranted and pointless hardships due to financial constraints.

In these tough economic times, it is more important than ever that we show our support for our servicemembers and their families. Relieving stress and strain during a permanent change in station is the least we can do. I ask my colleagues to support the Service Members PCS Relief Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 463—RECOGNIZING THE CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF NOWRUZ, EXPRESSING APPRECIATION TO IRANIAN-AMERICANS FOR THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS TO SOCIETY, AND WISHING IRANIAN-AMERICANS AND THE PEOPLE OF IRAN A PROSPEROUS NEW YEAR

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. WEBB, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. BURRIS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HATCH, Mr. KAUFMAN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Whereas Nowruz marks the traditional Iranian New Year, which originated in ancient Persia, and dates back more than 3,000 years;

Whereas Nowruz, meaning a ''New Day'', occurs on the vernal equinox and celebrates the arrival of spring;

Whereas Nowruz symbolizes a time of renewal and community, harkens the departure from the trials and tribulations of the previous year, and brings hope for the New Year;

Whereas Nowruz is celebrated by nearly 300,000,000 Iranians and other peoples all over the world, including in the United States, Iran, and other countries in Central Asia, South Asia, Caucasus, Crimea, and the Balkan regions;

Whereas Nowruz is celebrated by more than 1,000,000 Iranian-Americans of all backgrounds, including those with Baha'i, Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Zoroastrian, and nonreligious backgrounds;

Whereas the people of Iran have a long history of celebrating Nowruz and are congratulated for their bringing in of the New Year;

Whereas Nowruz embodies the tradition that each individual's thinking, speaking, and conduct should always be virtuous and the ideal of compassion for our fellow human beings regardless of ethnicity or religion, and symbolizes a time of renewal and community;

Whereas the United States is a melting pot of ethnicities and religion and Nowruz contributes to the richness of American culture and is consistent with our founding principles of peace and prosperity for all;

Whereas in 539 B.C., Cyrus the Great established one of the earliest charters on human rights, which abolished slavery and allowed for freedom of religion, and this marker in Iranian history has had significant impact on the respect for human rights that Iranian-Americans carry today;

Whereas Nowruz serves to remind the people of the United States of the many noteworthy and lasting contributions of Iranian-Americans to the social and economic fabric of society in the United States;

Whereas Iranian-Americans continue to make contributions in all sectors of public life in the United States, including as government, military, and law enforcement officials working to uphold the Constitution of the United States and to protect all people in the United States;

Whereas Iranian-Americans are vibrant, peaceful, and law-abiding citizens, many of whom are of the Baha'i, Christian, Jewish, Muslim, and Zoroastrian faiths; and

Whereas the Iranian-American community continues to enrich the tapestry of the diversity in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the cultural and historical significance of Nowruz;

(2) encourages the peaceful observance of the Nowruz holiday in Iran, and strongly supports the right of all Iranians to exercise freedom of assembly, freedom of expression, and freedom of speech;

(3) expresses its appreciation for the contributions of Iranian-Americans to society in the United States in observance of Nowruz; and

(4) wishes Iranian-Americans and the people of Iran and all those who observe this holiday a prosperous new year.

SENATE RESOLUTION 464—RECOGNIZING THE 189TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE AND CELEBRATING GREEK AND AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LEMIEUX, Mr. RISCH, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DODD, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. REED, Mr. BAYH, Mr. KOHL, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. REID) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 464

Whereas the ancient Greeks developed the concept of democracy, in which the supreme power to govern was vested in the people;

Whereas the Founding Fathers of the United States, many of whom read Greek political philosophy in the original Greek, drew heavily on the political experience and philosophy of ancient Greece in forming our representative democracy;

Whereas Greek Commander in Chief Petros Mavromichalis, a founder of the modern Greek state, said to the citizens of the United States in 1821 that ''it is in your land that liberty has fixed her abode and . . . in imitating you, we shall imitate our ancestors and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you'';

Whereas the Greek national anthem, the ''Hymn to Liberty'', includes the words, ''Most heartily was gladdened George Washington's brave land'';

Whereas the people of the United States generously offered humanitarian assistance to the Greek people during their struggle for independence;

Whereas Greece played a major role in the World War II struggle to protect freedom and democracy through such bravery as was shown in the historic Battle of Crete, which provided the Axis land war with its first major setback, setting off a chain of events that significantly affected the outcome of World War II;

Whereas hundreds of thousands of Greek civilians were killed in Greece during World War II in defense of the values of the Allies;

Whereas, throughout the 20th century, Greece was one of a few countries that allied with the United States in every major international conflict;

Whereas Greece is a strategic partner and ally of the United States in bringing political stability and economic development to the volatile Balkan region, having invested more than $20,000,000,000 in the countries of the region, thereby helping to create more than 200,000 new jobs, and having contributed more than $750,000,000 in development aid for the region;

Whereas Greece actively participates in peacekeeping and peace-building operations conducted by international organizations including the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe;

Whereas Greece received worldwide praise for its extraordinary handling during the 2004 Olympic Games of more than 14,000 athletes and more than 2,000,000 spectators and journalists, a feat Greece handled efficiently, securely, and with hospitality;

Whereas Greece, located in a region where Christianity meets Islam and Judaism, maintains excellent relations with Muslim nations and Israel;

Whereas the Government of Greece has taken important steps in recent years in furthering cross-cultural understanding and rapprochement with Turkey, as seen with the October 2009 visit to Turkey by the Prime Minister of Greece, George Papandreou, as his first trip abroad just days after being elected;

Whereas Greece and the United States are at the forefront of the effort for freedom, democracy, peace, stability, and human rights;

Whereas those and similar ideals have forged a close bond between Greece and the United States; and

Whereas it is proper and desirable for the United States to celebrate March 25, 2010, Greek Independence Day, with the Greek people and to reaffirm the democratic principles from which these two great nations were born: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) extends warm congratulations and best wishes to the people of Greece as they celebrate the 189th anniversary of the independence of Greece;

(2) expresses support for the principles of democratic governance to which the people of Greece are committed; and

(3) notes the important role that Greece has played in the wider European region and in the community of nations since gaining its independence 189 years ago.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3553. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3554. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3555. Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mrs. HUTCHISON) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1586, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide for modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3553. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Patient Choice Restoration Act''.

SEC. 2. REPEAL.

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and the amendments made by that Act, are repealed.

SA 3554. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title I, add the following:

SEC. 15____. PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR ACORN.

No Federal funds made available under this Act or the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act may be distributed to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) or its subsidiaries.

SA 3555. Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mrs. HUTCHISON) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1586, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide for modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: ''An Act to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide for modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.''

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the Public that the business meeting previously announced for Tuesday, March 23, at 10 a.m., is postponed until a later date.

The purpose of this business meeting was to consider the nomination of Jeffrey Lane to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs) and cleared legislative agenda items.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at (202) 224–7571 or Amanda Kelly at (202) 224–6836.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Thursday, March 25, 2010, at 9:30 a.m. in room 628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct an oversight hearing entitled ''The Preventable Epidemic: Youth Suicides and the Urgent Need for Mental Health Care Resources in Indian Country.''

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at 202–224–2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee on banking, housing, and urban affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 22, 2010, at 5 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kirsten Talken-Spaulding, a National Park Service fellow working on the staff of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources this year, be granted the privilege of the floor for today and for the remainder of the Senate's consideration of H.R. 1586.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING NOWRUZ AND EXPRESSING APPRECIATION TO IRANIAN-AMERICANS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 463 submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 463) recognizing the cultural and historical significance of Nowruz, expressing appreciation to Iranian-Americans for their contributions to society, and wishing Iranian-Americans and the people of Iran a prosperous new year.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, en bloc; the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc; that any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 463) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 463

Whereas Nowruz marks the traditional Iranian New Year, which originated in ancient Persia, and dates back more than 3,000 years;

Whereas Nowruz, meaning a ''New Day'', occurs on the vernal equinox and celebrates the arrival of spring;

Whereas Nowruz symbolizes a time of renewal and community, harkens the departure from the trials and tribulations of the previous year, and brings hope for the New Year;

Whereas Nowruz is celebrated by nearly 300,000,000 Iranians and other peoples all over the world, including in the United States, Iran, and other countries in Central Asia, South Asia, Caucasus, Crimea, and the Balkan regions;

Whereas Nowruz is celebrated by more than 1,000,000 Iranian-Americans of all backgrounds, including those with Baha'i, Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Zoroastrian, and nonreligious backgrounds;

Whereas the people of Iran have a long history of celebrating Nowruz and are congratulated for their bringing in of the New Year;

Whereas Nowruz embodies the tradition that each individual's thinking, speaking, and conduct should always be virtuous and the ideal of compassion for our fellow human beings regardless of ethnicity or religion, and symbolizes a time of renewal and community;

Whereas the United States is a melting pot of ethnicities and religion and Nowruz contributes to the richness of American culture and is consistent with our founding principles of peace and prosperity for all;

Whereas in 539 B.C., Cyrus the Great established one of the earliest charters on human rights, which abolished slavery and allowed for freedom of religion, and this marker in Iranian history has had significant impact on the respect for human rights that Iranian-Americans carry today;

Whereas Nowruz serves to remind the people of the United States of the many noteworthy and lasting contributions of Iranian-Americans to the social and economic fabric of society in the United States;

Whereas Iranian-Americans continue to make contributions in all sectors of public life in the United States, including as government, military, and law enforcement officials working to uphold the Constitution of the United States and to protect all people in the United States;

Whereas Iranian-Americans are vibrant, peaceful, and law-abiding citizens, many of whom are of the Baha'i, Christian, Jewish, Muslim, and Zoroastrian faiths; and

Whereas the Iranian-American community continues to enrich the tapestry of the diversity in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the cultural and historical significance of Nowruz;

(2) encourages the peaceful observance of the Nowruz holiday in Iran, and strongly supports the right of all Iranians to exercise freedom of assembly, freedom of expression, and freedom of speech;

(3) expresses its appreciation for the contributions of Iranian-Americans to society in the United States in observance of Nowruz; and

(4) wishes Iranian-Americans and the people of Iran and all those who observe this holiday a prosperous new year.

RECOGNIZING THE 189TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK DEMOCRACY

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 464, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 464) recognizing the 189th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating Greek and American democracy.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 464) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 464

Whereas the ancient Greeks developed the concept of democracy, in which the supreme power to govern was vested in the people;

Whereas the Founding Fathers of the United States, many of whom read Greek political philosophy in the original Greek, drew heavily on the political experience and philosophy of ancient Greece in forming our representative democracy;

Whereas Greek Commander in Chief Petros Mavromichalis, a founder of the modern Greek state, said to the citizens of the United States in 1821 that ''it is in your land that liberty has fixed her abode and . . . in imitating you, we shall imitate our ancestors and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you'';

Whereas the Greek national anthem, the ''Hymn to Liberty'', includes the words, ''Most heartily was gladdened George Washington's brave land'';

Whereas the people of the United States generously offered humanitarian assistance to the Greek people during their struggle for independence;

Whereas Greece played a major role in the World War II struggle to protect freedom and democracy through such bravery as was shown in the historic Battle of Crete, which provided the Axis land war with its first major setback, setting off a chain of events that significantly affected the outcome of World War II;

Whereas hundreds of thousands of Greek civilians were killed in Greece during World War II in defense of the values of the Allies;

Whereas, throughout the 20th century, Greece was one of a few countries that allied with the United States in every major international conflict;

Whereas Greece is a strategic partner and ally of the United States in bringing political stability and economic development to the volatile Balkan region, having invested more than $20,000,000,000 in the countries of the region, thereby helping to create more than 200,000 new jobs, and having contributed more than $750,000,000 in development aid for the region;

Whereas Greece actively participates in peacekeeping and peace-building operations conducted by international organizations including the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe;

Whereas Greece received worldwide praise for its extraordinary handling during the 2004 Olympic Games of more than 14,000 athletes and more than 2,000,000 spectators and journalists, a feat Greece handled efficiently, securely, and with hospitality;

Whereas Greece, located in a region where Christianity meets Islam and Judaism, maintains excellent relations with Muslim nations and Israel;

Whereas the Government of Greece has taken important steps in recent years in furthering cross-cultural understanding and rapprochement with Turkey, as seen with the October 2009 visit to Turkey by the Prime Minister of Greece, George Papandreou, as his first trip abroad just days after being elected;

Whereas Greece and the United States are at the forefront of the effort for freedom, democracy, peace, stability, and human rights;

Whereas those and similar ideals have forged a close bond between Greece and the United States; and

Whereas it is proper and desirable for the United States to celebrate March 25, 2010, Greek Independence Day, with the Greek people and to reaffirm the democratic principles from which these two great nations were born: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) extends warm congratulations and best wishes to the people of Greece as they celebrate the 189th anniversary of the independence of Greece;

(2) expresses support for the principles of democratic governance to which the people of Greece are committed; and

(3) notes the important role that Greece has played in the wider European region and in the community of nations since gaining its independence 189 years ago.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 2010

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, March 23; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, tomorrow we will begin consideration of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act. There will be up to 20 hours for debate under the rules. Senators should expect a busy week, with rollcall votes throughout.

RECESS UNTIL 2:15 P.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:33 p.m., recessed until Tuesday, March 23, 2010, at 2:15 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A TRIBUTE TO YVETTE HERRERA

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Yvette Herrera of Burbank, California. Each year in March, in recognition of Women's History Month, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our nation's most distinguished women.

Yvette currently works in the non-profit sector as a planning director for United Way of Greater Los Angeles. During her tenure at United Way, she developed outreach to the growing Asian Pacific Islander communities in both the San Fernando and San Gabriel Valleys and raised funds coordinating United Way workplace campaigns.

Yvette has served as board president of the Burbank Community YMCA since 2008. During her term, the YMCA built and opened a much needed parking lot and conducted its most successful annual campaign, meeting the challenge of raising $100,000 in donations during difficult economic times. In 2009 she co-chaired a first-time event for the Asian Pacific Women's Center, which exceeded its fundraising goal, netting over $25,000 for victims of domestic violence.

In 1993, Yvette was honored at the White House as National Big Sister of the Year for her volunteer efforts to help develop multi-cultural programming as well as fundraising for Big Sisters of Los Angeles and modeling the agency's first Asian Big-Little Sister match. Yvette mentored Jessica over the course of 16 years, beginning when her Little Sister was in kindergarten and continuing through Jessica's graduation from Cal State Northridge in 2005. No longer officially matched, they remain good friends today.

Yvette actively supports her alma mater and was recognized as the Scripps College Outstanding Recent Alumna in 2000. She is a graduate of the statewide leadership development program for women, Leadership California, and currently serves on their board of directors. Her previous community service includes serving as president of the Asian Pacific Women's Network and co-chairing the City of Los Angeles Asian Pacific Heritage Month Celebration.

I ask all Members of Congress to join me today in honoring a remarkable woman of California's 29th Congressional District, Yvette Herrera. The entire community joins me in thanking Yvette for the meaningful impact she has had on the 29th Congressional District.

A TRIBUTE TO SOMSRI SUWANNAPREECHA

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Somsri Suwannapreecha for her contributions to the care of the Brooklyn community.

Somsri Suwannapreecha was born in Chiangmai in northern Thailand. She graduated high school valedictorian at a very young age and beat out her school peers with a top score for admittance to medical school.

After earning a medical degree from Chiangmai Medical University (CMU) in 1969 at the age of 22, Somsri went on to train in a pediatric residency program at CMU. While there, Somsri did research for the Illinois Project of Malnutrition and Vitamin A deficiency, collecting blood and delivering medical care and immunizations in rural Chiangmai.

After moving to Bangkok, Somsri became the first senior resident of Institute of Dermatology. She helped found the dermatology clinic and pediatric ward at Paolo Memorial Hospital, the first and best private hospital in Bangkok. Here Somsri met Dr. Siew Ratanaprasatporn, the director of the otolaryngology department and they were married.

In 1978, fearful of communism, the Ratanaprasatporns immigrated to the United States and settled in Staten Island, New York. At Staten Island University, Somsri repeated residency training in pediatrics to meet the requirement for United States medical licensure.

After owning and operating several clinics which broadened her clinical experience caring for patients of any age and sickness, Dr. Ratanaprasatporn opened a walk-in clinic, operating six days a week, for the past 30 years at 2108 Linden Boulevard. Her late husband worked beside her as an otolaryngologist as did many doctors of different specialties, including dentistry. In spite of the loss of her husband and the Federal economic recession in 2007, Dr. Ratanaprasatporn still aspires to keep the clinic up and running to continue serving generations ahead.

Dr. Ratanaprasatporn has been involved in Thai associations and served on a committee of CMU alumni association to fundraise scholarships for exchange of CMU and Columbia University. Some of the fundraising has gone toward building a Thai temple on Long Island.

Dr. Ratanaprasatporn enjoys shopping, dining and cooking and is known for her charm, calm manner and friendly smile. She is also blessed with four children, two sons and identical twin daughters. Eldest son Richard, 29, is an attending physician at Downstate Medical Center of Brooklyn and John, 25 holds a doctorate degree in Mathematics at Temple University, Philadelphia. Twin daughters, Linda and Lisa, 21, are top students in Program in Liberal Medical Education at Brown University, Rhode Island. Dr. Ratanaprasatporn's hope is that her children will continue her legacy of service to the East New York community in years to come.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the service of Dr. Somsri Suwannapreecha.

UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN PROTECTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. PHIL HARE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 2010

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3671, the Upper Mississippi River Basin Protection Act. This is an important piece of legislation, which would provide us with a scientific basis for the management of sediment and nutrient loss in the Upper Mississippi River Basin. I am proud to represent an area of Illinois which is bordered by the Mississippi River and believe we must do more to protect this important waterway.

Soil erosion and ecological changes being made by nutrient displacement endanger the long-term viability of the midwest's farming community. The loss of sediments and nutrients upstream endanger the wetland environments downstream. The sediments that flow into the shipping channel of the Mississippi River cost more than $150 million in dredging annually. The Department of the Interior does not have the resources or the scientific data to work effectively at protecting the Mississippi and this bill will change that.

This bill requires that the U.S. Geological Survey and Department of Interior collect data and study sediment loss and soil erosion. I believe this is a good first step towards solving this problem. I also agree that the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences should conduct a comprehensive water resources assessment so that we can be sure that data obtained from both public and private monitoring stations come from a nonpartisan, unbiased source.

H.R. 3671 is beneficial to not just my constituents, but the knowledge we gain from the measuring and monitoring of sediment and nutrients could be used by several entities including the Army Corps of Engineers, who spend a significant amount of time dredging, scientists and academic researchers, environmentalists working to protect the biological integrity of areas in and around the Mississippi River, businesses who conduct barge commerce, the agriculture industry which uses the River's waterways on a daily basis, among many others. It is clear that the best way forward on addressing this issue is to enact a long-term, coordinated, basin-wide monitoring of the waterway. H.R. 3671 has my support because it is one part of this strategy.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative KIND, for introducing this bill and being persistent in once

again gaining passage. Today, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I call upon the Senate to swiftly pass this important, bipartisan, legislation and stand with the House in protecting the Upper Mississippi River Basin.

A TRIBUTE TO SHIRLEY HWONG

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Shirley Hwong of Monterey Park, California. Each year in March, in recognition of Women's History Month, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our Nation's most distinguished women.

Shirley has lived in Monterey Park with her husband Leo for over 35 years. Shirley served on the Monterey Highlands School Parent-Teacher Association, PTA, for more than 10 years. She held the roles of PTA president and treasurer and did significant fundraising to help teachers and students. She was also involved in the Mark Keppel Alliance at Mark Keppel High School for 4 years and successfully fundraised for the Mark Keppel Band.

Shirley has proven to be invaluable in her ability to raise money for charitable causes. In 2005, she was a chairperson of ''City with a Heart'' fundraising for Hurricane Katrina relief. They raised more than $55,000 to help the victims in New Orleans. She has also been quite active in raising money for the Monterey Park Bruggemeyer Library.

She was on the Monterey Park Community Relations Commission for 8 years. For all 8 years on the commission, she was the chair of the Harmony Festival Ball.

Shirley is currently a commissioner of the Sister Cities Commission and has been a chairperson for the past 2 years. She helped raise money at last year's Sister Cities International Mardi Gras Ball, of which over $7,000 was donated to the Monterey Park Fire Department for emergency laptops that were much needed. In 2008, she went to the South Korean sister city Yeongdeungpo-gu, Seoul, Korea with 4 other people from Monterey Park.

Shirley has served 3 terms as vice president of the Chinese American Citizens Alliance of Greater San Gabriel Valley and is currently serving as a board member. Shirley was also active with the Monterey Park Rotary Club for 5 years.

I ask all Members of Congress to join me today in honoring a remarkable woman of California's 29th Congressional District, Shirley Hwong. The entire community joins me in thanking Shirley for the meaningful impact she has had on the 29th Congressional District.

A TRIBUTE TO SHIRLEY McINTOSH

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Shirley McIntosh for her years of service in education and to her community.

Shirley McIntosh retired from Catholic Charities in 2008 and looks forward to retiring from the New York City Department of Education in 2010. Shirley was born and raised in New York City in the Sugar Hill area of Manhattan. She is the mother of two daughters, Omoyele and Dara. Shirley's educational preparation includes B.A. in Psychology from Hunter College, and Masters in Reading Instruction from Brooklyn College.

Shirley worked in different capacities in the Builders for Family and Youth Division of Catholic Charities. She received recognition for her service to the developmentally disabled adults that lived in the group homes where she worked for twenty-two years. It was very rewarding to her to be instrumental in providing individuals with opportunities that improved the quality of their lives.

Shirley will retire in June 2010 after 21 years of service with the New York City Department of Education. It has been important to her to not only prepare her students academically, but also encourage them to embrace their culture. A constant in her teaching career has been to make children aware of the contributions of their ancestors and recognize the fortitude demonstrated by them to overcome the many obstacles they encountered. She believes strongly in the importance of children knowing about how their world came to be. During her career she worked in the ''Parent Involvement Program'' at P.S. 181 and has conducted parent orientations and workshops that provided parents with ideas of activities to engage their child.

Shirley has been an active participant and supporter of school-wide events. She enjoys the creative thought and excitement that is generated through themes. It is an opportunity to express her creativity, strengths and talents. She has voluntarily involved herself in the School Leadership team and Curriculum Committee at P.S. 181.

After retirement, Shirley will continue in the business she and her daughter, Omoyele, have established—a company that provides educational and career workshops for high school students.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Shirley McIntosh.

ON THE OCCASION OF CELEBRATING HELEN PARKER GAY'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, on Saturday, March 20, 2010, friends and family will gather to honor Helen Parker Gay, a retired public servant who has had a tremendous impact on North Carolina's First Congressional District. I have great respect and admiration for Helen Gay, and I wish I could be there to pay tribute to this extraordinary woman.

A lifetime resident of Rocky Mount, North Carolina, Helen Gay will be celebrating her 90th birthday. She has tirelessly dedicated herself to the community. She worked at the North Carolina Employment Security Commission for 37 years, and served as mayor pro term three times during her 20 years as a member of Rocky Mount's City Council.

In 1962, she was among the people who gathered at Rocky Mount's Booker T. Washington High School to hear Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., speak. That day Dr. King delivered his famous ''I Have a Dream'' speech for the first time. As many people know, she not only met Dr. King that day but also cooked his dinner.

She was a board member of the Carolinas Gateway Partnership, a member of the N.C. Energy Policy Council, past president of the N.C. Black Elected Municipal Officials and a former board member of the N.C. League of Municipalities.

She also has served as elder of Mt. Pisgah Presbyterian Church, and has received numerous awards for her efforts, including the State's highest honor, the Order of the Long Leaf Pine.

As one of the most respected elected officials this region has ever known, she was well known for her honest nature and a strong desire to provide a voice for the people she represented so well.

While the pending historic vote to ensure that all Americans have access to affordable health insurance will keep me from attending the birthday celebration, my thoughts and prayers will be with Helen Parker Gay.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing Helen Parker Gay. She is truly a remarkable person deserving of our deepest well wishes for the enormous contributions that she made in the lives of so many people living in eastern North Carolina.

HONORING THE BO-DYN BOBSLED PROJECT

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize The Bo-Dyn Bobsled Project of Oxford, Connecticut for the performance of its sleds in the 2010 Olympic Winter Games. The Bo-Dyn Bobsled Project designed and built the Night Train sled that led the United States Four-Man Bobsled Team to win the Gold Medal for the first time in 62 years.

Even more incredible than helping the U.S. team claim victory is the mission of this remarkable company. The Bo-Dyn Bobsled Project is one of the great Made in America stories of our time. NASCAR veteran Geoff Bodine had a vision of providing the highest quality, American-made bobsleds to our athletes. He wanted to make sure that they were using not only a domestic product, but one that was able to compete internationally and win.

At the time Bo-Dyn was founded, the United States bobsled team purchased and raced used European-made sleds. The members of the team would famously spend much of their time raising money for the sleds and get into physical condition when they weren't doing that. BoDyn changed this by creating an enterprise that funds the research, development, and manufacturing of the sleds. Generous companies like Whelen Manufacturing of Chester make donations that allow the athletes to use the sleds at no charge. Phil Kurze, vice president at Whelen Engineering and president of the Bo-Dyn Bobsled Project,

fondly recalls a time when the company turned down offers from generous foreign buyers so that our athletes could have access to a superb and uniquely American sled.

I admire the good people of Bo-Dyn for putting their values into practice as they proudly carry their founder's vision. The hard work and creativity of the American people is something that we should all recognize and work hard to perpetuate. For this reason I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring The Bo-Dyn Bobsled Project.

A TRIBUTE TO KAY ROSSER, 29TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR—2010

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Kay Rosser of South Pasadena, California. Each year in March, in recognition of Women's History Month, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our nation's most distinguished women.

Kay began her volunteer work in South Pasadena when her two daughters were in elementary school during the early seventies. Kay helped in the classroom and with Parent-Teacher Association, PTA, special projects dealing with teen suicide and teen alcoholism. She was instrumental in creating the Theatre Arts Angels, a parent support group for the South Pasadena High School drama program.

She has been a volunteer in the South Pasadena Public Library since the early nineties and was a member of the Board of Trustees for 7 years. Today, she is still intimately involved with the library and co-chairs the Library's Restoration Concerts, a classical and jazz concert series that benefits the restoration of the library's community room. Embarrassed to have major artists perform on the library's aging piano, Kay plunged herself into researching and leading the effort to raise $35,000 to purchase a refurbished Steinway. When the funding for the piano was complete, Kay led the effort to raise more donations to fund a Quartet in Residence, the highly acclaimed New Hollywood String Quartet, now performing in its third season.

In addition to her work in South Pasadena, Kay has been a volunteer coordinator for 13 years with Plaza de la Raza, a school of performing arts with afternoon classes in music, theater, dance, and the visual arts offered to children in East Los Angeles and beyond.

In 1990, Kay worked as an assistant to the Chairman of Volunteers for the Los Angeles Festival, and in 1993, she became Chairman of Volunteers and recruited over 1,000 volunteers for the Festival.

I ask all Members of Congress to join me today in honoring a remarkable woman of California's 29th Congressional District, Kay Rosser. The entire community joins me in thanking Kay for the meaningful impact she has had on the 29th Congressional District.

A TRIBUTE TO WENDY RICH

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Wendy Rich for her years of contribution to education in New York City.

Wendy Rich was born in Brooklyn, New York, during the time of the Baby Boomer years. She grew up in Cambria Heights, Queens, where she attended P.S. 176, J.H.S. 59, and Andrew Jackson High School. Her father, Joseph Trachtenberg, worked as a salesman in the garment center. Her mother Hilda, a stay at home mom, worked as a school secretary for after school and summer programs in District 29 in Queens, New York. Wendy is the mother of two sons; Jared, an attorney in Brooklyn, New York, and Greg, a teacher who is on a mission to expose his students to great works of literature.

Wendy's educational preparation includes a bachelor's degree in education with a minor in behavioral science from Queens College. In the summer of 1970, she went on an archeological dig in Northern California which helped spark a lifelong interest in other cultures and natural things.

In 1972, after college graduation, she married Harris Rich, who was an English teacher. This was during the Vietnam War and many men were getting deferments by working in urban schools. Wendy worked as a substitute teacher since teaching jobs were difficult to find. She got her first teaching position in 1973 at P.S. 92 because of federal Comprehensive Employment and Training Act funds. In 1974, a year later, she was laid off with the other 10,000 teachers most recently hired, to balance the city's budget.

In 1977 she resumed teaching at P.S. 181 as a fourth grade teacher. After a few years at P.S. 181, she was given an opportunity to teach science. She was able to teach students amazing content with lots of freedom for 17 years. This opportunity opened other doors; she volunteered to be on the teacher's advisory group for the Prospect Park Audubon Center. Since the fall of 2003, she has been teaching graduate students at Brooklyn College the course Teaching Science in the Elementary Schools.

After years of hard work and dedication, in June of 2009, Wendy and her husband Harris retired from New York City Department of Education.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the contributions of Wendy Rich.

IN RECOGNITION OF TALLADEGA COLLEGE WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2010 USCAA NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I would like to request the House's attention today to pay recognition to the Talladega College women's basketball team, who recently won the 2010 USCAA National Championship.

On March 7th, the No. 2 Lady Tornados defeated the No. 7 Rochester Lady Warriors 48–36 in Uniontown, Pennsylvania. The Lady Tornadoes finished the season with a record of 22–12. The Talladega Lady Tornadoes are lead by Head Coach Romeo Lagmay Jr. and Assistant Coach Kevin Herod.

All of us across Talladega County and East Alabama are deeply proud of these talented young Alabamians. I'd like to congratulate the team, coaches and Talladega College on this outstanding achievement.

RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2010

SPEECH OF

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 21, 2010

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have followed this debate closely. We all have. But I haven't heard a colleague from Massachusetts say, ''In spite of my State's five billion dollar budget deficit, CommonwealthCare is a great model.'' I haven't heard my colleagues from Maine say ''Dirigo covered more people and lowered costs, let's try that approach.'' My colleagues form New Jersey can't say, ''When we passed guaranteed issue laws, costs came down, let's try our model.'' And you certainly haven't heard any of the Tennessee delegation come to the floor and say, ''TennCare was a great success, let's try that!''

You haven't heard these things because my colleagues know what is proposed today has been tried and tried and tried before. It has never worked. The theory sounds good, but the hard facts are that when you gamble that near-term costs will be made up by long-term savings, you always lose.

The real losers will be our children and grandchildren who will labor under heavy taxes to finance their own mediocre care. There is a bipartisan collection of Members who know that is the only result of this bill. I hope that we will be a bipartisan majority.

RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2010

SPEECH OF

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 21, 2010

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, a historic measure that will put families first when it comes to accessing health care coverage.

American families need this bill now more than ever. In the past decade, the cost of health care for American families has skyrocketed. Last year, more than half of Americans postponed care or skipped their medications because they could not afford it.

If we do nothing, it is only going to get worse.

If we do nothing, in ten years small businesses will shell out $29,000 in medical costs per employee—a staggering 166 percent increase.

If we do nothing, the cost of an employer-sponsored health insurance plan will reach $24,000 a year by 2016—an outrageous increase of 84 percent.

And if we do nothing, the American economy will break under the weight of mounting debt.

Just saying no and doing nothing is not an option. And yet, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to tell us exactly that—stop, do nothing, things are okay as is.

But, Americans know that the current situation is neither okay nor sustainable. Americans may be tired of the endless media coverage regarding this debate. And, they might be frustrated by the lack of cordiality between Republicans and Democrats. But, they know that we have serious problems in our health care system that must be fixed.

And we are ready to do it.

The Democratic Congress, along with President Obama, has put together a reform measure that will put an end to abuses in the insurance industry and mandate that patients' needs be put first.

When the President signs this measure into law, immediately:

Insurance companies will no longer be able to deny coverage to children who are sick or end coverage for Americans who get sick;

Children and young adults will be allowed to remain on their parents' insurance plans up to the age of 26—helping them stay healthy during this important transition period;

Seniors who currently have a gap in their prescription drug coverage will see the cost of their brand name drugs reduced by 50 percent and the gap in their prescription drug coverage reduced by $250. In the coming years, all gaps in coverage will be eliminated entirely.

Beyond the immediate benefits, many other important reforms will go into effect within a few years:

There will be stability and security for those who have health insurance. So, if you like the coverage you have currently, you can keep it.

Small businesses will qualify for generous tax credits to help offset the cost of insuring their employees and keep them competitive in the global economy;

The growth in medical costs will go down, as will the Federal government's deficit.

Simply put: health reform is good medicine for American families and businesses.

There's no doubt that this reform measure isn't perfect. But, like any significant change in policy, it will always be a work in progress. We will make changes as we move forward. There is no denying, however, that today's vote is historic and significant and will benefit millions of hard-working American families.

Madam Speaker, it is time for courage. Former President Franklin D. Roosevelt once said "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

We must not be afraid of tomorrow, when today we can change the lives of millions of Americans for the better.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" and join us in the effort to put the health of Americans before insurance company profits.

A TRIBUTE TO MAMIE WILLIAMS

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in commending Mamie Williams for her many years of service to her community.

Mamie Williams is blessed to turn 83 years old on January 11, 2010 and commits her life to cheerfully helping others. First and foremost is her mother, Irene Kibler, who turned 101 years of age September 9, 2009. Mother Mamie brought her mother to New York form Savannah, Georgia to take care of her in 2005 because the trips back and forth from New York to Savannah became extremely difficult for her, but she never ceased to do all she could. However, when her mother was diagnosed with breast cancer in 2006, it became inevitable that she continue to live in New York.

Dr. Rev. Sean P. Gardner, Sr., awarded 3 plaques to her in 2001—"Mother Wisdom", "Mother Love", and "Mother Charming",—her pastor of Eastward Missionary Baptist Church located on First Avenue in Manhattan. She is Chaplain of the Senior Usher Board and a member of the Mothers' Board. In 2008 she also received an award from the Filial Piety Society.

In 2009 she received an award for "Mother of the Year" in recognition of the care she always extends unselfishly with love and compassion. That same year she was presented an award by Major Bill Greene of the U.S. Marine Corp Reserve, from Toys for Tots Christmas Club in "Grateful Acknowledgement for the Special Relationship Shared with Children." She received a Certificate of Appreciation from Volunteers of America and a Certificate of Acknowledgement from Boys Town Christmas Appeal.

Mother Mamie is a member of the Joint Public Affairs Committee (JPAC), and attended the Institute for Senior Action (IFSA), where she graduated in the spring of 2003. IFSA is a leadership advocacy training course requiring graduates to commit to pursuing action within their communities, something she's been doing for many years. She also sings with the Unique Musical Society of New York, orchestrated by Professor Robert Newton, for 25 years.

Mother Mamie has been taking care packages to hospitals and nursing homes for many years no matter how bad the weather is and gives care packages to her neighbors to take home when they stop by to visit with her. Her thought is: "store up treasures in Heaven by giving them away on earth."

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the contributions of Mamie Williams.

IN MEMORY OF DR. LEW ALLEN, JR.

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Dr. Lew Allen, Jr., who passed away on January 4, 2010 at the age of 84.

From the mid-1950s through the late 1960s, Dr. Allen worked as a physicist in the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, as a project officer for the Air Force Special Weapons Center, as a special staff officer for the Space Technology Office of the Secretary of Defense, and Director of the Secretary of the United States Air Force. By the 1970s, he was Director of Special Projects and Deputy Commander of Satellite Programs for the Space and Missile Systems Organization, chief of staff Headquarters Air Force Systems Command, director of the National Security Agency, and chief of staff of the U.S. Air Force.

In 1982, because of Dr. Allen's expertise in the military space program, he was recruited to serve as director of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, JPL. During the years he led JPL, the laboratory launched Galileo to Jupiter, Magellan to Venus, The Infrared Astronomical Satellite Mission—the first-ever space-based observatory to perform a survey of the entire sky at infrared wavelengths—and sent the Voyager 2 spacecraft on its flybys of Uranus and Neptune. A champion of technology, Dr. Allen invested funds into research and development projects that paved the way for new capabilities in space observations.

Dr. Allen was the recipient of numerous military awards and decorations including the Department of Defense Joint Service Commendation Medal, the Legion of Merit with two oak leaf clusters, the Air Force Distinguished Service Medal, and the National Intelligence Distinguished Service Medal. Additionally, he received the George W. Goddard Award from the Society of Photo-Optical Engineering, the Goddard Memorial Trophy, and the Rotary National Space Trophy.

Two awards were named in his honor: the General Lew Allen, Jr. Award presented by the U.S. Air Force, and the Lew Allen Award for Excellence presented by JPL. The Air Force award recognizes sustained job performance, proven leadership, job knowledge and military qualities. The JPL award is given in the early years of an individual's professional career and recognizes significant accomplishments and leadership in scientific research or technological innovation.

Without Dr. Lew Allen, Jr.'s extraordinary contributions, the field of science and technology would not be the same today. I extend my sincere condolences to his family and friends.

MILITARY LEADERS' LETTER TO CONGRESS

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to submit this letter signed by 48 retired four- and three-star generals/flag officers urging Congress to support the President's FY11 International Affairs Budget request—given its importance to U.S. national security. These military leaders state that "balancing our military power with the range of International Affairs programs funded by the International Affairs Budget is critical to stabilizing fragile states, combating terrorism, and deterring

threats before they reach America's shores." I couldn't agree more, and appreciate the hard work that these signatories and the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition have done to support our international affairs budget.

MARCH 10, 2010.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: As retired officers of the U.S. military across all branches of the armed services, we are writing to express our support for the President's FY 2011 International Affairs Budget request, a fundamental pillar of U.S. national security and foreign policy. The critical programs in the International Affairs Budget invest in the non-military tools of development and diplomacy, foster economic and political stability on a global scale, strengthen our allies, and fight the spread of poverty, disease, terrorism and weapons of mass destruction.

Continuing the bipartisan precedent set by the Bush Administration, the Obama Administration views the International Affairs Budget as part of the national security funding alongside Defense, Homeland Security, Intelligence, and Veterans programs. However, the International Affairs Budget remains underfunded, representing 1.4 percent of the entire federal budget and less than 7 percent of our total national security funding.

Our view is shared by Defense Secretary Robert Gates, who has stated that ''America's civilian institutions of diplomacy and development have been chronically undermanned and underfunded for far too long—relative to what we traditionally spend on the military, and more important, relative to the responsibilities and challenges our nation has around the world.'' Secretary Gates and other military leaders believe, as we do, that our national security is dependent not only on a strong military force but also on increased investments in the full range of diplomatic, development and humanitarian tools funded through the International Affairs Budget.

The United States must combine its strong military with robust, effective civilian tools of international development and diplomacy to secure its national interests in an era when many of the challenges of the 21st century recognize no borders. While our military power can provide the logistics and organizational support to help those in need in times of humanitarian crisis, as demonstrated by our current efforts in Haiti, it can only help create the conditions necessary to allow the other tools of statecraft—our diplomatic, development and humanitarian programs—to effectively address these issues.

Balancing our military power with the range of International Affairs programs funded by the International Affairs Budget is critical to stabilizing fragile states, combating terrorism, and deterring threats before they reach America's shores. Therefore, we urge you to support no less than the Administration's request of $58.5 billion for the International Affairs Budget.

Sincerely,

General Michael W. Hagee, USMC (Ret.), Co-Chair, National Security Advisory Council; Admiral James M. Loy, USCG (Ret.), Co-Chair, National Security Advisory Council; Charles S. Abbot, USN (Ret.), Deputy Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command ('98–'00); General John P. Abizaid, USA (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Central Command ('03–'07); Admiral Frank L. Bowman, USN (Ret.), Director, Naval Nuclear Propulsion ('96–'04); General Charles G. Boyd, USAF (Ret.), Deputy Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command ('92–'95); Admiral Archie R. Clemins, USN (Ret.), Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet ('96–'99); General Richard A. ''Dick'' Cody, USA (Ret.), Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army ('04–'08); Lieutenant General John B. Conaway, USAF (Ret.), Chief, National Guard Bureau ('90–'93); General Richard D. Hearney, USMC (Ret.), Assistant Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps ('94–'96); General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Southern Command ('02–'04); Admiral James R. Hogg, USN (Ret.), U.S. Military Representative, NATO Military Committee ('88–'91); General James L. Jamerson, USAF (Ret.), Deputy Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command ('95–'98); Admiral Gregory G. Johnson, USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Europe/Commander in Chief, Allied Forces Southern Europe ('01–'04); Admiral Jerome L. Johnson, USN (Ret.), Vice Chief of Naval Operations ('90–'92); General John P. Jumper, USAF (Ret.), Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force ('01–'05).

Lieutenant General Jeffrey W. Oster, USMC (Ret.), Deputy Administrator and Chief Operating Officer, Coalition Provisional Authority, Iraq (2004); Deputy Commandant for Programs and Resources, Headquarters Marine Corps (ended in '98); Lieutenant General Charles P. Otstott, USA (Ret.), Deputy Chairman, NATO Military Committee ('90–'92); Admiral William A. Owens, USN (Ret.), Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff ('94–'96); Admiral Joseph W. Prueher, USN (Ret.), Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Command ('96–'99); Lieutenant General Harry D. Raduege, Jr., USAF (Ret.), Director, Defense Information Systems Agency ('00–'05); Manager, National Communications System ('00–'03); Commander, Joint Task Force for Global Network Operations ('04–'05); Vice Admiral Norman W. Ray, USN (Ret.), Deputy Chairman, NATO Military Committee ('92–'95); General Robert W. RisCassi, USA (Ret.), Commander in Chief, United Nations Command/Commander in Chief, Republic of Korea/U.S. Combined Forces Command ('92–'93); Lieutenant General John Costello, USA (Ret.), Commanding General, U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command/U.S. Army Space Command ('98–'01); Admiral James O. Ellis, Jr., USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Strategic Command ('02–'04); Admiral Thomas B. Fargo, USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Pacific Command ('02–'05); Admiral S. Robert Foley, USN (Ret.), Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet ('82–'85); Lieutenant General Robert G. Gard, Jr., USA (Ret.), President, National Defense University ('77–'81); Admiral Edmund P. Giambastiani, Jr., USN (Ret.), Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff ('05–'07); Vice Admiral Lee F. Gunn, USN (Ret.), Inspector General, U.S. Navy ('97–'00); General Michael W. Hagee, USMC (Ret.), Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps ('03–'06); General Richard E. Hawley, USAF (Ret.), Commander, Air Combat Command ('96–'99).

General Paul J. Kern, USA (Ret.), Commanding General, U.S. Army Materiel Command ('01–'04); General William F. Kernan, USA (Ret.), Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic/Commander in Chief, U.S. Joint Forces Command ('00–'02); Admiral Charles R. Larson, USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Pacific Command ('91–'94); Vice Admiral Stephen F. Loftus, USN (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Logistics ('90–'94); General John Michael Loh, USAF (Ret.), Commander, Air Combat Command ('92–'95); Admiral James M. Loy, USCG (Ret.), Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard ('98–'02); General Dan McNeill, USA (Ret.), Commander, International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan ('07–'08); Lieutenant General Paul T. Mikolashek, USA (Ret.), The Inspector General, U.S. Army/Commanding General of the Third U.S. Army Forces Central Command ('00–'02); Commanding General, Southern European Task Force ('98–'00); Admiral Robert J. Natter, USN (Ret.), Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet/Commander, Fleet Forces Command ('00–'03); General Peter J. Schoomaker, USA (Ret.), Chief of Staff, U.S. Army ('03–'07); General Henry H. Shelton, USA (Ret.), Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff ('97–'01); Admiral Leighton W. Smith, Jr., USN (Ret.), Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces Europe/Commander in Chief, Allied Forces Southern Europe ('94–'96); Admiral William D. Smith, USN (Ret.), U.S. Military Representative, NATO Military Committee ('91–'93); General Carl W. Stiner, USA (Ret.), Commander in Chief, U.S. Special Operations Command ('90–'93); Admiral Carlisle A. H. Trost, USN (Ret.), Chief of Naval Operations ('86–'90); General Charles F. Wald, USAF (Ret.), Deputy Commander, U.S. European Command ('02–'06); General Charles E. Wilhelm, USMC (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Southern Command ('97–'00); General Michael J. Williams, USMC (Ret.), Assistant Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps ('00–'02).

HONORING JAMES HARDEN ''PAT'' DAUGHERTY AND THE BUFFALO SOLDIERS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Mr. James Harden ''Pat'' Daugherty who was a member of the 92nd Infantry Division of the United States Army in World War II.

Veterans are some of our country's greatest treasures, and I commend Mr. Daugherty on his service. It is important for us to remember the sacrifices that members of our armed services make and have made to ensure our freedom and our prosperity. It is with heartfelt thanks that I recognize Mr. Daugherty today, and I encourage my fellow colleagues to join me in doing so.

Additionally, I would be remiss if I did not recognize the collective efforts of Mr. Daugherty's division, the 92nd Infantry. This group was more commonly known as the Buffalo Soldiers and was the only African American infantry division to see combat in Europe during World War II. Their efforts helped to desegregate the military, and they proved that African-Americans were valorous and dedicated members of the United States military.

Madam Speaker, America is a stronger and nobler country because of veterans like Pat Daugherty and his compatriots in the 92nd Infantry Division. I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in recognizing the service and accomplishments of Mr. Daugherty and the Buffalo Soldiers with which he served.

A TRIBUTE TO GLORIA WILLIAMS

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Gloria Williams, who has made important contributions to education throughout her career in Brooklyn and internationally.

Born and raised in the small rural village of Bartica, Guyana, South America, Gloria Williams hails from a large family of ten and is blessed with one son, Robert. She is the beneficiary of an amazing journey that focuses on being allowed to play a deciding role in the future of children's lives. Ms. Williams is currently an Assistant Principal of Intermediate School 292, located in East New York, Brooklyn.

Gloria spent her formative years in Guyana and completed her secondary education in Zambia. She earned her Bachelor's Degree in Secondary education from the University of Guyana and began her teaching career in 1984. She later migrated to the United States of America was awarded two masters Degrees: one in Literacy Education and the other in Supervision and Administration from Touro College in New York.

Gloria is fortunate to have found her niche in the field of education and has been charting courses in that arena for the last twenty-six years. She has held the positions of teacher, staff-developer, assistant-principal and principal and has made it her mission to lead young people in the right direction. Her passion is curriculum development and instruction and she works assiduously to ensure all students in her charge have opportunities to engage in a rounded productive education. Ms. Williams has been credited as being a member of the dynamic team that transformed Intermediate School 292 in East New York, Brooklyn from a struggling, failing school to one that is now the pride of East New York.

Being cognizant of the struggles and sacrifices her parents endured to ensure her success, Ms. Williams has founded the Educating All Guyanese through Literacy and Education (EAGLE) foundation where she seeks to empower children in need. Through her foundation, Gloria donates school supplies to students in Guyana and conducts professional development sessions for teachers and other educators in the hope of enhancing the teaching and learning process so that ultimately, all benefit.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the contributions of Gloria Williams.

A TRIBUTE TO LEANNE DICKSON

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Leanne Dickson of San Gabriel, California. Each year in March, in recognition of Women's History Month, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our Nation's most distinguished women.

Leanne Dickson has been a resident of San Gabriel for over thirty-five years. She is the widow of James Dickson, owner of Dickson Motor Service, Towing Service, & Auto Repair. Leanne has two adult children, Wendy Dickson Holten and Greg Dickson.

Leanne's involvement in San Gabriel has been varied. She has been the Vice President and Box Office manager for the San Gabriel Valley Music Theatre since 2005. At the same time, she has served as treasurer of the San Gabriel Rotary for the last three years. For the San Gabriel Chamber of Commerce, she volunteers her time two days a week and has served as board member and treasurer for three years. In 2008, the chamber honored her as Women's Division Woman of the Year.

Leanne is continually doing for others in the community. It seems as though she attends every city function and every community activity, helping out where needed. She has volunteered on the Parent-Teacher Association for twelve years, has been a Neighborhood Watch Block Captain for four years, and was a Girl Scout leader for seven years. In 2008, she donated her time volunteering for the Church of Our Savior's AIDS luncheon. Leanne has actively supported La Casa Community Center and the San Gabriel Valley YMCA with their events.

Leanne was the Vice President at Pasadena Federal Credit Union twenty-three years, and she is currently employed part time at the Gazebo boutique in San Gabriel.

I.ask all Members of Congress to join me today in honoring a remarkable woman of California's 29th Congressional District, Leanne Dickson. The entire community joins me in thanking Leanne for the meaningful impact she has had on the 29th Congressional District.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Madam Speaker, today our national debt is $12,661,039,727,506.65.

On January 6th, 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 $2,022,613,981,212.80 so far this Congress.

This debt and its interest payments we are passing to our children and all future Americans.

RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2010

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 21, 2010

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, in a desperate effort to pass a sweeping government takeover of our health care system, Democrats held Congress in session throughout the weekend to pass H.R. 3590, The Patient Protection and Health Care Affordability Act along with a package of desired ''fixes,'' H.R. 4872, The Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act. In a purely partisan fashion, the Democrats have now passed the largest tax increase in history, a massive expansion of entitlements, and policies which will put the health care system at the whim of the Federal Government.

One of the most distressing aspects of this legislation is the dishonesty which has been utilized for its passage. While I am pleased that the Democrats forfeited the ''Deem-and-Pass'' ploy to hide a vote on the Senate health care bill, I am shocked that they support this 2,700 page monstrosity, complete with its slew of sweetheart deals that benefit home states of members who once opposed the bill. Despite the backlash that rightfully followed these deceitful kickbacks, the Democrats included even more million-dollar deals for specific members in the reconciliation package. This tactic is an abuse of power, an abuse of taxpayer money, and abandons the integrity that the American public expects from their Congress.

The numbers in this Democratic health care package are astounding. The bill costs about $1.2 trillion over the next ten years, imposes almost $570 billion in new taxes on the American public, and cuts the Medicare program by over $500 billion. As our economy attempts to recover from the largest recession since the Great Depression, this bill's laundry list of new taxes is deplorable: $32 billion in taxes on health care benefits, $52 billion in taxes on employers, $17 billion in penalties on individuals, $210.2 billion in an unprecedented Medicare tax on wages, self-employment income, and certain investment income, and many more. While these taxes will be in effect immediately, 98% of the bill's provisions do not begin until 2014. Therefore, Americans will be paying for health reform for four years without ever seeing the government return the favor. Unbelievably, the bill's true ten-year cost when fully implemented totals about $2.4 trillion dollars. To pay for this spending, it proposes half a trillion in cuts to Medicare and Medicare Advantage, robbing the benefits our seniors deserve.

What may be worse than the vast cost of this bill are the budgetary gimmicks used in its scoring. The authors use ten years of revenue to pay for only six years of government spending. They also double count savings from Medicare cuts to simultaneously pay for Medicare entitlements and the bill's new entitlements. Furthermore, the bill does not include the ''doc fix,'' legislation that will likely be passed separately to ensure doctors do not incur a huge cut in reimbursements—and costs an additional $371 billion. These methods were used to dupe the American people, a smoke-and-mirrors strategy to uphold President Obama's pledge that health care reform will ''not add a dime to the deficit.'' Unfortunately, if one omits these budgetary tricks from the bill's cost, it will actually increase the deficit by almost $600 billion in the first ten years.

The structure of this bill is a clear effort to give the government complete control over health care—it takes choice and flexibility from American citizens while also making them pay more. For example, the bill instructs the Health and Human Services (HHS) Secretary to determine what constitutes a ''minimum

benefits package'' for all Americans and then requires all citizens to purchase it. This mandate will be enforced by a massive expansion of the IRS, which will fine those who do not comply two percent of their income. I believe that individuals can best determine for themselves how comprehensive their health care insurance should be, and that Americans have many different needs which cannot be defined by a one-size-fits-all package. Unfortunately, H.R. 3590 sets the stage for mandated, standardized health care.

The provisions in H.R. 3590 will hurt families, businesses, and kill jobs at a time when we can least afford it. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has reported that this health care package will most likely raise premiums for millions of families by $2,100 per year. It also taxes employers if they cannot provide health insurance and their employees receive federal subsidies—this provision will cause employers to lay off employees due to cost increases, and it discourages companies from hiring low-wage workers who are more likely to qualify for subsidies. Furthermore, Democrats have promised that Americans may keep their health insurance if they like it, but the CBO has predicted that up to 9 million Americans will lose their employer-based coverage. Additionally, the bill imposes an unfunded mandate on Texas by drastically expanding the Medicaid program, costing Texas an estimated $24.3 billion dollars in the next ten years.

Unfortunately, the reasons why this bill will hurt this country abound. This legislation fails to ensure federal funding is not used for elective abortions. While the President has promised to issue an Executive Order for political effect, the President cannot amend a bill by issuing an order, and the federal courts will enforce what the law says. The bill also fails to include proper verification procedures to ensure illegal immigrants do not receive federal subsidies to purchase health insurance. Furthermore, it lacks protections for 9.2 million military personnel, families and retirees that their health insurance will not be affected. These pitfalls explain why Americans have flooded the DC area in protest, a visual testament of the public opinion on the Democratic health bill, which has become largely opposed throughout the debate. Unfortunately, the Democrats have not listened, and in one of the largest abuses of majority power, have forced their hand on the American public.

My fellow Republicans and I have been willing to work on health care reform from the beginning of this debate. We have introduced numerous proposals emphasizing free market solutions and cost-cutting strategies to make health care insurance readily available and more affordable to Americans. We were present when the President called us to discuss health care reform, but our willingness to start over and work together was ignored by our colleagues. I am disappointed by the events of tonight, but I have not given up and will continue to work for true reform that will lower costs instead of simply shifting those costs onto the government.

A TRIBUTE TO CAROL WILSON-SMITH

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Carol Wilson-Smith for her continued service and commitment to the health care field.

Carol Wilson-Smith is currently the Director of Rehabilitation Medicine at Kings County Hospital Center (KCHC). She is responsible for overseeing all operations of the department, managing the budget, and for ensuring that all patients receive the most effective rehabilitation that allows them to maximize their function to be re-integrated into their community. One of the many challenges of her position is adapting to the changing healthcare/managed care requirements as resources dwindle and patients' demands increase.

Carol began her career as a public school teacher specializing in Physical Education. After fourteen years in this role, she changed careers and attained a Physical Therapy degree. She has since practiced as a Physical Therapist at Harlem Hospital and Kings County Hospital, in the New York City Department of Education and in Home Care and moved on to become the Director of Physical Therapy and subsequently of Rehabilitation Medicine, EMG/EEG and Early Intervention at KCHC. Her ultimate goal is to have a positive impact on policy and decision making in the health and wellness field on a larger scale.

She received her secondary education at St. Joseph's Convent in Port-of-Spain, followed by a Teacher's Diploma from the Trinidad and Tobago Government Teachers College. She enrolled in the Physical Therapy program at Mona Campus, University of the West Indies before migrating to the United States of America where she earned her Bachelor of Science in Physical Therapy at Howard University. Ms. Wilson-Smith received a Master of Arts in Motor Learning from Columbia University, and a Master of Public Administration from New York University. Currently she is enrolled in a Doctoral Program at Boston University.

Recently appointed to the New York State Board for Physical Therapy by the Regents of New York City Department of Education, Carol has worked with the Foreign Credentialing Commission for Physical Therapy for the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS).

She is a member of the Trinidad & Tobago Alliance USA, Inc., and is a member of the Board of the University of the West Indies Alumni Association New York Chapter, providing educational scholarships to deserving candidates from both organizations.

As a devoted mother of three children: Naila, Kayode, and Karim she lives by the maxim: To whom much is given, much is expected (Luke 12:48).

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Carol Wilson-Smith.

A TRIBUTE TO NOVA HINDOYAN, 29TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR—2010

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Nova Hindoyan of Pasadena, California. Each year in March, in recognition of Women's History Month, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our nation's most distinguished women.

Nova came to the United States in 1975 from Damascus, Syria to attend her brother's wedding. While here, she met Garabet Hindoyan, then a student and now the co-owner of Burger Continental Restaurant in Pasadena. They fell in love and married within the same year. They were blessed with a son and two daughters.

Nova has been a long-time dedicated member of the Armenian Relief Society of Western USA, Inc., (ARS–WR) and has held executive positions as Chair of the Armenian Relief Society of Pasadena Chapter ''SOSSE'', as well as been on the Executive Board of Directors of the ARS–WR as vice chair and chair. She has worked on the ARS Public Relations Committee's special events, Red Cross blood drives, and City of Hope Bone Marrow Registry. Nova has always been an active parent and was on the Parent-Teacher Association while all three of her children were in school.

With her leadership, she was able to raise funds for special projects for ARS, most recently for the Society's Centennial Fund. She was also on the Board of Directors of the Old Town Conservatory School of Music in Pasadena, as well as on the Board of Directors and an active participant of the Lark Musical Society. Nova has sponsored foreign students who have come to enjoy her hospitality while they were in school. Today, Nova is on the Board of the Directors of the ARS Central Executive, while staying active in her chapter in Pasadena.

I ask all Members of Congress to join me today in honoring a remarkable woman of California's 29th Congressional District, Nova Hindoyan. The entire community joins me in thanking Nova for the meaningful impact she has had on the 29th Congressional District.

RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2010

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 21, 2010

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3590 and H.R. 4872. Passage of this legislation represents the first step to a government takeover of our health care system. Everyone agrees that our health care system needs to be reformed. Health care in America is too expensive and too many families across America are worried about losing or have already lost their health coverage. Businesses, small and large alike, are struggling to provide health insurance for their employees.

Unfortunately, rather than working on real reforms to improve access to health care for

all Americans, Democrats have chosen to pass a trillion dollar bill that would raise Americans' taxes, create a massive new tax burden, and do little to address the problems in our current health system. The frightening reality for the American taxpayer and anyone who will need health care in the future is that the Democrats are hiding the true costs of these bills and doing so in ways that will be disastrous to our Nation's long-term fiscal health. Instead of creating another absurdly expensive government program, we should work to make health care affordable and accessible for everyone.

I strongly believe that there are a number of measures that all of us, regardless of party affiliation, support that will bring down costs and improve access to care for all Americans. These are not new ideas—they are, however, ideas that are critical to implementing real, affordable and effective health reform. First, we must pass effective medical malpractice reform. We should end the practice of banning the purchase of insurance across State lines, and we should pass legislation to allow small businesses to band together through associations to buy health care coverage. I also support provisions that prohibit insurers from denying coverage to those people with pre-existing conditions. Further, we need to do more as a country to focus on prevention and early intervention. As a dentist, I have seen the benefits of prevention and early intervention. We should be focusing more on how to prevent disease or treat it early when it is most cost-effective and the outcomes are best.

Unfortunately, the Democrats' health reform bill fails to accomplish these goals. I am disappointed that President Obama and Speaker PELOSI have chosen to ignore the clear message from the American people by supporting a massive government takeover of our health system. Americans deserve REAL reform—not a partisan, gimmicky bill that will cost trillions of dollars and do little to improve care.

REGARDING AMERICA'S STRONG BONDS WITH ISRAEL

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to reaffirm the strong bonds between Israel and the United States. Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East. We share the same values, the same commitment to education, the same commitment to development, the same commitment to helping others.

Israel is situated in a dangerous neighborhood, with many of its neighbors overtly calling for its destruction. I was pleased to hear both President Obama and Secretary of State Clinton reaffirm America's close ties to Israel and our commitment to Israel's security in recent days. And I hope that this signals a desire to reduce the appearance of a rift.

During Vice President BIDEN's recent trip to the Middle East, Palestinian leaders participated in naming a public square for Dalal Mughrabi, the terrorist who led the most devastating attack in Israel's history. In 1978, Mughrabi and her cohorts hijacked a bus and murdered 37 innocent civilians, including 13 children and an American citizen.

Further, during Vice President BIDEN's visit, senior Fatah leaders, including Mahmud Dahlan, called on Muslims to protect the Temple Mount from the Jews, during the dedication of the reconstructed historic Hurva Synagogue located in the Jewish quarter 500 yards from the Western Wall and not on Temple Mount. President Obama has condemned the rioting that resulted, as was appropriate. I hope America will also take a strong stance against Palestinian leaders who foment violence.

As long as Israelis fear a third intifada and worry about the safety of their families, they will be far less likely to participate in peace talks in which they know they will be asked to take risks for peace. Israelis have already taken risks for peace—they withdrew from Lebanon, they withdrew from the Gaza Strip, they signed peace treaties with Jordon and Egypt, they abandoned the city Yamit in the Sinai desert, and they have released hundreds of terrorists, many of whom have had blood on their hands and many of whom have returned to their terrorist activities.

I believe very strongly that both the Palestinians and the Israelis would benefit from a real, lasting peace agreement and I hope talks will soon resume. But they will not resume if the Palestinians believe they will gain more by not talking. And they cannot resume if Israel feels that its existence or its people are being threatened. In previous administrations, there were direct talks. Today, the best we can hope for are proximity talks. I urge the administration to take every possible action to quell the tensions between the U.S. and our great friend, Israel, and to create an atmosphere in which both the Palestinians and the Israelis feel comfortable about resolving their differences.

Madam Speaker, I ask my distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing the importance of maintaining a warm relationship with Israel, our strong ally and good friend.

A TRIBUTE TO AMOTE SIAS

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Amote Sias, for her commitment and contributions to education and the New York City community.

Amote Sias is the founding principal of Brooklyn Collegiate, a College Board School, located in the Ocean-Hill section of Brownsville, Brooklyn and services 575 students in grades 6 through 12. She is a visionary leader who is passionate about her students and staff having and being the best.

Principal Sias started her career in education as a teacher in 1982 in Nassau County Board of Cooperative Education Services (BOCES) as a Math and Social Studies teacher and department chairwoman. She transferred to New York City Board of Education to be able to give back to her community. From 1985 to 1999, she taught grades kindergarten through twelfth in various subjects including, English, Social Studies, Mathematics, and Computer Science. From 1999 to 2001, she was the Leadership Development Coordinator for Brooklyn and Staten Island High Schools (BASIS). As the Leadership Development Coordinator, she was responsible for training principals, teachers, students, and parents in the areas of leadership, conflict resolution, cultural competence and team building. Because of her dedication and effective leadership, she advanced on to become the Director of Community Engagement for the new small schools of Brooklyn High Schools Superintendent and New Visions for New Schools Organization.

After the reorganization of the Department of Education in 2003, Principal Sias was asked to take on the position of Project Manager of Region 5 for the creation of new small schools within boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens. This responsibility included recruiting and organizing the prospective school teams, training the teams, engaging the community in the process and serving on the committee which recommended the schools to be selected. In the midst of her work, Dr. Kathleen Cashin, Regional Superintendent of Region 5 afforded her the opportunity to become a principal at EBC of Public Service High School in East New York. While working as principal of EBC, Principal Sias wrote a proposal which was approved for the creation of Brooklyn Collegiate, which opened in September 2004. In June of 2008, Brooklyn Collegiate celebrated its first graduating class with seventy four percent of all seniors graduating and eighty-five percent of those students attending college.

Simultaneously working for the Department of Education, Principal Sias has served as an adjunct professor of English at Long Island University Brooklyn Campus for four years and rose the rank of Associate Professor. As an ordained minister since 1999, she pastors The Church without Borders and Assistant Pastor of Provision of Promise Miracle Family Worship Center located at 347 Rockaway Avenue in Brownsville, Brooklyn. She has received numerous awards and honors including ''Principal of the Year,'' 2008–2009. She was the host of ''Words of Wisdom for Daily Living'' a daily radio program on WLIB, 1190AM. As a well rounded individual, Principal Sias has a passion for the things of God and enjoys traveling, reading and playing sports.

She firmly believes ''we can and we will succeed!''

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Amote Sias.

A TRIBUTE TO CAROLE RODENBUCHER, 29TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR—2010

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Carole Rodenbucher of Temple City, California. Each year in March, to recognize Women's History Month, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our nation's most distinguished women.

In 1985, when her son Ryan was at Young People's Village Preschool, Carole started volunteering by attending all off-site outings and working on the first ever Camellia Parade float entry. Since 1988, Carole has served as the Parent-Teacher Association, PTA president at Emperor Elementary School and at Temple

City High School, TCHS. She also held several PTA executive board positions and chairmanships. She served on the Emperor School Site Council for two terms (two years each) as chairman and secretary.

Carole volunteered as Den Leader for Cub Scout Pack 169; Webelos Leader; Den Leader Coach; and Tiger Cub coach, secretary, treasurer, and committee chairman (seven years). She was also on the Lucky Baldwin Round Table Staff and Scout Expo, Pow Wow, Cub Scout, and Webelos Day Camps both at Trask and Cherry Valley. The most fun she had was teaching ''Cooking with Carole'' for three years at Camp Trask. She also served as the assistant to the Webelos Day Camp Director at Camp Trask for five years.

In 1999, Carole was a chaperone for the TCHS trip to Germany, and in 2003, 2004, and 2005, Bob and Carole were chaperones on the TCHS Washington DC trips. In 2003, Brett was part of the State Department exchange program with Russia, and the family had a Russian exchange student live with them. In 2005, Carole joined Friends of Foster Children, San Gabriel Valley. She has served as a director; secretary; Ways and Means; chaired the 2009 luncheon; and for Sugar Plum acted as secretary and Outside Groups Coordinator as well as volunteered on several committees.

Carole, her husband Bob, and her two sons Ryan and Brett have coordinated the Camellia Festival Grandstand Seating for the last twelve years. Carole is the General Chairman for 2010 and was Assistant General Chairman in 2009. Carole was in charge of the TCHS Grad Night Ram Discount Card in 2000 and 2004, helped on the game booths for Grad Night 2004, and continues to volunteer at Grad Night celebrations.

I ask all Members of Congress to join me today in honoring a remarkable woman of California's 29th Congressional District, Carole Rodenbucher. The entire community joins me in thanking Carole for the meaningful impact she has had on the 29th Congressional District.

HONORING FLORIDA PARENT TEACHER ASSOCIATION (PTA)

HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize and congratulate Florida Parent Teacher Association, PTA on receiving the 2010 Outstanding Advocacy Awards. Their advocacy efforts at state, local and individual levels were recognized because of their dedication, leadership and sustained efforts to positively affect child related policy, regulation and legislation. This association serves a critical role in helping to provide the best possible educational environment for our students throughout Florida.

As the largest volunteer child advocacy association in the nation, the PTA reminds our country of its obligations to children and provides parents and families with a powerful voice to speak on behalf of every child while providing the best tools for parents to help their children be successful students.

It is important to recognize that Florida PTA is being honored for their efforts while facing proposed education budget cuts. The state PTA formed a coalition with major education groups during these efforts. Unfortunately, Florida ranks near the bottom in the country in school funding. But, Florida PTA's initiatives created sustained advocacy and generated new-found enthusiasm for parents and local PTAs to work together for education funding for Florida children. Advocates sent more than 3,000 letters of protest to the Florida Governor and state legislators, held regular conference calls with regional and local PTAs, developed an advocacy toolkit, and held one of the largest rallies at the state Capitol steps. As a result of Florida's PTA efforts, Florida legislators did not reduce education funding as proposed.

Madam Speaker, please join me in congratulating Florida Parent Teacher Association for their outstanding achievement. The dedicated involvement from parents throughout Florida reflects a strong commitment to public education and community service. I offer my strong support for Florida PTA and their dedicated volunteers.

IN RECOGNITION OF TALLADEGA COLLEGE'S MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM WINNING THE 2010 USCAA NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I would like to request the House's attention today to pay recognition to the Talladega College Men's Basketball team who recently won the 2010 USCAA National Championship.

On March 7th, the Tornados defeated Southern Virginia 65–56 in Uniontown, Pennsylvania. This is their second consecutive National Championship win. The Tornadoes finished the season with a record of 18–15. The Talladega College Tornados are led by Head Coach William Brown and Assistant Coach Randy Pulley.

All of us across Talladega County and East Alabama are deeply proud of these talented young Alabamians. I'd like to congratulate the team, coaches and Talladega College on this outstanding achievement for the second straight year.

A TRIBUTE TO KATYA RATTRAY

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Katya Rattray for her commitment to social service and her years of service in the Brooklyn community.

Katya Rattray's story is that of the quintessential American immigrant experience. Katya Rattray was born in Georgetown Guyana of mixed race parentage and spent her early years in Guyana and Nassau, Bahamas before immigrating to the U.S. almost three decades ago.

Tragedy struck with the passing of her father Patrick Thorne, a sworn land surveyor, while she was still a teenager. She and her family, mother Eslyn Thorne and brother Maxim Thorne, immigrated to the United States in search of a better future.

Katya deferred her studies and worked in retail and administrative services in the legal and banking industries in New York to help support her mother and younger brother. Throughout this period however, she kept her eyes on the goals of resuming her education and giving back to her community as best she could.

Upon resuming her studies, she excelled at Rutgers University where she double majored in sociology and women's studies. She became a Mabel Smith Douglass Honors student focusing on racial justice in the U.S. and the plight and struggles of young women of African descent in the period leading up to and through the Civil Rights movement.

She later went on to achieve a masters in business administration with a dual specialization in marketing and logistics from the University of Miami and embarked on her career in the private sector as an international management consultant focusing on issues facing minority communities.

Katya also served a brief stint as a political campaign manager, before joining the executive management of Brooklyn Child and Family Services, Inc. (BCAFS), a 501(c)(3) non-profit, community-based organization that receives millions in public and private grants. She has served as both the Interim Executive Director and the Head Start and Early Head Start Program Director. She oversees a full range of early educational and comprehensive social services to over 800 families in a predominantly low-income population where many are African American, Latino and immigrant. BCAFS has been a provider of community-based education, social and other supportive services in the Bedford Stuyvesant, Fort Greene, Flatbush, Bushwick, Brooklyn Heights, Williamsburg and surrounding Brooklyn neighborhoods since 1963.

Under her leadership, Ms. Rattray has engineered a significant transformation to the operations of the program and drastically increased its operating efficiency, program outreach and education outcomes; no small feat in these trying times.

She has achieved an almost one hundred percent enrollment in the program that is unprecedented in this history of the organization, community partnerships have dramatically increased, and once again a Policy Council from the community is vibrant and engaged in helping the agency, all hallmarks of the Head Start ethos.

Under Ms. Rattray's stewardship, Brooklyn Children and Family Services is once again poised to become a beacon in the 10th Congressional District of New York.

Katya is married to her soul mate, Ken Rattray, an international management and technology consultant, and together they have three wonder children, Kyra, Kenneth Patrick (KP), and Kalyn.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Katya Rattray.

HONORING MS. SALLIE HICKS

HON. KENDRICK B. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker. Today I rise to pay tribute to the life and legacy of the late Ms. Sallie Hicks, a constituent in the Congressional district I represent who was known for her contagious, spiritual and endearing personality. It is with both profound sadness, but also an enduring sense of gratitude that I recognize her for the tremendous inspiration she provided to the South Florida community.

Ms. Hicks was born on April 6, 1913 in Chipley, Florida to the late Mr. and Mrs. Charlie Hicks. She was the second child of 14 siblings. Her early years were spent in Chipley until her family moved to Live Oak, Florida where she attended Suwannee County Public Schools.

Affectionately known as ''Dr. Sally'', Ms. Hicks was employed by the Mary Elizabeth Hotel. Upon retiring, she began a second career as a caregiver at Betty's Sunshine and Sunset Daycare. Soon thereafter, she established her own daycare in her home. She created a loving home, gave guidance, potty trained, and provided health information. Most importantly, all of her children were loved. She was the surrogate grandmother to more than 15 children.

Moreover, Ms. Hicks was a faithful member at Greater Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church since the early 1950s.

Ms. Hicks was blessed with a loving family who took pleasure in every aspect of her life and her interests. I offer my heartfelt condolences to her two daughters, Eveline and Cathia; granddaughter, Kimberly; and great-granddaughter, Evelyn.

Madam Speaker, I ask you and all the members of this esteemed legislative body to join me in recognizing the extraordinary life and accomplishments of Ms. Sallie Hicks. She will be missed by all who knew her, and I appreciate this opportunity to pay tribute to her before the United States House of Representatives. While she will indeed be missed, her legacy, as well as the outstanding contributions she made to Greater Bethel A.M.E Church and the South Florida community will live on.

A TRIBUTE TO CATHERINE KEEN, 29TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR—2010

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Catherine ''Cathy'' Keen of Glendale, California. Each year in March, in recognition of Women's History Month, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our Nation's most distinguished women.

Cathy has served the Glendale community primarily in the area of child advocacy, spending many years as an officer in the Parent-Teacher Association, PTA, at the elementary, middle school, high school, and council levels, including president of the Glenoaks PTA for two years. She was awarded the California Golden Oak Service Award by the State PTA, the highest level of award bestowed by the PTA. She also served as president of the Glenoaks Elementary School Foundation in 1994.

Cathy is active in Las Candelas, a philanthropic group which works to improve the lives of emotionally disturbed children. Cathy served as president of Las Candelas for two years and has chaired their biennial benefit twice, raising $140,000 for programs for emotionally disturbed children. In 1993, she was a finalist for the Glendale News Press Woman of Achievement, nominated for her help with the family of a dying child.

She chaired the Glendale Healthy Kids, GHK's popular ''Guess Who's Coming to Dinner?'' for nine years and also served on the Board of Directors of GHK for six years. She served as president of the Board of GHK and filled in as executive director when they were without one. Cathy personally published the GHK newsletter for five years and received the GHK Volunteer of the Year Award.

Cathy is currently serving as president of the Kiwanis Club of Glendale, the second woman in eighty-nine years to hold this position. In Kiwanis, she has served as Chairman of Youth Services for two years, overseeing nineteen Kiwanis projects to help our community youth, and has served on the Board of Directors. Cathy also publishes the weekly KiwaniNews and is a regular reporter for the news when not serving as president.

I ask all Members of Congress to join me today in honoring a remarkable woman of California's 29th Congressional District, Catherine Keen. The entire community joins me in thanking Cathy for the meaningful impact she has had on the 29th Congressional District.

A TRIBUTE TO TYNE L. NEWMAN

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Tyne L. Newman for her achievements in television, the arts, and her community.

Tyne L. Newman was born in Queens, New York and is the middle of three children. Growing up, she had aspirations of becoming an actress/director and wanted to work in television. As an adolescent, she attended Salvation Bedford Day Camp where she met actor Emmanuel Lewis. Enthused and inspired she knew exactly what path in life she wanted to take and began writing her first screenplay. Hard work in the South Ozone Park community as a youngster earned her Salute to Youth award in tribute to the late Congressman Joseph Addabo.

Tyne attended John Bowne High School and received her bachelor's and master's degrees in communications/business. After college, she began working at Brooklyn Community Access Television (BCAT), known today as BCAT TV Network. She began as a production assistant and worked her way up to her current position as Production Manager.

At the BCAT TV Network, Tyne has worked on two State of the Borough addresses and three candidate debates—most recently with former council member District 39 and now Public Advocate Bill deBlasio, and former council member District 20 and now New York City Comptroller John Liu. In addition, Tyne has produced over 160 episodes of ''Brooklyn Elected Officials.''

During an internship at Public Broadcasting Service (PBS), Tyne was privileged to work with actor Ben Vereen on ''Broadway: The American Musical.''

Tyne has been a faithful member of Fellowship Missionary Baptist Church since her early childhood and currently works on the Pulpit Community, Combined Choir, Youth Ministry and the Arts/Culture Ministry. Tyne also directs, produces and writes plays for the children in her Brooklyn church community. She has a special love for children and choreographs dance moves for gospel music for their enjoyment.

In 2006, Tyne met Everton Griffith and in 2008 they were married. They currently reside in Westchester, New York.

Tyne enjoys being an active participant in her community and spearheaded a campaign to ''Rock the Vote'' by organizing local community members in the Van Siclen/Dumont area block, registering a noteworthy amount of individuals to participate in the presidential election of 2008.

Tyne currently owns/operates her own videography business entitled Tru Vision Entertainment. Ms. Newman has been the recipient of numerous honors and enjoys acting, singing, writing, skiing and shopping.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Tyne L. Newman.

RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2010

SPEECH OF

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 21, 2010

Mr. ROSKAM. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the reconciliation procedure that will transform over one-sixth of our nation's economy and increasingly cause reliance on the federal government for healthcare and education. Beyond my procedural and political problems, I have major concerns with the elimination of the Federal Family Education Loan program because it will destroy an important tool for need-based graduate student aid—the School as Lender program. Overhauling the federal student loan program will have unintended consequences in the form of lost private sector jobs and lost opportunities for graduate students in Illinois' Sixth Congressional District. Millions of dollars in financial aid for thousands of students across the country will be lost. I also fear the program will add to our nation's already record deficit.

Procedurally, the proposal has not received a hearing or markup in the United States Senate. At least nine Democrats in the Senate have written with concerns on the proposal's effect on job losses in the private sector.

The elimination of the School as Lender program ignores the needs of graduate students. Schools obtain credit to make loans and use the proceeds from their origination to support financial aid. Proceeds from the sale of loans must be returned to graduate students in the form of need-based grants. A

2005 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report stated, ''School lenders either used money to lower borrowing costs and/or provide need-based grants to its students.'' Without School as Lender, many students will now be forced to take out more loans and student debt.

Within my Congressional District, one of the pioneers of the School as Lender program, Midwestern University, uses its School as Lender program to provide need-based grants to students who would otherwise not be able to pursue the University's graduate programs in osteopathic medicine, pharmacy, dental medicine and other health sciences. Decreasing access to education for low-income students would further inflame the shortage of the healthcare workforce as Congress considers a massive healthcare takeover. Over the past three academic years, Midwestern University has paid out over four million dollars in School as Lender scholarship monies to more than 1,500 students. Midwestern lacks profit motives to continue the program—they simply desire to maintain an affordable option to attract graduate students.

Additionally, the savings from the transition to fully federal funded student lending has been overpromised and any savings will be overspent. Updated Congressional Budget Office (CBO) scores show the initiative is projected to increase deficits rather than decrease our debt. According to CBO, after evaluating the fair value of providing credit assistance to students including the cost of market risk and the present value of future administrative costs, the lending overhaul increases the deficit even more significantly. The House-passed (H.R. 3221) measure promises $77 billion in new spending compared to only $40 billion in savings from the President's proposal. This accounting is necessary to factor all of the risks that loans and loan guarantees impose on taxpayers and the cost of market risk.

Through the School as Lender program, Midwestern is able to break down cost barriers that keep many low-income students from seeking graduate degrees. I urge my colleagues to rise against this overreach that would prohibit graduate students from access to a valuable scholarship opportunity while further burdening our children with an increase to our record national debt.

TRIBUTE TO RUSS WIESLEY

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Russ Wiesley for his commitment to improving the educational system in Iowa and for recently being elected as president to the Iowa Association of School Boards' board of directors. The IASB, encompassing 361 school districts, 10 area education agencies and 15 community colleges, is a private, nonprofit organization that serves as a major advocate for Iowa's school system.

Born and raised in Cedar Falls, Mr. Wiesley attended the University of Northern Iowa as well as Drake University, earning a degree in pharmacy. Upon graduation, he went on to work in various pharmacies, eventually opening his own.

With 13 years of experience on the Waukee school board and six for the IASB, Mr. Wiesley has risen to be a key figure for supporting the development and training of Iowa's students and school administrators. A former Marine and Vietnam War veteran, the leadership role is nothing new to Mr. Wiesley, who has held prominent positions during his time as a member of the Iowa Pharmacists Association, the Dallas County Empowerment Board of Directors, the Urbandale Jaycees, the YMCA, the American Legion, the Waukee Veterans of Foreign Wars, the First Marine Corps Division and 2/1 Associations, the Military Order of the Purple Heart and Waukee United Methodist Church.

Madam Speaker, individuals such as Russ Wiesley should be recognized for their sincere dedication to educating our nation and for their devotion to creating a better community. I sincerely appreciate the work that Mr. Wiesley has done and wish him further success in his educational endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. GAY TOLTL KINMAN, 29TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR—2010

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Gay Toltl Kinman of Alhambra, California. Each year in March, in recognition of Women's History Month, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our Nation's most distinguished women.

Gay has been active with both the City of Alhambra and the Alhambra Chamber of Commerce. As vice president of the Housing and Urban Development Committee for the City of Alhambra, Gay assisted the Alhambra Historical Society in obtaining a grant for the Alhambra Historical Society Museum. Gay also served as president of the Civil Service Commission for the City of Alhambra. While a member of the Alhambra Chamber of Commerce, Gay formed the committee to plan for a Chinese New Year Festival Parade, which still takes place today, and then was chair of the parade. Gay also served as Chair of Transportation on the Government Affairs Committee for the Alhambra Chamber of Commerce.

Gay has been involved with Soroptimist International of Alhambra, San Gabriel, and San Marino. As president of the chapter, Gay helped bring in a record of nine new members, established the Friendship Link exchange where members of SI Burnley, England visited, helped establish the link between Alhambra Curves and La Casa de San Gabriel Community Center, and was the chair of various committees. She also founded the Soroptimist Camino Real Region's Friendship Grant Committee, which provides hospitality and professional education every two years for a Soroptimist from another part of the world. Currently, she is the Alhambra, San Gabriel, and San Marino chapter's co-vice president of programs, chair of the Woman of Distinction Award Committee, and co-chair of Reading is Fundamental, which buys books for third graders in the Alhambra and San Gabriel School Districts.

In addition to Soroptimists, Gay has given her time to various organizations throughout Alhambra. For the Alhambra Historical Society, she has served as president and publicity chair. As a board member for the Alhambra Educational Foundation, she started the Authors Festival, which brings over eighty children's authors, storytellers, and illustrators to the Alhambra Unified School District. As chair of the Alhambra Red Cross Council, she helped restore the presence of the Red Cross in Alhambra and taught volunteer training classes. She has been secretary for the Alhambra Toastmasters, a volunteer for Meals on Wheels, and is currently head usher at Alhambra's All Souls Church. In addition, she helped design Alhambra's float for the Tournament of Roses Parade.

On top of all this, Gay has been active outside of Alhambra with the YMCA West San Gabriel Valley, the Special Libraries Association of Southern California, the Los Angeles County Deputy Commissioner of Civil Marriages, the League of Women Voters Greater Pasadena Area, and the Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens.

I ask all Members of Congress to join me today in honoring a remarkable woman of California's 29th Congressional District, Dr. Gay Toltl Kinman. The entire community joins me in thanking Gay for the meaningful impact she has had on the 29th Congressional District.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF TALLADEGA

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I would like to request the House's attention today to pay recognition to the people of the city of Talladega, who are celebrating their city's 175th anniversary this year.

Talladega, Alabama, was incorporated on January 9, 1835. Talladega is home to the Talladega Superspeedway, Talladega College, and many other historic sites, to name a few, and is also known for its fascinating history and deep traditions.

On March 25th, a four-day celebration of the founding of Talladega will begin. Included in the festivities are a historic play—presented by Talladega High School; USA Powerlifting, Alabama State Championship; a 5K run benefiting Hope Academy; a national championship celebration parade for Talladega College; a BBQ cook-off; a burial of the time capsule; and concerts by American Idol contestants Bo Bice and Ruben Studdard, to list a few.

All of us across east Alabama are proud of this important occasion for the citizens of Talladega. We look forward to seeing the city continue to thrive and grow, and congratulate local citizens and Mayor Brian York on their 175th anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO THE BOONE COUNTY FAIR

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Boone County Fair for receiving the 2009 ''Blue Ribbon Fair'' Award.

This award, presented by the Association of Iowa Fairs' (AIF) Board of Directors at their 2009 Conference and Annual Meeting in Des Moines, recognizes the Boone County Fair for displaying sincere commitment to educational programs, such as 4–H and FFA, in their community, as well as exhibiting genuine dedication to providing services in both fair and non fair locations.

Representing the Association of Iowa Fairs' North Central District, the Boone County Fair is one of six fairs in Iowa to receive this award in 2009. The AIF, a key advocate for Iowa's fair industry, is a non-profit corporation composed of 106 county and district fairs, the Iowa State Fair, and over 130 associate members, including carnivals, entertainment agencies, festivals, chambers, concessionaires, special attractions and suppliers of the industry.

Madam Speaker, the Boone County Fair truly captures the American spirit and demonstrates unwavering devotion to enhancing the lives of their community members. I commend the Boone County Fair for being recognized as a ''Blue Ribbon Fair'' and I am honored to represent the people of this county in the United States Congress.

A TRIBUTE TO JUANITA WEST TILLMAN, 29TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR—2010

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Juanita West Tillman of Altadena, California. Each year in March, in recognition of Women's History Month, we pay special tribute to the accomplishments made by our nation's most distinguished women.

Juanita has been a resident of Pasadena and Altadena for 55 years. She taught for 26 years in the Los Angeles Archdiocese and Pasadena Unified School District, PUSD.

During her career at PUSD, Juanita served on school leadership teams, school site councils, school library grant writing committees, Pasadena Historical Society Curriculum Committee, Language Arts Textbook Adoption Committee, LAAMP Family Leadership Team, and in a professional development academy and literacy academy. While teaching, Juanita acquired a real estate license and, upon retiring, she joined her daughter, Lynnette West-Cater, as co-owner of Westlyn Realtors.

Juanita has volunteered as a mentor and advisor for children and youth, served on boards of service and community organizations, and has been effective in getting citizens registered to vote and out to the polls. She is a founding member and past president of Pasadena Delta Foundation, which is the first African American organization in the Pasadena area to establish a six-figure scholarship endowment fund; past president of the National Sorority of Phi Delta Kappa, Gamma Lambda Chapter and Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Pasadena Alumnae Chapter, respectively; chairperson of the Education Committee of the Pasadena NAACP Branch; current treasurer of the Pasadena Council of Women's Clubs; member of the Friends of the Pasadena Playhouse where she volunteers as an usher; and member of First AME Church where she serves as a Class Leader providing encouragement and service to her class members.

Juanita served on the John Muir High School principal selection committee in 2003 and the teacher selection committee in 2007 and continues to be an advisor and active supporter of Mentoring & Partnership for Youth Development (MPYD), a male-mentoring program at John Muir High School. She also assisted in planning the Entering the College Zone, a National Black Child Development program.

I ask all Members of Congress to join me today in honoring a remarkable woman of California's 29th Congressional District, Juanita West Tillman. The entire community joins me in thanking Juanita for the meaningful impact she has had on the 29th Congressional District.

TRIBUTE TO BRANDON PETTIT

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Brandon Pettit, of Prole, Iowa, who has achieved national recognition for exemplary volunteer service in his community. The 2010 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program recently named Brandon as one of the top youth volunteers in Iowa for his part in the 2009 Warren County Fair's recycling effort.

Brandon, upon noticing significant potential to cut down on waste at public events, created and successfully implemented a plastic bottle and aluminum can recycling initiative for the 2009 Warren County Fair. His plan recruited fellow 4-H members to monitor and empty 10 recycling bins strategically placed throughout the fairgrounds. Brandon would then, with the help of his family, proceed to sort, bag, and deliver the used bottles and cans to redemption and recycling centers.

Created in 1995, by Prudential Financial in partnership with the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards annually honors the most impressive student volunteers in each state and the District of Columbia. This organization strives to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions are critically important and highly valued, while inspiring other young individuals 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.

Madam Speaker, individuals such as Brandon Pettit must be recognized and applauded for their sincere dedication to maintaining a healthy community and for their positive impact on the lives of others. Brandon's actions show that young Americans can—and do—play important roles in our nation, and I am proud to represent him, his family and his fellow volunteers in the United States Congress.

IN HONOR OF MS. JEANETTE ECKMAN

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to Jeanette Eckman, a remarkable woman who is to be posthumously inducted into the Hall of Fame of Delaware Women. Jeanette is truly deserving of this high distinction for her contributions to our State and the valuable legacies she left for historians.

Ms. Eckman was an educator, political activist, historian, and author. Her works, endorsed by our State, are considered official historical documents which have preserved vital aspects of Delaware's past. She served as director and historian for the 300th anniversary of the settlement of New Castle by the Dutch colonials in 1950–55, and received an honorary award from the Queen of the Netherlands for her devotion to Dutch colonial history in the Delaware Valley.

In 1915, Ms. Eckman became the first women in the First State to be appointed to an executive position with the Republican State Committee, organizing women voters in the State soon after the women's suffrage amendment was ratified. She served as secretary for women's affairs for U.S. Senator T. Coleman du Pont in the 1920s.

As a champion of women's rights and preserving American history in the State of Delaware, Jeanette is the epitome of what this Hall of Fame represents. Her contributions to the State of Delaware are remarkable, irrespective of her gender. She was an amazing woman, and her legacy continues with this accolade.

SHOW OF SUPPORT MILITARY HUNT

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, today I want to show appreciation to an organization that is doing something unique for our wounded warriors. Show of Support Military Hunt honors men and women from different branches of service with a Texas way of saying ''Thank Ya'll.'' We Texans love to hunt. It's a way of life in the South and Terry Johnson founded an idea to thank these brave men and women who sacrificed so much with all expenses paid guided hunts.

Terry wrote letters and made calls to get people on board. He sought to bring awareness to outdoor sports while showing his gratitude to our warriors. The first hunt began in

2002 with only two soldiers. Now, due to overwhelming support, over 50 wounded soldiers released from duty have been on one of these memorable hunts. Everything is donated; the land to hunt on, rifles and ammunition, hunting gear, airfare if they are flying in from another state, and anything else that may be required. Not to be left out, they also pay tribute to the families of the soldiers.

While the men are hunting, the wives are treated to a day on the town. The Show of Support Military Hunt, ''Hunt for Heroes'' has brought about a new way for the public to offer its thanks and I cannot imagine a more noble cause.

IN HONOR OF MS. BEVERLY LOUISE STEWART

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize Beverly Louise Stewart, who is to be inducted into the Hall of Fame of Delaware Women for her contributions to education in Delaware. Beverly pioneered an innovative method of tutoring, and created a thriving educational center out of her own home.

Beverly started Back to Basics, a one-on-one private tutoring service, in 1985 after teaching at Sanford School. What started as a small tutoring service in her kitchen, and with her as the only instructor, is now a vibrant firm that employs approximately 80 degreed tutors, and a multitude of services in addition to basic subject help. The center offers corporate education, adult education, English as a Second Language, and a unique state-approved private school. The motto of Back to Basics is ''Aim High!''—which is certainly the axiom of Beverly's story, as well.

The accolades Beverly has collected over the years speaks to the ingenuity of Back to Basics. She was given the ''Delaware Entrepreneurial Woman of the Year Award'' by the New Castle County Chamber of Commerce's The Capitol Review in 1998, and the Delaware Small Business Administration's ''2004 Small Businessperson of the Year.'' In 2007, Delaware Today named her one of the ''Top 35 Women in Business.''

As a Member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, it makes me proud to see all that Beverly has accomplished as a citizen of Delaware, both to advance education, and as small business leader. I am grateful for her contributions to the State of Delaware, and wish her all the best as she accepts the well-earned honor of being inducted into the Hall of Fame of Delaware Women.

MANIFEST OF HOPE

HON. JARED POLIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share with my colleague and all Americans interested in the cause of immigration reform; words that were shared with me by one my constituents.

To the People and Government of the United States of America:

We, the not authorized migrants that are looking for the American Dream, We wrote (this) in Spanish and (it) has been translated to the English Language:

MANIFEST OF THE HOPE

We manifest that every man and woman that demonstrates the loyalty through work, education, art and culture; furthermore, honor the American virtues, and to the fact of comply with the responsibilities acquired because of residing in this country, deserves the opportunity to be a part of it. Desire born from the most beautiful precept that God granted to America:

''That all Men are created equal, that they are
Endowed by their creator with certain
Unalienable rights, that among these are life,
Liberty and the pursuit of happiness''
—From the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776.

This Nation has the historic responsibility of preserving those natural rights to their future generations.

The world is actually agitated by violence, and the security of America depends on all their inhabitants, those of us who breath the winds of freedom, those of us who enjoy the colors of diversity and those of us who love the fruit of America's land.

Keep into your heart and conscience our hope and goodwill. God bless America and its freedom, generation after generation.

So be it.

HONORING SISTER ASCENSION BANEGAS

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to Sister Ascension Banegas, an extraordinary woman who is to be inducted into the Hall of Fame of Delaware Women. Sister Banegas is truly deserving of this high distinction for the profound impact she has made not only upon Delaware, but around the world.

Sister Ascension Banegas, Spanish Carmelite Sister of Charity, has lived in Delaware since 1994. She has worked on behalf of the less fortunate in Japan, England, and New York City, before moving to rural Delaware to be the very first trained nonprofit immigration provider in the southern part of the State. In 1996, she helped co-found ''La Esperanza'' (''Hope'') Community Center, which is a multi-service, bilingual center in Georgetown, Delaware. Because of Sister Ascension's influence, La Esperanza and nearby Delaware Technical and Community College have great numbers of immigrant English language learners, which aids in the integration and empowerment of immigrants in Southern Delaware. In October of 2009, she received the Bank of America Local Hero Award, and is profoundly respected by her clients and colleagues for her ceaseless advocacy, spirit, strength and humor on behalf of the Spanish-speaking community.

Sister Ascension has dedicated 55 years to helping people in need around the globe, having a life-changing impact in communities in Spain, Japan, London, Brooklyn, NY and Delaware. Her tireless advocacy on behalf of those suffering from poverty and discrimination is unrivaled, and she remains committed to fight for justice for hardworking immigrants and foreign nationals living in Delaware.

Her ceaseless efforts to improve the situation of the immigrant population, as well as that of the broader community, are testaments to her tremendous quality of character. I commend her for her outstanding service to the State of Delaware, and wish her all the best as she accepts the well-deserved honor of being inducted into the Hall of Fame of Delaware Women.

RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2010

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN BOOZMAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, March 21, 2010

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all here because we want to do what is best for our constituents, our State, and our country. All of us in this chamber understand the importance of health care reform no matter what side of the aisle we sit on. We've all heard stories and know of family members, friends and neighbors who aren't able to get the care they need at a cost they can afford. Like my constituents and all Americans I want reforms that save lives, save money, and improve care. Unfortunately, this bill doesn't reach those goals.

We must remember that we work for the people. I think some of us have forgotten who our bosses are. It's not President Obama, Speaker PELOSI or Senator REID, it's the American people. There is no doubt that the people have spoken loud and clear against this big government health care bill. If you need a reminder, go look out the window of the Capitol where you can see the opposition to this bill mounting.

I urge my colleagues to do what the overwhelming majority of Americans want and that is to kill this bill.

IN HONOR OF MS. KATHRYN YOUNG HAZEUR

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to Kathryn Young Hazeur, who is to be inducted into the Hall of Fame of Delaware Women for her notable lifelong involvement with education. Her outstanding work ethic, superb organizational skills, intelligence, and perseverance have enabled her to break through the many barriers that stood in her way.

Kathryn is an educational pioneer in the State of Delaware, as she was the first African-American to earn a graduate degree in the First State, and was also the first director of Head Start for the State. Throughout her outstanding career in education that spanned over four and a half decades, as both a teacher and as a principal, Kathryn impacted the

lives of thousands of young people fortunate enough to be under her tutelage.

Over the years, Kathryn has utilized her strong leadership skills to enact positive change in the community. She served as the Chair of the Desegregation Commission for the Wilmington Public Schools during the desegregation era in the Wilmington school system, and has been active on numerous committees for Saint Joseph's Catholic Church. In 2003, she was the recipient of the Phi Delta Kappa (Teachers) Sorority ''Lifetime Achievement Award.''

Kathryn has built a legacy of legendary teaching and nurturing of Delaware's young people, as well as community service. I am grateful for her marvelous service to the State of Delaware, and wish her all the best as she accepts the well-earned honor of being inducted into the Hall of Fame of Delaware Women.

IN HONOR OF MS. JACQUELIN PITTS

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to Jacquelin Pitts, an exemplary woman who is to be inducted into the Hall of Fame of Delaware Women. Jackie is truly deserving of this high distinction for the profound impact she has made not only here in Delaware, but around the world, as well.

Jacquelin Pitts is a gifted athlete, devoted educator, and invaluable leader in the Delaware community. She has advanced the sport of women's lacrosse around the world, providing advocacy and coaching in North America, Europe, Asia, and Australia, developing it in Japan and the former Czechoslovakia, as well as introducing the sport to Cuba. Here in the First State, she helped co-found the Delaware Women's Lacrosse Association, the Delaware High School Girls All-Star Game, and lacrosse and field hockey camps for high school students, serving 13,000 girls over 25 years.

Jackie's positive influence on young people extends beyond the field and into the classrooms and hearts of those she has coached, taught and worked with over the years. Now in her 51st year as a math teacher at Sanford School, she was also chairwoman of the Math Department for 25 years. She was selected for a U.S. Presidential Scholar's Teacher Recognition Award in 2000, and was once chosen to serve on an advisory committee to the U.S. Department of Education.

Jackie has made an indelible impact on the sport of lacrosse for girls and women locally and worldwide as a player, coach and ambassador with lacrosse associations in Delaware, around the United States and internationally. She continues to contribute to our State as a teacher, community leader and role model. I commend her for her outstanding service to the State of Delaware, and wish her all the best as she accepts the well-merited honor of being inducted into the Hall of Fame of Delaware Women.

IN HONOR OF DR. JUDITH GEDNEY TOBIN

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 2010

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize Dr. Judith Gedney Tobin, who is to be inducted into the Hall of Fame of Delaware Women for her remarkable accomplishments in the field of forensic pathology.

Dr. Tobin demonstrated expertise and longevity as a pathologist, working as the Assistant Delaware State Medical Examiner from 1964 to 2009. She became the only woman to serve as President of the Nanticoke Hospital Medical Staff and the first woman to be inducted into the Nanticoke Hospital's Physician Hall of Fame. In 2006, Dr. Tobin was recognized for her leadership and contributions to the discipline of pathology when the Delaware Division of Health and Human Services named the Southern Office of the Chief Medical Examiner building in her honor. She was appointed by the Governor of Delaware to the Board of Medical Practice, served on the Board of the Delaware Institute of Medical Education and Research, and in 1985 was awarded the Distinguished Service Award for her professional contributions.

Dr. Tobin has been the recipient of many awards for her role as a leader, role model and advocate for her profession and in her community. Her impact as a forensic pathologist will forever be remembered by the countless number of people who were affected by her work. In addition, she helped found the Western Sussex Boys and Girls Club, and served on the boards of the Blood Bank, American Cancer Society, as well as Children and Family First.

Dr. Tobin succeeded and thrived in an extremely challenging medical field, and contributed so much as a volunteer and citizen. I am grateful for her service to the State of Delaware, and wish her all the best as she accepts the well-earned honor of being inducted into the Hall of Fame of Delaware Women.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, March 23, 2010 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 24

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, ''Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010''.

SR–328A

Veterans' Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine Veterans' Affairs plan for ending homelessness among veterans.

SR–418

10 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider S. 773, to ensure the continued free flow of commerce within the United States and with its global trading partners through secure cyber communications, to provide for the continued development and exploitation of the Internet and intranet communications for such purposes, to provide for the development of a cadre of information technology specialists to improve and maintain effective cybersecurity defenses against disruption, S. 2881, to provide greater technical resources to FCC Commissioners, S. 1252, to promote ocean and human health and for other purposes, S. 2870, to establish uniform administrative and enforcement procedures and penalties for the enforcement of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act and similar statutes, S. 2871, to make technical corrections to the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention Implementation Act, and the nominations of Robert J. Papp Jr., to be Commandant of the U.S. 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, and a promotion list in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Corps and the U.S. Coast Guard.

SR–253

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2011 for the the Guard and Reserve.

SD–192

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine opportunities to improve energy security and the environment through transportation policy.

SD–406

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Major General Robert A. Harding, United States Army (Retired), of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security.

SD–342

Armed Services

Personnel Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine Military Health System programs, policies, and initiatives in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2011 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR–232A

1:30 p.m.

Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold a hearing examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2011 for the Small Business Administration.

SR–485

2 p.m.

Aging

To hold hearings to examine medicine and prescription drugs, focusing on nursing home patients.

SD–106

2:30 p.m.

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Contracting Oversight Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine contracts for Afghan National Police training.

SD–342

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine U.S. Pacific Command, U.S. Strategic Command, and U.S. Forces Korea 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.

SH–216

Appropriations

Financial Services and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2011 for the Office of Personnel Management.

SD–192

Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Goodwin Liu, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, and Kimberly J. Mueller, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California.

SD–226

MARCH 25

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine youth suicides and the need for mental health care resources in Indian country.

SD–628

Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Investigations Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine Wall Street and the financial crisis, focusing on high risk home loans.

SH–216

Appropriations

Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the review and oversight of the Federal Housing Administration and its role in the housing crisis.

SD–138

9:45 a.m.

Rules and Administration

To hold hearings to examine the filibuster, focusing on the history of the filibuster 1789–2008.

SR–301

10 a.m.

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2011 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SD–192

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting to consider H.R. 2062, to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to provide for penalties and enforcement for intentionally taking protected avian species, S. 2724, to provide for environmental restoration activities and forest management activities in the Lake Tahoe Basin, H.R. 3305, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 224 South Boulder Avenue in Tulsa, Oklahoma, as the ''H. Dale Cook Federal Building and United States Courthouse'', and S. 2129 and H.R. 1700, bills to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in the District of Columbia to provide for the establishment of a National Women's History Museum, and a proposed resolution relating to the General Services Administration.

SD–406

Judiciary

Business meeting to consider 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. 3111, to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays, S. 3031, to authorize Drug Free Communities enhancement grants to address major emerging drug issues or local drug crises, and the nominations of Sharon Johnson Coleman, and Gary Scott Feinerman, both to be United States District Judge for the Northern

District of Illinois, William Joseph Martinez, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, and David A. Capp, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Indiana, Anne M. Thompkins, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of North Carolina, Peter Christopher Munoz, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Michigan, and Kelly McDade Nesbit, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of North Carolina, all of the Department of Justice.

SD–226

1 p.m.

Finance

International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine doubling United States exports, focusing on United States seaports.

SD–215

2 p.m.

Appropriations

To hold hearings to examine the President's fiscal year 2010 War Supplemental Request.

SD–G50

APRIL 14

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Justice.

SD–226

Armed Services

SeaPower Subcommittee

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.

SD–562

APRIL 28

2 p.m.

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization, focusing on standards and assessments.

SD–430

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed H.R. 1586, Tax on Bonuses Received from Certain TARP Recipients, as amended.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1783–S1817

Measures Introduced: Seven bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3146–3152, and S. Res. 463–464. **Pages S1812–13**

Measures Reported:

S. 479, to amend the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 to provide for the continuing authorization of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network. (S. Rept. No. 111–164)

S. 690, to amend the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to reauthorize the Act. (S. Rept. No. 111–165)

H.R. 1741, to require the Attorney General to make competitive grants to eligible State, tribal, and local governments to establish and maintain certain protection and witness assistance programs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 1376, to restore immunization and sibling age exemptions for children adopted by United States citizens under the Hague Convention on Intercountry Adoption to allow their admission to the United States, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 2772, to establish a criminal justice reinvestment grant program to help States and local jurisdictions reduce spending on corrections, control growth in the prison and jail populations, and increase public safety, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1812**

Measures Passed:

Tax on Bonuses Received from Certain TARP Recipients: By a unanimous vote of 93 yeas (Vote No. 61), Senate passed H.R. 1586, to modernize the air traffic control system, improve the safety, reliability, and availability of transportation by air in the United States, provide for modernization of the air traffic control system, reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration, as amended, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S1790–S1810**

Adopted:

Rockefeller (for Reid) Amendment No. 3469 (to Amendment No. 3452), to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Clark County, Nevada, certain public land for the development of flood mitigation infrastructure for the Southern Nevada Supplemental Airport in the State of Nevada. **Pages S1805–06**

Rockefeller (for Warner) Amendment No. 3488 (to Amendment No. 3452), to allow aircraft owners and operators to accept reimbursement for voluntary medical transportation. **Page S1806**

Rockefeller (for Begich/Murkowski) Amendment No. 3492 (to Amendment No. 3452), to provide a limited exemption from compliance with FAA and PHMSA standards for the air transportation within Alaska of cylinders of compressed oxygen, nitrous oxide, or other oxidizing gases without regard to the end use of the cylinders. **Page S1806**

Rockefeller (for Wicker) Amendment No. 3494 (to Amendment No. 3452), to correct an error related to Amtrak security in the enrollment of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010. **Page S1806**

Rockefeller (for Cantwell) Amendment No. 3511 (to Amendment No. 3452), to require a semiannual report on the status of the Greener Skies project. **Page S1806**

Rockefeller (for Nelson (FL)) Modified Amendment No. 3479 (to Amendment No. 3452), to allow for the simultaneous inclusion of more than one General Aviation airport in the Military Airport Program. **Pages S1806, S1809–10**

Rockefeller (for Durbin) Modified Amendment No. 3483 (to Amendment No. 3452), to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to make a grant to develop best practices and

metrics with respect to the sustainable design, construction, planning, maintenance, and operation of airports. **Pages S1806–07**

Rockefeller (for Menendez/Schumer) Modified Amendment No. 3506 (to Amendment No. 3452), to ensure that all consumers are able to easily and fairly compare airfares and other costs applicable to tickets for air transportation, including all taxes and fees. **Page S1807**

Rockefeller (for Feingold) Modified Amendment No. 3514 (to Amendment No. 3452), to include the modernization, renovation, and repairs of buildings to meet the criteria for being high-performance green buildings as airport development. **Page S1807**

Rockefeller (for Murkowski) Modified Amendment No. 3520 (to Amendment No. 3452), to develop a monitoring system for flight service specialist staffing and training under service contracts for flight service stations. **Page S1807**

Rockefeller (for Coburn) Modified Amendment No. 3538 (to Amendment No. 3452), to conduct audits of certain small airports to analyze the accrual of annual passenger enplanements and to modify the method for apportioning amounts to airports for airport improvements. **Page S1807**

Hutchison/Rockefeller Amendment No. 3543 (to Amendment No. 3452), to authorize the FAA to provide financial assistance for NextGen equipage of aircraft. **Page S1807**

Rockefeller (for McCain) Modified Amendment No. 3527 (to Amendment No. 3452), to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to develop a financing proposal for fully funding the development and implementation of technology for the Next Generation Air Transportation System. **Pages S1790, S1805, S1807**

Rockefeller (for Feinstein) Modified Amendment No. 3541 (to Amendment No. 3452), to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to conduct a study of air quality in aircraft cabins. **Pages S1807–08**

Rockefeller (for Coburn) Modified Amendment No. 3539 (to Amendment No. 3452), to apportion amounts to airports for airport improvements in proportion to the amounts of air traffic at the airports and to limit aggregate apportionments to the aggregate amount apportioned for fiscal year 2009. **Page S1808**

Rockefeller (for Coburn) Amendment No. 3532 (to Amendment No. 3452), to set the fee to be paid by commercial air tour operators that conduct commercial air tour operations over a national park at an amount sufficient to offset all of the costs incurred by the Federal Government to develop air tour management plans for national parks. **Page S1808**

Rockefeller (for Cantwell) Modified Amendment No. 3525 (to Amendment No. 3452), to require the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Commerce to develop a plan for flying scientific instruments on commercial flights. **Page S1808**

Rockefeller (for Wyden/Merkley) Modified Amendment No. 3534 (to Amendment No. 3452), to amend section 40128 of title 49, United States Code, relating to air tour management plans at national parks. **Pages S1808–09**

Rockefeller Amendment No. 3452, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1790**

Rockefeller/Hutchison Amendment No. 3555, to amend the title. **Page S1809**

Withdrawn:

McCain Amendment No. 3528 (to Amendment No. 3452), to provide standards for determining whether the substantial restoration of the natural quiet and experience of the Grand Canyon National Park has been achieved and to clarify regulatory authority with respect to commercial air tours operating over the Park. **Pages S1790–98**

Hutchison (for Ensign) Modified Amendment No. 3476 (to Amendment No. 3452), to enhance air travel opportunities to and from the National Capital. **Pages S1798–S1805**

Recognizing Cultural and Historical Significance of Nowruz: Senate agreed to S. Res. 463, recognizing the cultural and historical significance of Nowruz, expressing appreciation to Iranian-Americans for their contributions to society, and wishing Iranian-Americans and the people of Iran a prosperous new year. **Page S1816**

189th Anniversary of Independence of Greece: Senate agreed to S. Res. 464, recognizing the 189th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating Greek and American democracy. **Pages S1816–17**

Messages From the House: **Page S1812**

Measures Referred: **Page S1812**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1813–14**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1814–15**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1811–12**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S1815**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S1816**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1816**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S1816**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—61) **Page S1808**

Recess: Senate convened at 2:01 p.m. and recessed at 6:33 p.m., until 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, March 23,

2010. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1817.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill entitled, "Restoring American Financial Stability Act of 2010", with amendments.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 13 public bills, H.R. 4900–4912; and 1 resolution, H. Con. Res. 256 was introduced. **Page H2215**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2215–16**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 1879, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for employment and reemployment rights for certain individuals ordered to full-time National Guard duty, with an amendment (H. Rept. 111–450);

H.R. 4810, to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the services provided for homeless veterans under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (H. Rept. 111–449);

H.R. 3976, to extend certain expiring provisions providing enhanced protections for servicemembers relating to mortgages and mortgage foreclosure, with amendments (H. Rept. 111–451);

H.R. 4667, to increase, effective as of December 1, 2010, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans (H. Rept. 111–452);

H.R. 4592 to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in energy-related positions, with an amendment (H. Rept. 111–453);

H. Res. 1204, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4899) making emergency supplemental appropriations for disaster relief and summer jobs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010 (H. Rept. 111–454); and

H. Res. 1205, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4849) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for small business job creation, extend the Build America Bonds program, and provide other infrastructure job creation tax incentives (H. Rept. 111–455). **Page H2215**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Ann Kirkpatrick to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2175**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:41 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H2176**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

End Veteran Homelessness Act of 2010: H.R. 4810, to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the services provided for homeless veterans under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 413 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 170; and **Pages H2178–80, H2189**

Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2010: H.R. 4667, to increase effective as of December 1, 2010, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 407 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 171. **Pages H2184–85, H2190**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:15 p.m. and reconvened at 6:33 p.m. **Page H2188**

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in honor of Fred Heineman, former Member of Congress. **Pages H2189–90**

Suspensions—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measures under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed:

National Guard Employment Protection Act of 2009: H.R. 1879, amended, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for employment and

reemployment rights for certain individuals ordered to full-time National Guard duty; **Page H2181**

Recognizing and honoring the Blinded Veterans Association on its 65th anniversary of representing blinded veterans: H.J. Res. 80, to recognize and honor the Blinded Veterans Association on its 65th anniversary of representing blinded veterans and their families; **Pages H2182–83**

Helping Heroes Keep Their Homes Act of 2009: H.R. 3976, amended, to extend certain expiring provisions providing enhanced protections for servicemembers relating to mortgages and mortgage foreclosure; and **Pages H2183–84**

Providing for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in energy-related positions: H.R. 4592, amended, to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in energy-related positions. **Pages H2185–88**

Quorum Calls—Votes: There were 2 yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2189, H2190. There were no Recorded votes. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 10:55 p.m.

Program for Tuesday: To be announced.

Committee Meetings

SELECT INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT PANEL

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Select Intelligence Oversight Panel met in executive session to hold a hearing on the CIA Budget for FY 2011. Testimony was heard from Leon Panetta, Director, CIA.

DESIGN PATENTS AND AUTO REPLACEMENT PARTS

Committee on the Judiciary: Held a hearing on Design Patents and Auto Replacement Parts. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

MINORITY AND IMMIGRANT RIGHTS

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Commission received a briefing to examine minorities and members of immigrant communities, focusing on reported instances of racial and ethnic profiling by police throughout the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OCSE) region, after receiving testimony from Rachel Neild, Open Society Justice Initiative, and Jamil Dakwar, American Civil Liberties Union Human Rights Program, both of Washington, D.C.; and Rosalind Williams, Madrid, Spain.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 2010

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2011 for the Department of Labor, 9 a.m., SD–138.

Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2011 for the Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy, 10 a.m., SD–124.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Elizabeth A. McGrath, of Virginia, to be Deputy Chief Management Officer, Michael J. McCord, of Virginia, to be Principal Deputy Under Secretary, Comptroller, Sharon E. Burke, of Maryland, to be Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs, Solomon B. Watson IV, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Army, and Katherine Hammack, of Arizona, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army, all of the Department of Defense, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Major General Robert A. Harding, United States Army (Retired), of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration and to be Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine reviewing the national broadband plan, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests, to hold hearings to examine S. 1546, to provide for the conveyance of certain parcels of land to the town of Mantua, Utah, S. 2798, to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire through the facilitation of insect and disease infestation treatment of National Forest System and adjacent land, S. 2830, to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to clarify that uncertified States and Indian tribes have the authority to use certain payments for certain noncoal reclamation projects, and S. 2963, to designate certain land in the State of Oregon as wilderness, to provide for the exchange of certain Federal land and non-Federal land, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security, to hold hearings to examine making the government more transparent and accountable, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, on NASA FY 2011 Budget Overview, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Defense, on Army Posture, 4:30 p.m., H–140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, on Department of Energy—Nuclear Energy FY 2011 Budget, 2 p.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Homeland Security, on DHS Air and Marine Operations and Investments: Customs and Border Protection and Coast Guard, 10 a.m., H–140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies, on Voices from Our Native American Communities, 9:30 a.m., and 2 p.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, on VA Mental Health, 10 a.m., and on Outside Witnesses, 1:30 p.m., H–143 Capitol.

Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs, on Global Health and HIV/AIDS programs at the Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development, 11 a.m., 2362B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, on Intercity and Commuter Passenger Rail: Moving People Safely and Efficiently (Including FY 2011 Budget Requests for FTA, FRA and Amtrak) 10 a.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on military associations' legislative priorities, 9:30 a.m., 210 HVC.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on the Interagency Coordination of Grants and Contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan: Progress, Obstacles, and Plans, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities, hearing on FY 2011 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Department of Defense's Science and Technology Programs, 2:30 p.m., 210 HVC.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing on Oversight of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled "NCI Cancer Research: Today's Progress; Tomorrow's Challenges," 2 p.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, hearing entitled "Housing Finance—What Should the New System Be Able to Do?: Part I—Government and Stakeholder Perspectives," 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Emergency Communications, Preparedness and Response, hearing entitled "FEMA's FY 2011: Aligning Resources, Mission and Vision," 10 a.m., 211 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship, Refugees, Border Security, and International Law, hearing on the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands and the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, Oceans and Wildlife, joint oversight hearing entitled "How to Manage Large Constrictor Snakes and Other Invasive Species," 1 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs, hearing entitled " Rise of Drones: Unmanned Systems and the Future of War," 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

DISASTER RELIEF AND SUMMER JOBS ACT OF 2010

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4899, the "Disaster Relief and Summer Jobs Act of 2010". The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Obey and Representatives Lee of California, and Lewis of California.

SMALL BUSINESS AND INFRASTRUCTURE JOBS TAX ACT OF 2010

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4849, the "Small Business and Infrastructure Jobs Tax Act of 2010." The rule provides 1 hour of general debate in the House equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, modified by the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report, shall be considered as adopted. The rule waives all points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended. The rule provides that the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Levin and Representatives McDermott, Lee of California, Chu and Tiberi.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation, hearing on NIST Structure and Authorities, Its Role in Technical Standard, and Federal Coordination on Technical Standards, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, hearing on Snow Disasters for Local, State, and Federal Governments in the National Capital Region: Response and Recovery Partnerships with FEMA, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures, hearing on the role of taxes as part of the federal budget, 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, hearing on Cybersecurity Budget for Fiscal Year 2011, 2 p.m., 304–HVC.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2:15 p.m., Tuesday, March 23

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will begin consideration of H.R. 4872, Heath Care and Education Reconciliation Act, with up to 20 hours for debate.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10:30 a.m., Tuesday, March 23

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Berman, Howard L., Calif., E438
Blackburn, Marsha, Tenn., E437
Boozman, John, Ark., E447
Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E436
Castle, Michael N., Del., E446, E447, E447, E447, E448, E448
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E440
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E436
Crowley, Joseph, N.Y., E437
Hare, Phil, Ill., E435
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E439
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E445, E446, E446
McCaul, Michael T., Tex., E440
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E442
Meek, Kendrick B., Fla., E443, E444
Poe, Ted, Tex., E446
Polis, Jared, Colo., E447
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E437, E443, E445
Roskam, Peter J., Ill., E444
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E435, E436, E437, E438, E440, E441, E442, E444, E445, E446
Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E441
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E435, E436, E437, E438, E440, E441, E442, E443, E444

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record,* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.