



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 29, 2010

No. 99

House of Representatives

The House met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 29, 2010.

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

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

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 25 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 10:20 a.m.

WALL STREET REFORM

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, it would be unconscionable for this Congress to fail to enact legislative protections for the Nation's consumers after the worst economic collapse in 80 years. We must pass Wall Street reform when it comes before the House hopefully later this week.

We know what happened without adequate oversight. Under the Bush administration and previous Republican Congresses, the large financial institu-

tions were granted free rein to undertake abusive, risky behavior, ultimately at great public expense. In the absence of well-enforced regulation, their reckless actions triggered the great recession, plunging millions of American families into economic chaos.

Starting in 2007 when the mortgage and credit crises hit, the recession accelerated in 2008 as the financial sector came perilously close to a complete collapse. Millions of Americans acutely felt that collapse through lost jobs, foreclosed homes, and the destruction of their personal savings. Collectively, Americans lost \$17.5 trillion worth of aggregate household wealth during that recession: college funds, retirement accounts, 401(k)s, and emergency nest eggs like that.

In the midst of this economic carnage, many of the financial institutions that precipitated the collapse had the chutzpah to turn to those same American families and ask for a bailout. For example, AIG received \$170 billion through 2008's TARP bill and the Federal Reserve, despite having engaged in a number of risky actions that led to its own predicament. AIG's unbridled pursuit of profit became America's pain. We must not allow that to happen again.

I support the visionary Wall Street reform that protects consumers from the abuses and deceptive practices that led to this crisis. It will create a consumer financial protection bureau that will consolidate consumer protections currently spread out inefficiently and ineffectively over seven different Federal agencies. The bureau will ensure transparency in financial products and transactions, providing consumers with greater information and protections on mortgages, credit cards, and other financial products.

Unscrupulous mortgage lenders no longer will be able to hoodwink prospective home buyers into home loans

that the home buyer cannot afford. Not only did that practice lead to individual homeowners suffering eventual foreclosures, but it drove down the equity in all homes as prices sunk and mortgage failures exacerbated the financial collapse.

I support Wall Street financial reform that properly regulates the risky aspects of the financial sector, finally bringing transparency to the shadowy world of derivatives. In 2006, the derivative markets bought and sold, and often repackaged, was worth \$668 trillion, that's with a T, an astonishingly high amount, and yet all traded virtually without oversight or regulation. The financial institutions that traded these derivatives did so in secret, and when the underlying assets failed, such as mortgage-backed securities, the financial sector was unprepared for the repercussions, and American families paid the price.

I support Wall Street reform that provides an orderly liquidation for financial institutions that fail at the institution's expense, not the taxpayers. That means never again will big banks receive taxpayer-funded bailouts. In the event of failure, large financial institutions must be prepared for an orderly wind down that does not cause additional strain to the overall economy and does not require taxpayer assistance. This reform ensures that the firms prepare liquidation plans ahead of time in case they are ever needed, and most importantly, Wall Street reform clearly states that taxpayers will never again have to fund a failing firm's bailout or liquidation costs.

Madam Speaker, the Wall Street reform before us accomplishes the goals of protecting consumers, providing transparency to previously unregulated markets, and ending too-big-to-fail taxpayer-funded bailouts. It finally provides the financial protections for consumers and homeowners that have been lacking for far too long. Wall

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H4907

Street reform will help ensure that never again will American families be unprotected and left footing the bill for someone else's big mistake.

I strongly support Wall Street reform and encourage my colleagues to do so. Never again should private risk become public responsibility.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10:30 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10:30 a.m.

□ 1030

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland) at 10 o'clock and 30 minutes a.m.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Paul Powell, First Baptist Church, Tyler, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we bow our heads and our hearts before You today to recognize You as the maker of Heaven and Earth, and the author of our liberty. We thank You for the freedom we enjoy today.

Grant that these we have chosen to lead us may have the courage and the conviction to preserve that which is good from the past and to lead us wisely into the future. And may they ever be worthy of the trust we and You have placed in them.

We believe that righteousness exalts a nation, and so may justice and mercy and truth prevail throughout the land. Cause us always to look to You, to bow before You, and to humbly follow You is my prayer in Jesus' name. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 572

In the Senate of the United States, June 28, 2010.

Whereas the Honorable Robert C. Byrd served the people of his beloved state of West Virginia for over 63 years, serving in the West Virginia House of Delegates, the West Virginia Senate, the United States House of Representatives, and the United States Senate;

Whereas the Honorable Robert C. Byrd is the only West Virginian to have served in both Houses of the West Virginia Legislature and in both Houses of the United States Congress;

Whereas the Honorable Robert C. Byrd has served for fifty-one years in the United States Senate and is the longest serving Senator in history, having been elected to nine full terms;

Whereas the Honorable Robert C. Byrd has cast more than 18,680 rollcall votes—more than any other Senator in American history;

Whereas the Honorable Robert C. Byrd has served in the Senate leadership as President pro tempore, Majority Leader, Majority Whip, Minority Leader, and Secretary of the Majority Conference;

Whereas the Honorable Robert C. Byrd has served on a Senate committee, the Committee on Appropriations, which he has chaired during five Congresses, longer than any other Senator;

Whereas the Honorable Robert C. Byrd is the first Senator to have authored a comprehensive history of the United States Senate;

Whereas the Honorable Robert C. Byrd has played an essential role in the development and enactment of an enormous body of national legislative initiatives and policy over many decades; and

Whereas his death has deprived his State and Nation of an outstanding lawmaker and public servant; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Robert C. Byrd, Senator from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 286. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 235th birthday of the United States Army.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3249. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to reauthorize the predisaster hazard mitigation program and for other purposes.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MELANCON. 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, this 15-minute vote on approval of the Journal will be followed by a 5-minute vote on

suspending the rules and adopting House Resolution 1439.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 175, answered “present” 1, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 395]

YEAS—219

Ackerman	Grayson	Nadler (NY)
Andrews	Green, Al	Napolitano
Baca	Green, Gene	Neal (MA)
Bachmann	Grijalva	Obey
Baird	Gutierrez	Olver
Baldwin	Hall (NY)	Ortiz
Barrow	Halvorson	Pallone
Bean	Hare	Pascarell
Becerra	Harman	Pastor (AZ)
Berman	Harper	Paulsen
Berry	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Heinrich	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (NY)	Herseht Sandlin	Polis (CO)
Blumenauer	Higgins	Pomeroy
Boren	Hill	Posey
Boucher	Hinchev	Price (NC)
Boyd	Hinojosa	Quigley
Brady (PA)	Hirono	Rahall
Braley (IA)	Holden	Rangel
Butterfield	Holt	Reyes
Calvert	Honda	Richardson
Capps	Hoyer	Rodriguez
Capuano	Inslee	Ross
Cardoza	Israel	Rothman (NJ)
Carnahan	Jackson (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Castle	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Salazar
Chaffetz	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Chandler	Kanjorski	T.
Chu	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clay	Kildee	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kilpatrick (MI)	Schauer
Clyburn	Kind	Schiff
Conyers	Kissell	Schrader
Cooper	Klein (FL)	Schwartz
Costello	Kosmas	Scott (GA)
Courtney	Kratovil	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Kucinich	Serrano
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Sestak
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Dahlkemper	LaTourette	Sherman
Davis (AL)	Lee (CA)	Sires
Davis (CA)	Levin	Skelton
Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Davis (TN)	Loebsock	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Lofgren, Zoe	Snyder
DeGette	Lowe	Space
DeLauro	Luján	Speier
Dent	Lynch	Spratt
Deutch	Maloney	Stark
Dicks	Markey (MA)	Tanner
Dingell	Marshall	Teague
Doggett	Matheson	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	Matsui	Tierney
Driehaus	McCarthy (NY)	Titus
Edwards (MD)	McClintock	Tonko
Edwards (TX)	McCollum	Towns
Ellison	McDermott	Tsongas
Eshoo	McGovern	Van Hollen
Etheridge	McIntyre	Velázquez
Farr	McMahon	Visclosky
Fattah	McNerney	Walz
Filner	Meek (FL)	Wasserman
Fortenberry	Meeks (NY)	Schultz
Foster	Melancon	Waters
Frank (MA)	Michaud	Watson
Fudge	Miller (NC)	Watt
Garamendi	Miller, George	Waxman
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Weiner
Goodlatte	Moore (KS)	Welch
Gordon (TN)	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (OH)
Graves (MO)	Murphy, Patrick	Yarmuth

NAYS—175

Aderholt	Bilirakis	Brown (SC)
Adler (NJ)	Bishop (UT)	Brown-Waite,
Akin	Blackburn	Ginny
Alexander	Blunt	Buchanan
Altmire	Boccieri	Burgess
Arcuri	Bonner	Buyer
Austria	Bono Mack	Camp
Bachus	Boozman	Campbell
Barrett (SC)	Boustany	Cantor
Bartlett	Brady (TX)	Capito
Biggert	Bright	Carney
Bilbray	Broun (GA)	Carter

Cassidy	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Platts
Childers	Kline (MN)	Price (GA)
Coble	Lamborn	Radanovich
Coffman (CO)	Lance	Rehberg
Cole	Latham	Reichert
Conaway	Latta	Roe (TN)
Connolly (VA)	Lee (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)
Critz	Linder	Rogers (MI)
Davis (KY)	LoBiondo	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas	Rooney
Diaz-Balart, M.	Luetkemeyer	Ros-Lehtinen
Djou	Lummis	Roskam
Donnelly (IN)	Lungren, Daniel	Royce
Dreier	E.	Ryan (WI)
Duncan	Mack	Scalise
Ehlers	Manzullo	Schmidt
Emerson	Marchant	Schock
Flake	Markey (CO)	Sensenbrenner
Fleming	McCarthy (CA)	Sessions
Forbes	McCaull	Shadegg
Fox	McCotter	Shimkus
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Shuler
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Shuster
Galleghy	McMorris	Simpson
Garrett (NJ)	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
Gerlach	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (FL)	Smith (MI)
Granger	Miller (MI)	Smith (TX)
Graves (GA)	Miller, Gary	Stearns
Guthrie	Minnick	Stupak
Hall (TX)	Mitchell	Sullivan
Hastings (WA)	Moran (KS)	Terry
Heller	Murphy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Hensarling	Murphy, Tim	Thompson (PA)
Herger	Myrick	Thornberry
Himes	Neugebauer	Tiberi
Hunter	Nunes	Turner
Inglis	Nye	Upton
Issa	Olson	Walden
Jenkins	Owens	Westmoreland
Johnson, Sam	Paul	Whitfield
Jones	Pence	Wilson (SC)
Jordan (OH)	Perriello	Wittman
Kilroy	Peters	Wolf
King (IA)	Peterson	Wu
King (NY)	Petri	Young (FL)
Kingston	Pitts	

servant. He was a dear friend to many of us. He was an individual who defended our Constitution and an individual who truly had the best interests of the American people in mind every day.

I would ask that the House take a moment of silent prayer on behalf of the late Honorable senior Senator from West Virginia, ROBERT C. BYRD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will rise and observe a moment of silence.

CONGRATULATING THE CHICAGO BLACKHAWKS

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1439) congratulating the Chicago Blackhawks on winning the 2010 Stanley Cup Championship, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 5, answered “present” 1, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 396]
YEAS—395

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1
Gohmert

NOT VOTING—37
Barton (TX) Fallon Oberstar
Berkley Giffords Payne
Boehner Griffith Poe (TX)
Boswell Hodes Putnam
Brown, Corrine Hoekstra Rush
Burton (IN) Johnson (IL) Sutton
Cao Kagen Taylor
Cohen Kirk Tiahrt
Costa Langevin Wamp
Culberson Lipinski Woolsey
Delahunt Maffei Young (AK)
Ellsworth Moore (WI)
Engel Moran (VA)

□ 1100

Messrs. ALTMIRE, SMITH of Texas, CONAWAY, and PETRI, and Ms. KILROY and Mrs. LUMMIS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 395 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE LATE HONORABLE ROBERT C. BYRD

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

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, as we all know, the country and our State of West Virginia has lost a true public

Ackerman	Brown-Waite,	Cummings
Aderholt	Ginny	Dahlkemper
Akin	Buchanan	Davis (AL)
Alexander	Burgess	Davis (CA)
Altmire	Butterfield	Davis (IL)
Arcuri	Buyer	Davis (KY)
Austria	Calvert	Davis (TN)
Baca	Camp	DeFazio
Bachmann	Campbell	DeGette
Bachus	Cantor	DeLauro
Baird	Capito	Dent
Baldwin	Capps	Deutch
Barrett (SC)	Capuano	Diaz-Balart, L.
Barrow	Cardoza	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bartlett	Carnahan	Dicks
Barton (TX)	Carney	Dingell
Bean	Carson (IN)	Djou
Becerra	Carter	Doggett
Berman	Cassidy	Donnelly (IN)
Biggart	Castle	Doyle
Bilbray	Castor (FL)	Dreier
Bilirakis	Chandler	Driehaus
Bishop (GA)	Childers	Duncan
Bishop (NY)	Chu	Edwards (MD)
Bishop (UT)	Clarke	Edwards (TX)
Blackburn	Clay	Ehlers
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Ellison
Blunt	Clyburn	Emerson
Bocchieri	Coble	Eshoo
Bonner	Coffman (CO)	Etheridge
Bono Mack	Cole	Farr
Boozman	Conaway	Fattah
Boren	Connolly (VA)	Filner
Boucher	Conyers	Flake
Boustany	Cooper	Fleming
Boyd	Costa	Forbes
Brady (PA)	Costello	Fortenberry
Brady (TX)	Courtney	Foster
Bralley (IA)	Crenshaw	Fox
Bright	Critz	Frank (MA)
Broun (GA)	Crowley	Franks (AZ)
Brown (SC)	Cuellar	Frelinghuysen

Fudge	Luetkemeyer	Rogers (MI)
Galleghy	Lujan	Rohrabacher
Garamendi	Lummis	Ros-Lehtinen
Garrett (NJ)	Lungren, Daniel	Roskam
Gerlach	E.	Ross
Gohmert	Lynch	Rothman (NJ)
Gonzalez	Mack	Roybal-Allard
Goodlatte	Maffei	Royce
Gordon (TN)	Maloney	Ruppersberger
Granger	Manzullo	Ryan (OH)
Graves (GA)	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Graves (MO)	Markey (CO)	Salazar
Grayson	Markey (MA)	Sánchez, Linda
Green, Al	Marshall	T.
Green, Gene	Matheson	Sanchez, Loretta
Grijalva	Matsui	Sarbanes
Guthrie	McCarthy (CA)	Scalise
Gutierrez	McCarthy (NY)	Schakowsky
Hall (NY)	McCaull	Schauer
Hall (TX)	McClintock	Schiff
Halvorson	McCollum	Schmidt
Hare	McCotter	Schock
Harman	McDermott	Schrader
Harper	McGovern	Schwartz
Hastings (FL)	McHenry	Scott (GA)
Hastings (WA)	McIntyre	Scott (VA)
Heinrich	McKeon	Sensenbrenner
Heller	McMahon	Serrano
Hensarling	McMorris	Sessions
Herger	Rodgers	Sestak
Herseth Sandlin	McNerney	Shadegg
Higgins	Meek (FL)	Shea-Porter
Hill	Meeks (NY)	Sherman
Himes	Melancon	Shimkus
Hinchey	Mica	Shuler
Hinojosa	Michaud	Shuster
Hirono	Miller (FL)	Simpson
Holden	Miller (MI)	Sires
Holt	Miller (NC)	Skelton
Honda	Miller, Gary	Slaughter
Hoyer	Miller, George	Smith (NE)
Hunter	Minnick	Smith (NJ)
Inglis	Mitchell	Smith (TX)
Inslee	Mollohan	Smith (WA)
Israel	Moore (KS)	Snyder
Issa	Moran (KS)	Space
Jackson (IL)	Moran (KS)	Speier
Jackson Lee	Murphy (CT)	Spratt
(TX)	Murphy (NY)	Stark
Jenkins	Murphy, Patrick	Stearns
Johnson (GA)	Murphy, Tim	Stupak
Johnson, E. B.	Myrick	Sullivan
Johnson, Sam	Nadler (NY)	Sutton
Jones	Napolitano	Tanner
Jordan (OH)	Neal (MA)	Teague
Kagen	Neugebauer	Terry
Kanjorski	Nunes	Thompson (CA)
Kaptur	Obey	Thompson (MS)
Kennedy	Olson	Thompson (PA)
Kildee	Ortiz	Thornberry
Kilpatrick (MI)	Owens	Tiahrt
Kilroy	Pallone	Tiberi
Kind	Pascrell	Tierney
King (IA)	Pastor (AZ)	Titus
King (NY)	Paul	Tonko
Kingston	Paulsen	Towns
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Pence	Tsongas
Kissell	Perlmutter	Turner
Klein (FL)	Perriello	Upton
Kline (MN)	Peters	Peterson
Kosmas	Peterson	Petri
Kratovil	Petri	Van Hollen
Kucinich	Pingree (ME)	Velázquez
Lamborn	Pitts	Vislosky
Lance	Platts	Walden
Langevin	Poe (TX)	Walz
Larsen (WA)	Polis (CO)	Wasserman
Larson (CT)	Pomeroy	Schultz
Latham	Posey	Waters
LaTourette	Price (GA)	Watson
Latta	Price (NC)	Watt
Lee (CA)	Quigley	Waxman
Lee (NY)	Radanovich	Weiner
Levin	Rahall	Welch
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Westmoreland
Linder	Rehberg	Whitfield
LoBiondo	Reichert	Wilson (OH)
Loeb sack	Reyes	Wilson (SC)
Lofgren, Zoe	Richardson	Wittman
Lowey	Rodriguez	Wolf
Lucas	Roe (TN)	Wu
	Rogers (AL)	Yarmuth
	Rogers (KY)	Young (FL)

NAYS—5

Adler (NJ)	Berry	Rooney
Andrews	Nye	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1
Chaffetz

NOT VOTING—31

Berkley	Fallin	Oberstar
Boehner	Giffords	Olver
Boswell	Gingrey (GA)	Payne
Brown, Corrine	Griffith	Putnam
Burton (IN)	Hodes	Rush
Cao	Hoekstra	Taylor
Cohen	Johnson (IL)	Wamp
Culberson	Kirk	Woolsey
Delahunt	Lipinski	Young (AK)
Ellsworth	Moore (WI)	
Engel	Moran (VA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1110

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 23, nays 379, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 397]

YEAS—23

Bartlett	Gohmert	Miller, George
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Olson
Broun (GA)	Heller	Paul
Chaffetz	Hunter	Posey
Flake	Johnson, Sam	Price (GA)
Foxx	King (IA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Garrett (NJ)	Lummis	Tiahrt
Gingrey (GA)	Maffei	

NAYS—379

Ackerman	Boozman	Chu
Aderholt	Boren	Clarke
Adler (NJ)	Boucher	Clay
Akin	Boustany	Clyburn
Alexander	Boyd	Coble
Altmire	Brady (PA)	Coffman (CO)
Andrews	Brady (TX)	Cole
Arcuri	Braley (IA)	Conaway
Austria	Bright	Connolly (VA)
Baca	Brown (SC)	Conyers
Bachmann	Brown-Waite,	Cooper
Bachus	Ginny	Costa
Baird	Buchanan	Costello
Baldwin	Burgess	Courtney
Barrett (SC)	Butterfield	Crenshaw
Barrow	Buyer	Critz
Barton (TX)	Calvert	Crowley
Bean	Camp	Cuellar
Becerra	Campbell	Culberson
Berman	Cantor	Cummings
Berry	Capito	Dahlkemper
Biggert	Capps	Davis (AL)
Bilbray	Capuano	Davis (CA)
Bilirakis	Cardoza	Davis (IL)
Bishop (GA)	Carnahan	Davis (KY)
Bishop (NY)	Carney	Davis (TN)
Blackburn	Carson (IN)	DeFazio
Blumenauer	Carter	DeGette
Blunt	Cassidy	DeLauro
Boccieri	Castle	Dent
Boehner	Castor (FL)	Deutch
Bonner	Chandler	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bono Mack	Childers	Diaz-Balart, M.

Dicks	Larson (CT)
Dingell	Latham
Djou	LaTourette
Doggett	Latta
Donnelly (IN)	Lee (CA)
Doyle	Lee (NY)
Dreier	Levin
Driehaus	Lewis (CA)
Duncan	Lewis (GA)
Edwards (MD)	Linder
Edwards (TX)	LoBiondo
Ehlers	Loeb sack
Ellison	Lofgren, Zoe
Emerson	Lowe y
Eshoo	Lucas
Etheridge	Luetkemeyer
Farr	Lujan
Fattah	Lungren, Daniel
Filner	E.
Fleming	Lynch
Forbes	Mack
Fortenberry	Maloney
Foster	Manzullo
Frank (MA)	Marchant
Franks (AZ)	Markey (CO)
Frelinghuysen	Markey (MA)
Fudge	Marshall
Gallegly	Matheson
Garamendi	Matsui
Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)
Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)
Goodlatte	McCaul
Gordon (TN)	McClintock
Granger	McCollum
Graves (MO)	McCotter
Grayson	McDermott
Green, Al	McGovern
Green, Gene	McHenry
Grijalva	McIntyre
Guthrie	McKeon
Gutierrez	McMahon
Hall (NY)	McMorris
Hall (TX)	Rodgers
Halvorson	McNerney
Hare	Mee k (FL)
Harman	Meeks (NY)
Harper	Melancon
Hastings (FL)	Mica
Hastings (WA)	Michaud
Heinrich	Miller (FL)
Hensarling	Miller (MI)
Herger	Miller (NC)
Herseth Sandlin	Miller, Gary
Higgins	Minnick
Hill	Mitchell
Himes	Mollohan
Hinche y	Moore (KS)
Hinojosa	Moran (KS)
Hirono	Murphy (CT)
Holden	Murphy (NY)
Holt	Murphy, Patrick
Honda	Murphy, Tim
Hoyer	Myrick
Inglis	Nadler (NY)
Inslee	Napolitano
Israel	Neal (MA)
Issa	Neugebauer
Jackson (IL)	Nunes
Jackson Lee	Nye
(TX)	Obey
Jenkins	Olver
Johnson (GA)	Ortiz
Johnson, E. B.	Owens
Jones	Pallone
Jordan (OH)	Pascrell
Kagen	Pastor (AZ)
Kanjorski	Paulsen
Kaptur	Pence
Kennedy	Perlmutter
Kildee	Perriello
Kilpatrick (MI)	Peters
Kilroy	Peterson
Kind	Petri
King (NY)	Pingree (ME)
Kingston	Pitts
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Platts
Kissell	Poe (TX)
Klein (FL)	Polis (CO)
Kline (MN)	Pomeroy
Kosmas	Price (NC)
Kratovil	Quigley
Kanich	Radanovich
Lamborn	Rahall
Lance	Rehberg
Langevin	Reichert
Larsen (WA)	Reyes

Richardson	Rodriguez
Roe (TN)	Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)	Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)	Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher	Rohrabacher
Rooney	Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen	Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam	Roskam
Ross	Ross
Rothman (NJ)	Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard	Roybal-Allard
Royce	Royce
Ruppersberger	Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)	Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)	Ryan (WI)
Salazar	Salazar
Sánchez, Linda	Sánchez, Linda
T.	T.
Sarbanes	Sarbanes
Scalise	Scalise
Schakowsky	Schakowsky
Schauer	Schauer
Schiff	Schiff
Schmidt	Schmidt
Schock	Schock
Schrader	Schrader
Schwartz	Schwartz
Scott (GA)	Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)	Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner	Sensenbrenner
Serrano	Serrano
Sessions	Sessions
Sestak	Sestak
Shadegg	Shadegg
Shea-Porter	Shea-Porter
Sherman	Sherman
Shimkus	Shimkus
Shuler	Shuler
Shuster	Shuster
Simpson	Simpson
Sires	Sires
Skelton	Skelton
Slaughter	Slaughter
Smith (NE)	Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)	Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)	Smith (WA)
Snyder	Snyder
Space	Space
Speier	Speier
Spratt	Spratt
Stark	Stark
Stearns	Stearns
Stupak	Stupak
Sullivan	Sullivan
Sutton	Sutton
Tanner	Tanner
Teague	Teague
Terry	Terry
Thompson (CA)	Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)	Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)	Thompson (PA)
Thornberry	Thornberry
Tiberi	Tiberi
Tierney	Tierney
Titus	Titus
Tonko	Tonko
Towns	Towns
Tsongas	Tsongas
Turner	Turner
Upton	Upton
Van Hollen	Van Hollen
Velázquez	Velázquez
Visclosky	Visclosky
Walden	Walden
Walz	Walz
Wasserman	Wasserman
Schultz	Schultz
Waters	Waters
Watson	Watson
Watt	Watt
Waxman	Waxman
Weiner	Weiner
Welch	Welch
Westmoreland	Westmoreland
Whitfield	Whitfield
Wilson (OH)	Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)	Wilson (SC)
Wittman	Wittman
Wolf	Wolf
Wu	Wu
Yarmuth	Yarmuth
Young (FL)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—30

Berkley	Fallin	Oberstar
Boswell	Giffords	Payne
Brown, Corrine	Griffith	Putnam
Burton (IN)	Hodes	Rangel
Cao	Hoekstra	Rush
Cleaver	Johnson (IL)	Smith (TX)
Cohen	Kirk	Taylor
Delahunt	Lipinski	Wamp
Ellsworth	Moore (WI)	Woolsey
Engel	Moran (VA)	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1128

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Madam Speaker, unfortunately this morning, Tuesday, June 29th, I was unable to cast my votes on Approving the Journal, H. Res. 1439, and on the Motion to Adjourn and wish the RECORD to reflect my intentions had I been able to vote. Last night I was conducting a town hall meeting at the Philo City Hall in Philo, Illinois and was unable to catch an airplane that would get me to Washington, DC in time for the 10:30 a.m. votes.

Had I been present on rollcall No. 395 on Approving the Journal, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present on rollcall No. 396 on suspending the rules and passing H. Res. 1439, Congratulating the Chicago Blackhawks on winning the 2010 Stanley Cup Championship, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present of rollcall No. 397 on the Motion to Adjourn, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BOSWELL. Madam Speaker, I regret missing morning votes in the House on June 29th due to a flight cancellation. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall votes 395 and 396 and "nay" or rollcall vote 397, and I ask that my statement be placed in the appropriate place in the RECORD to reflect this.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GIFFORDS. Madam Speaker, today I was absent and missed rollcall votes 395, 396, and 397.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 395, "aye" on rollcall 396, and "nay" on 397.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas 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.

WELCOMING THE REVEREND DR.
PAUL W. POWELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, our guest chaplain today has been Reverend Dr. Paul W. Powell. He is retired dean of Baylor University's Truett Theological Seminary and is a distinguished graduate of both Baylor and Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. He has also been the president of the Southern Baptist Annuity Board and Baptist General Convention of Texas, along with a vast array of offices with many charitable institutions too numerous to mention.

He is an author of 36 books and has been pastor of churches all over Texas and spanned two decades as pastor of Green Acres Baptist Church in Tyler, Texas, leading our church from about 700 members to over 7,000, where it fed and clothed the poor through founding the Good Samaritan Outreach Center and People Attempting to Help. Under his direction, our church began Hispanic church ministries, a Korean church ministry, dental and medical outreach ministries, as well as churches in Mexico, Belize, and many other places. Green Acres became the largest single donor to missions in the entire Southern Baptist Convention.

He and his wife, Cathy, have three children: Kent, Mike, and Lori; and three grandchildren: Jordan, Katie, and Matthew.

He is now the interim pastor of First Baptist Church in Tyler. He brings wisdom, accountability, growth, life, and light wherever he serves and truly has a heart after God's own. Seeking always to serve, he has been pastor, dean, president, chairman, director, officer, trustee of so many entities, but of most importance to me, he has been a friend, mentor, confidant, encourager, and inspiration.

May God bless Paul Powell and his family.

□ 1130

JOBS AND THE ECONOMY

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, we continue to see a growing sign of economic recovery resulting from the economic policies of the Democratic Congress and the Obama administration responding to the Bush recession and the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. More must be done to create jobs and save jobs, but the latest signs of recovery include: Industrial production has increased a cumulative 8.1 percent during the last 11 months, the largest 11-month gain since 1997.

Total industrial production rose 1.2 percent in May. The increase, slightly

above market expectations, was led by a strong .9 percent growth in manufacturing output. Industrial production has grown at a rate of 7.4 percent annually for this past quarter, on the heels of 7.6 percent annualized growth in the first quarter.

Madam Speaker, we are on our way in the right direction.

ADOPTION OF THE BUDGET

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, when I'm home in the Fifth District of North Carolina, folks tell me they're concerned about the debt, the deficit, and job loss.

What's the reaction of those in charge of Congress?

Well, they canceled the adoption of the budget. House Democrats have failed in their responsibility to lead by not proposing or passing a 2011 budget resolution. The House has never failed to pass an annual budget resolution since the current budget rules were put in place in 1974.

In 2006, then House Whip, Steny Hoyer, now House majority leader, said the most basic responsibility of governing is enacting a budget. Where's that responsibility now?

They plan a deeming resolution later in the week. That is not a substitute for a budget.

Democrat jobs bills have failed to create jobs. Democrats continue to spend at a near record pace. Through the first 8 months of the current fiscal year, the Federal Government amassed \$935 billion in deficit spending on track to an annual deficit approaching last year's record \$1.4 trillion.

PUTTING PEOPLE BACK TO WORK

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

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I rise to talk about the emergency that our country is in. Over 15 million Americans are unemployed, unemployed presently and unemployed in the last three years. Many more are long-term unemployed. We need an emergency bill that will put people back to work.

In the 1970s and 1980s, President Reagan, President Carter started what was called the Comprehensive Employment Training Act, or CETA, put \$50 million in it, and hired 20 million Americans across the country. We need such a jobs bill today.

This Congress has done some things. The President has worked with us, and we've passed legislation and bills that helped small businesses to hire and to get tax incentives. But what America needs is to address the emergency now.

Home sales are down. Foreclosures are up. Americans want to work. It's our responsibility that we help them do so.

Today, let's pass a real jobs bill similar to the CETA Comprehensive Employment Training Act.

Is it an emergency? Yes, it is. Should it be offset? Are the American people an emergency? I believe that they are.

USC COLLEGE WORLD SERIES

(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, congratulations to the University of South Carolina's baseball team for a spectacular showing in the College World Series at Omaha, Nebraska.

The journey to this point hasn't been the easiest for the Gamecocks. The team overcame an opening loss and then won four consecutive games for the finals. Gamecocks proved persistent. The USA Today headline says "South Carolina in command after Game 1 victory."

I'm very proud of the way these student athletes are representing the University of South Carolina on the national stage. Whit Merrifield, first cousin of congressional staffer Melissa Hite of Irmo, withstood a hard collision in South Carolina's victory on Saturday and stayed in the game, ultimately bumping his average to .300 in the College World Series.

And talk about stats. Lead-off hitter Evan Marzilli has an impressive .378 batting average, to always start things off right. Second District resident Blake Cooper last night was MVP, with an outstanding defeat over UCLA in championship game one.

Congratulations to USC Coach Ray Tanner for his leadership and determination.

HONORING WEST MESA HIGH SCHOOL IN ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

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

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of West Mesa High School in Albuquerque, New Mexico, which was recently selected as one of America's best high schools by Newsweek magazine.

Since 1966, West Mesa High School has been the heart of Albuquerque's west side. Recently the school was a great partner when they hosted one of my job fairs, as well as my service academy nomination information night.

Last year the school had an outstanding 75 percent of its students enrolled in at least one advanced placement course, the kind of rigorous classes that push students to achieve their potential and lead our Nation in the 21st century.

The late educator, Jaime Escalante, associated with the film "Stand and Deliver," told his students, You do not enter the future; you create the future.

I want to thank the West Mesa Mustangs for pushing themselves and for creating a bright future for themselves and for our community. Again, congratulations on this well-deserved recognition.

HEALTHCARE AT THREE MONTHS

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, you may remember that the American people were told that Congress had to pass the health care bill so they could find out what was in it.

After 3 months, the American people have found out what was in the new law, and they still don't like it. The latest Rasmussen poll from just this week shows that 55 percent oppose the law. And they have good reasons to be upset.

New HHS rules published just a few weeks ago will mean that many companies and individuals will be forced to change to plans that meet the government's new standards. So much for "if you like your plan you can keep it," as the President said.

For seniors, CBO reports that half of all Medicare Advantage plans will end in the coming years. Seniors who were receiving vision and dental coverage on these plans will now be forced to buy costly supplemental coverage. The more layers we peel away, the less there is to like about ObamaCare.

JOBS AND THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Congressional Republicans threaten to take us back to the failed policies that created the economic crisis, siding with special interests, i.e., the Wall Street investment banks. These economic and fiscal policies created the Bush recession, the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression, with job losses of nearly 800,000 a month and nearly doubling our national debt.

Democrats in Congress will continue to take America in a new direction, creating good American jobs, lowering taxes for the middle class and for small business, and building a strong new foundation for the economy and for Main Street instead of Wall Street.

□ 1140

CONGRATULATING NEW JOURNEYS TRANSITIONAL HOME

(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. I would like to recognize an outstanding south Florida organization, New Journeys Transitional Home. This home is committed

to decreasing the rate of homelessness among young women in south Florida. It provides an immediate, safe, affordable, and nurturing housing environment that promotes independence and self-sufficiency.

New Journeys Transitional Home serves those who have a desire to achieve educational and employment goals, as well as those with a motivation to progress through the program. This wonderful organization provides young women with workshops to help strengthen their educational and employment goals, their interviewing skills, and improve their self-esteem.

Due to its generosity and dedication, New Journeys Transitional Home has helped so many young women in my community in south Florida. I would like to commend all the individuals involved in the organization. Through their service and support, they help our community and they help so many young women in our Nation.

Thank you for your devotion; thank you for your commitment to improving the lives of south Floridians in need.

PASS THE HOME STAR ENERGY RETROFIT BILL

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

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, America needs jobs. The unemployment is too high, and there are concrete things that we can do to create jobs. One is to pass the Home Star Energy Retrofit bill into law. The Senate has to act. The House passed it on a bipartisan basis last year.

It's a partnership between homeowners, the private sector, and government. It will create 170,000 jobs where we need them the most: in manufacturing; in retail, by getting customers to the local hardware stores; and in construction, by putting out-of-work home builders to work retrofitting homes.

This is a triple play. It will allow us to save \$10 billion in energy bills, it will put 170,000 out of work folks to work, and it will help homeowners save on their energy bills.

MCDONALD V. CITY OF CHICAGO

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, yesterday the United States Supreme Court upheld a Federal appeals court ruling overturning a law prohibiting private citizens from possessing handguns in the City of Chicago. This is a momentous decision, and I commend the justices for protecting our right to gun ownership.

The Second Amendment guarantees an individual's right to keep and bear arms. However, for too long this right has been denied to some Americans

simply because of where they reside. This 5-4 decision was the right one, though the close margin underscores the necessity to remain vigilant to future attempts to curtail our right to bear arms.

Residents across this country should be able to exercise their constitutional rights to protect themselves and their families. I am committed to protecting the constitutional rights of all law-abiding, freedom-loving Americans, and I invite my colleagues to join me.

PUT FORWARD CONSTRUCTIVE IDEAS

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, as we work to resolve our Nation's fiscal crisis, we must have bipartisan cooperation to best find ways to balance economic recovery and job creation with long-term deficit reduction. Americans clearly understand the danger of debt and the need for a serious long-term plan. What they don't understand is sound bites and political rhetoric.

And so to my Republican colleagues, as you come to the well today, put your ideas on the table. It doesn't help to demagogue this issue. The fact is, and it remains, President Obama inherited a \$11 trillion debt on day one, and we are trying to recover. The American people need your constructive ideas.

FAILURE TO PASS A BUDGET

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

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, for the first time since 1974, the House has failed to pass a budget resolution. Instead of making tough decisions, congressional Democrats have chosen to keep their heads in the sand. A problem won't go away just by ignoring it. It will require real leadership and a commitment to fiscal discipline to tackle the out-of-control spending and debt that threatens our economic prosperity. Failure to even propose a budget fundamentally means that congressional Democrats have no plan and are content to ignore our skyrocketing debt.

Madam Speaker, the American people know it's a failure of leadership to ignore the massive tax increases and the crushing burden of debt Washington is leaving our children and grandchildren.

HONORING RUBY BATTS ARCHIE

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

Mr. PERRIELLO. Madam Speaker, on Saturday, southern Virginia lost a legend, a lion, and a beloved leader.

Ruby Batts Archie, at the age of 76, passed away. She had been an educator in our community for 37 years. She had been the mayor of Danville from 1998 to 2000, and served on the city council for 16 years. She was just a few days from finally retiring from the council to spend more time with her grandchildren.

She was a tireless educator; she was a fearless leader. She always put the interests of the people in her community ahead, being willing to work with people from all parties, my predecessor, Mr. Goode, myself, people in the city, people in the county. For her, this was a matter of faith; it was a matter of fairness. She will be deeply missed.

We pray for her, for her family, and for all of those who served with her. It was an honor to have a chance to work with her to make Danville and southern Virginia a better place. And we look forward to what Mayor Sherman Saunders has called her everlasting legacy.

CHRISTIANS ARRESTED FOR PASSING OUT BIBLES IN AMERICA

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, four Christian missionaries were recently arrested for disorderly conduct. What was their behavior that got them arrested? These four Christians were peacefully handing out the Gospel of John outside an Arab cultural festival.

Now, the festival was not a private or even a Muslim event. It was an Arab festival, free and open to the public. A video shows the Christian group, that included a former Muslim, outside, about a block away from that event. They were standing quietly on the corner handing out Bibles, when they were arrested by no less than eight police officers.

Now, under sharia law it is forbidden to preach Christianity to a Muslim. But, Madam Speaker, these discriminatory arrests against Christians did not occur in a Muslim country; they occurred in Dearborn, Michigan.

The First Amendment of our Constitution safeguards freedom of speech and freedom of religious expression even for Christians. Maybe the police in Dearborn, Michigan, haven't read the Constitution. These arrests are shameful, whether the police in Dearborn, Michigan, like it or not.

And that's just the way it is.

SUPPORT FOR WALL STREET REFORM

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Wall Street reform. After months of diligent work, the House and Senate will finally vote this week to enact Wall Street reform.

This is a historic achievement. The bill is not perfect, but it's a major step forward. Wall Street's unchecked greed and recklessness nearly destroyed our economy. Wall Street reform will repair our financial system and prevent another collapse.

When the House last voted on this bill, Democrats voted "yes," while Republicans all voted "no." Democrats voted to protect Main Street consumers from deceptive mortgages and predatory credit cards. Republicans voted "no." Democrats voted to shine a bright light of transparency and accountability on the shady dealings of Wall Street, but Republicans voted "no." And Democrats voted to never again use taxpayer dollars to bail out reckless, too-big-to-fail financial firms like AIG. Republicans voted "no."

It's time to show where you stand: with Main Street or with Wall Street.

I urge my Republican colleagues to finally vote "yes." Support Main Street instead of Wall Street.

FOLLOW THE TEXT OF THE CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, this week the United States Supreme Court actually decided a constitutional question of extreme importance, and it had to deal with the right of individuals to keep and bear arms. The interesting thing was they reached this conclusion by looking at the text of the Constitution, the words of the Second Amendment. What a shame we didn't do that last week when we were dealing with the DISCLOSE Act, where we essentially eviscerated the First Amendment, the First Amendment protection for political speech.

Instead of saying that it exists for all and that we should protect it for all, we decided that some are more equal than others. We auctioned off parts of the First Amendment last week. Let us hope that the Senate will not repeat that mistake, and that we understand that perhaps the best way to understand what the Constitution means is to actually look at its words. Sometimes you can find the rights expressed there far more easily than looking at penumbras and those that emanate from penumbras. At times it makes sense for us to pay attention to what the Founding Fathers actually said.

WALL STREET REFORM

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

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Speaker, for too long New Mexicans have been put at financial risk by the irresponsible actions of Wall Street. Because of their risky gambles, our country lost 8 mil-

lion jobs and \$17 trillion in retirement savings and net worth. That's why I voted against the Wall Street bailout in 2009, and why Wall Street reform is needed.

We need to protect consumers and hold Wall Street accountable, and the current Wall Street reform package is an important step in that direction. It will rein in banks with their big bonuses, help put an end to bailouts, help put an end to too-big-to-fail, and introduce more transparency into the financial system.

We must keep working so that Wall Street is held accountable and is never again allowed to endanger the financial security of New Mexicans and people all across our great Nation.

□ 1150

WHERE IS THE BUDGET?

(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, it's tough economic times, and almost every family, every business back in my district knows in tough times you've got to sit down and put pen to paper and figure out a budget so you know where you stand and where you're going. But right now, people find it unbelievable that they're sitting down and going through this tough process but we, in Congress, are not.

Until this year, we've never failed to pass a budget since the Budget Act was put into place in 1974. In fact, it is astonishingly insensitive of the Democratic leadership to not do a budget this Congress.

Earlier this year, President Obama himself said in January, "Like any cash-strapped family, we will work within a budget to invest in what we need and sacrifice what we don't."

So why not do a budget this year? I can't understand it. My folks back home can't either.

Last week, Brian Garlotte of Flower Mound, Texas, posted on my Facebook page, "Where is our budget, Congressman? This is unacceptable." I agree with Brian. It is unacceptable that this year, of all years, Congress will not work on a budget.

SMALL BUSINESS

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, at roundtables that I hold with small business owners in San Diego, there are some consistent themes. They all say that they need banks to lend and people to spend. A few also pointed out that when their businesses fail or fall behind on their taxes, the IRS is more than willing to work out a payment plan that they can afford but then slaps them with penalties that they can't afford.

The small business lending package we passed earlier this month provides small business penalty relief and \$3.5 billion in tax incentives for innovation and growth, and it gives community banks the lending leverage they need to help small businesses keep their doors open and create jobs.

This legislation is essential for businesses in my district and across our country. I hope our colleagues in the Senate see the importance of its immediate passage.

AMERICA SPEAKING OUT

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I'm here to speak about a program called America Speaking Out. You can put that into Google, "America Speaking Out," and go to YouTube, in which Kevin McCarthy explains it in a little bit more detail.

But the idea behind it is to ask the American people what would they like on their agenda, what do we need to be doing in Washington. Because one of the big complaints I get back home is, you know, You folks are up there and you seem to be in a bubble. You ignore what we want to do; you attach things to bills that don't belong there, and then you force through legislation and it's out of sync with the American people.

So the idea of America Speaking Out is to give the grassroots voters back home a little bit of an opportunity, and more of an opportunity than they get now, to be heard. And you can weigh in on the Web page and say, I want you to work on education as your top priority; I want you to bring the budget in, cut spending, top priority; I want you to finish up in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Whatever it is, we seek the input of the American people so that the Republican Party can work on an agenda.

TRIBUTE TO BRIGADIER GENERAL HARRY C. ADERHOLT

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I would like to pay tribute today to Brigadier General Harry C. "Heinie" Aderholt, a true America hero and one of the founders of the United States Air Force Special Operations. On May 20 of this year, I and many others across the State and across the Nation were saddened to hear about the passing of General Aderholt.

Heinie, as he was affectionately known by all those who knew him and loved him, began his military service with the United States Army Air Corps in 1942 and retired from the U.S. Air Force in 1976. General Heinie Aderholt will be remembered for his valor, his character, and his strength. It was an

honor to have known him as a relative, friend, and great American patriot, and his leadership will be missed by all who knew him. His influence for good for all Americans will live on.

A memorial service will be held at Hurlburt Air Park at Fort Walton Beach, Florida, on July 2, 2010, at 9 a.m. Our thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Anne; his daughter, Janet; and son, George, and all of their family.

Thank you, Heinie, for all you did for America.

HONORING DAVID TAYLOR MILLER

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

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I rise today with the very sad duty of reporting the tragic passing of U.S. Army Private First Class David Taylor Miller. Miller was killed in action by a suicide bomber who detonated an explosive device at a checkpoint Miller was guarding in Kunar Province of Afghanistan on Monday, June 21, 2010.

Taylor was just 19 years old, having graduated from Saratoga Springs High School in 2009. Despite his young age, his contributions to this world exceeded those of many people many times his age. The loss of so young a life is truly heart wrenching.

This tragic news comes as our community is still reeling from the loss of another young hero just last week.

Whether on the football field or on the battlefield, Taylor was a leader. He showed the strength and bravery that makes this Nation great. My heart goes out to his parents.

This true American hero made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of his Nation, and we owe him our eternal gratitude.

While it is moments like these that bring the true cost of our freedoms to the forefront of the public discussion, it is imperative that each and every one of us never forget what's at stake. We must always remember the hardships, suffering, bravery, and sacrifices for the families of those who serve our Armed Forces.

On behalf of a grateful Nation, our thoughts and prayers are with the entire Miller family during this tough time.

WE NEED TO GET THE DEFICIT UNDER CONTROL

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Before coming to the floor, I was with two couples from back home. Lisa and Fred Koetting and George and Jeanette Coiner and their grandchildren were up here visiting. Mr. Coiner said his goal in life is to make sure he helps leave a country that is better for his grandchildren than the one that his parents bequeathed to him.

They are, like all of us, so worried about the deep debt this country is amassing each day, \$10 trillion of new debt over the next decade if these spending plans go forward. On top of a failed stimulus bill, on top of the 2,000-page health care bill no one read, this week Congress is going to take up an almost 2,000-page bill that will institutionalize bailout and, I think, harm our economy.

We don't have a budget for the first time in 40 years, and this week they're going to make up budget numbers. We're not going to have a vote on it, not have a debate. We haven't funded our troops in Afghanistan and Iraq. They need money, but it's hung up because people here want to spend it on other things.

We've got to get this deficit under control. We have to do it or we're putting an anchor around our children's necks.

□ 1200

URGENT ECONOMIC LEGISLATION

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, for years, reckless Republican economic policies and lax oversight of the financial industry led to an historic economic collapse for which everyday Americans are still paying the price, but now we are beginning to turn the corner.

Today, we are creating jobs, not losing jobs. The unemployment rate is beginning to fall, and confidence is rising.

Just as we are beginning to grow this economy, Republicans are prepared to stop the recovery in its tracks by blocking desperately needed job creation legislation. If we don't act now, the bedrock of our communities—our teachers and police and firefighters—will be laid off. Yet Republicans have blocked needed emergency aid to State and local governments.

If we don't act now, unemployment assistance will be cut off for so many of our citizens—for the mothers and fathers who only want to find work to support their families. If we don't act now, up to 300,000 teachers will be fired.

Instead of punishing the unemployed teachers and police, Republicans must stop blocking this urgent economic legislation. The time to act is now.

PAKISTAN

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

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, late last month, extremist Islamist militants attacked two Ahmadiyya mosques in the central Pakistani city of Lahore—with guns, grenades and suicide bombs—killing 94 people and injuring well over 100. The attackers

claimed to be members of the Punjab Taliban. The victims are members of a minority Muslim sect, who, as a result of their beliefs, have been branded heretics who should be killed.

I urge my colleagues to join with me to condemn this hateful act and to express our sincerest condolences to the families of those killed and to those still living in fear in Pakistan because of their sincerely held beliefs. These cowardly assaults on people of prayer are attacks against people of all faiths, and these assaults cannot be tolerated.

It is time to pass House Resolution 764, which expresses the importance of interreligious dialogue and the protection of religious freedom and related human rights for persons of all faiths and nationalities in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

HOLDING BIG OIL ACCOUNTABLE

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, the Republican Party's mantra of "drill, baby, drill" dropped from sight almost as fast as the Deepwater Horizon oil rig. Yet the fact is, while this was the worst ecological catastrophe in American history and an accident, it was also an inevitability. It was inevitable because, for 8 years, the Cheney-Bush administration allowed Big Oil to operate with almost complete disregard for the protection of our environment.

So I am proud of the fact that President Obama and the Democratic Party are now holding BP accountable for all of the costs of the cleanup and for the devastating impact on the local economy in the gulf. I am also proud of the fact that they are holding Big Oil accountable to explore and produce domestic energy on already leased lands at competitive prices in a clean and safe manner.

The gulf coast catastrophe underscores the need for comprehensive energy and climate reform to rein in Big Oil and to reduce our reliance on dirty fossil fuels and foreign sources of oil. It is what the Democratic Party wants. More importantly, it is what the American people need and want. Let's pass an energy reform bill now.

HEALTH INSURANCE REFORM

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, just months ago, the President signed the historic health care reform law, and thanks to the Affordable Health Care Act, Americans are already seeing benefits from the reform.

First, our seniors on Medicare part D have begun receiving \$250 rebate checks when they fall into the doughnut hole so that they are receiving help

when they most need it. Second, the new law requires that health care insurers offer dependent coverage to allow children, up to age 26, to remain on their parents' policies, and that plan has been implemented by most policies.

Just today, the Department of Health and Human Services announced it would begin accepting applications for the Early Retiree Reinsurance Program to help early retirees get affordable coverage. Later this summer, Americans with preexisting conditions will be able to get insurance at affordable rates.

Now, we know that there are some who want to repeal all of these provisions and who want to take these benefits away from American families, but we remain dedicated to health care reform, which has expanded coverage to all Americans, and we are going to make sure that the law remains in effect.

TAMPA POLICE OFFICERS FATALLY SHOT

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my community and home in Tampa, Florida, to mourn the deaths of two Tampa police officers who were fatally shot in the line of duty early this morning.

Officers David Curtis and Jeffrey Kocab simply were doing their jobs when they pulled over a car in what appeared to be a routine traffic stop at 2:15 a.m. this morning, but someone in the car was wanted on an arrest warrant. Demonstrating just how truly dangerous these jobs are for those who protect us, this stop was not routine. The officers were shot at close range, and later died at Tampa General Hospital.

Officer Curtis leaves behind a wife, Kelly, and four young sons. Officer Kocab leaves behind a wife, Sara, who is 9 months pregnant and is expected to deliver next week. Both of these young men were only 31 years old.

So I join the Tampa Police Department, Chief Jane Castor, Mayor Pam Iorio, and the entire city of Tampa in mourning the senseless loss of these two young community heroes.

EXTENDING EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, we must extend the emergency unemployment benefits. Why? Because the program is structured to assist those who are looking for work.

If you are not looking for work, you don't get the extension of benefits. Why? Because 1.7 million people will

lose their emergency benefits in 4 days if we do not act now.

Over 100,000 will lose their benefits in the State of Texas in 4 days if we do not act now. Why? Because, for every dollar that we spend on unemployment benefits—emergency benefits, I might add—we turn over \$1.63 in economic activity.

Finally, we must do it because, but for the grace of God, there go I and because Dr. King was right. Life is an inescapable network of mutuality, tied to a single garment of destiny. What impacts one directly impacts all indirectly. It has an impact on all of us. We benefit when we spend the money.

FINANCIAL REFORM

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

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, when you buy a car, you expect to put a key in the ignition and go. When you eat at your favorite restaurant, you expect a memorable meal.

When the California Public Employees' Retirement System invested in mortgage funds with AAA ratings, it expected a safe, steady return. Instead, it lost \$1 billion when subprime mortgages, which were hidden in the funds, unraveled—wiping out the pensions of millions of public employees and leaving taxpayers high and dry.

The Wall Street reform bill ensures this won't happen again. It ends taxpayer bailouts. It lets investors know what they are buying, and it makes sure banks are never too big to fail. That is why I am backing this bill, and am helping those 1.6 million California retirees and countless others across America.

A vote against this bill is only a vote for the big banks that got us in the mess in the first place.

TRADE

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

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to encourage our leadership to expand our trade opportunities and to grow our economy by calling up and passing our pending free trade agreements.

Just this week, President Obama reaffirmed his commitment to passing the Korea Free Trade Agreement. I applaud the President for this effort.

Korea, Colombia and Panama hold great economic potential for our country, especially for agricultural regions, such as the region I represent in the San Joaquin Valley.

Still, while these trade agreements languish, our farmers continue to face high tariffs in these countries—some as high as 80 percent. Worse yet, many of our international competitors in the European Union and in Canada are expanding market opportunities by signing their own trade agreements and by

seizing markets that could and should belong to U.S. agriculture.

Madam Speaker, we are living in a global economy. If we are truly committed to economic recovery in the United States, now is the time to promote U.S. products abroad.

□ 1210

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 later.

EXPANDING ACCESS TO STATE
VETERANS HOMES FOR GOLD
STAR PARENTS

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4505) to enable State homes to furnish nursing home care to parents any of whose children died while serving in the Armed Forces.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4505

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

SECTION 1. EXPANSION OF STATE HOME CARE FOR PARENTS OF VETERANS WHO DIED WHILE SERVING IN ARMED FORCES.

In administering section 51.210(d) of title 38, Code of Federal Regulations, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall permit a State home to provide services to, in addition to non-veterans described in such subsection, a non-veteran any of whose children died while serving in the Armed Forces.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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. 4505.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of this bill, legislation to support the families of fallen service men and women. The bill offers access to State veteran homes to parents who have lost a child serving in the Armed Forces. While this service is currently available to some parents, we must recognize that any parent who has lost even one child should be given our support and care.

Madam Speaker, it is easy to understand the profound sacrifices that members of the armed services make daily in the service of their country. However, sometimes we forget that their fathers, mothers, husbands, wives and children also sacrifice deeply. When we memorialize the service of a dead servicemember, we must not forget the pain and sacrifice that their family has also endured.

Madam Speaker, this bill represents an important step forward in honoring the sacrifices of not just our servicemembers, but their families as well. I urge the support of my colleagues.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BUYER. Today, I rise in support of H.R. 4505 to enable State homes to furnish nursing home care to parents any of whose children died while serving in the Armed Forces.

This legislation was introduced by my good friend and colleague from Texas, MAC THORNBERRY.

The loss of a child is a heartbreaking tragedy for any parent. When that loss occurs in defense of American freedom and democracy, we as a grateful and compassionate nation, must do all that we can to ease their pain and provide for their needs.

The State Veterans Home program is a partnership between the VA and the States to provide a broad range of long-term nursing home care for our veterans in need of such care.

Although admission to a State Home is determined by each individual state, each Home is required to maintain a residency of at least seventy-five percent veterans. Non-veterans may be admitted to a State Home if they meet certain criteria. Under current law, eligible non-veterans are veteran's spouses, widows, and Gold Star parents who have lost all of their children in military service.

H.R. 4505 would allow Gold Star parents who have lost a child but not necessarily all of their children to service in the Armed Forces eligibility for admission to a State Home. This is a simple change, and simply the right thing to do.

I want to thank MAC for recognizing this gap and taking the initiative to introduce legislation to correct the oversight and improve services for a parent who suffered the loss of a child in service to our country.

It is important to note that this bill would not result in any additional cost to the VA. And, most importantly, would not in any way impact the space available to veterans in State Veterans Homes.

Our highest admiration and respect should always lie with our servicemembers and veterans who knowingly and willingly put their lives on the line to protect our freedoms. And, we must also acknowledge and honor their beloved family members who also sacrifice in service to our country.

H.R. 4505 is supported by the Gold Star Wives of America, other major Veterans Service Organizations, and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I urge each and every one of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4505.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the author of the bill, MAC THORNBERRY of Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana, who has been a very strong advocate for veterans and a respected voice in national security during the time that he has been in Congress. We will surely miss him in another year when he is no longer in our midst.

Madam Speaker, this is one of those issues that leaves people scratching their heads and saying, well, that doesn't make sense, because the way it works now is to be eligible for a State veterans home, a Gold Star parent must have lost all of their children. This bill will allow a parent to be eligible for a State veterans home if they have lost a child while serving in the military.

Now, there are 137 State veterans homes in all 50 States. Those States will still be able to determine the priority level about admissions. They still have to have 75 percent of their beds occupied by veterans. But the average occupancy rate now across the country is 86 percent. There is roughly 15 percent of empty beds in these homes, so this bill basically allows an added group of Gold Star parents who have lost a child while serving in the military to be eligible to fill those beds.

Essentially, there is no cost. The Department of Veterans Affairs has come back and said it will not cost the Federal Government anything. Our visits with the States have gotten the same result. It is supported by the American Legion, the VFW, and the Veterans Department.

Madam Speaker, I would say it has a practical benefit in that it gives an additional option for parents who have lost a child serving in the military, but in a larger sense, it gives a message of gratitude and support for the sacrifice that those parents have made.

I want to thank the chair and certainly the ranking member for bringing this to the floor. I want to express my appreciation to Dr. VIC SNYDER, the gentleman from Arkansas, who was an original sponsor of this bill with me, as well as Senator ENSIGN, who brought this matter to my attention last year. He tried to resolve it last year and was not able to do so, but hopefully it can be solved this year. I thank the gentleman again for yielding.

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for bringing this, and I also thank the gentleman for his leadership on the House Armed Services Committee. You are filling a gap here. This is supported by the Gold Star wives, along with other major veterans service organizations.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 4505.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 4505, 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. 4505.

The question was taken.

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

RECOGNIZING RESIDENTS OF TRACY, CALIFORNIA

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1446) recognizing the residents of the City of Tracy, California, on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the city's incorporation, for their century of dedicated service to the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1446

Whereas the City of Tracy is located in San Joaquin County, which is home to more than 42,000 veterans;

Whereas the Tracy area is home to the Defense Distribution Depot San Joaquin, which serves as a vital distribution center for materials and supplies for the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas the City of Tracy maintains a cherished memorial containing the names of the heroes from Tracy who made the ultimate sacrifice in service to the United States from World War I to the present;

Whereas Camp Tracy, located near the City of Tracy, played a role in intelligence operations that contributed to the war effort during World War II;

Whereas members of the United States Armed Forces from the City of Tracy served bravely, and many lost their lives, in the Korean War, Vietnam War, Persian Gulf War, and other military conflicts of the 20th century;

Whereas members of the United States Armed Forces from the City of Tracy have served with honor in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan; and

Whereas the Tracy Press reported on November 11, 2008, that the City of Tracy has endured one of the Nation's highest per capita casualty rates in the war in Iraq; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its gratitude to the veterans of the City of Tracy, California, who have committed their lives to serving the United States; and

(2) expresses its gratitude to all of the residents of the City of Tracy, California, for their century-long commitment to serving the United States.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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 materials on H. Res. 1446.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise to join the City of Tracy, California, in celebrating its 100th anniversary of its incorporation.

I join the resolution's sponsor, Mr. MCNERNEY, in recognizing Tracy residents for their century of dedicated service to the United States.

The city of Tracy has endured one of the Nation's highest per capita casualty rates in the war in Iraq. Today, I urge the House to recognize the servicemembers and veterans of the city of Tracy.

Though many return to their homes and their families, those who make the ultimate sacrifice will not be forgotten. Forever memorialized in their city's monument, the fallen of Tracy stand as a reminder of the tragedies of war and the respect that all veterans are owed.

Most recently, with solemn grief and unwavering pride, the name of Marine SSgt Daniel Hansen was added to the memorial. The city of Tracy has supported generations of men and women, willing to make the same sacrifice as Staff Sergeant Hansen.

I join Mr. MCNERNEY in also thanking the sons and daughters of Tracy who do not enter the armed forces, yet are committed to supporting the 42,000 veterans living there today.

The resolution's sponsor is Mr. MCNERNEY from California, and I yield such time as he may consume to him to explain the bill.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the residents of the City of Tracy on the 100th anniversary of the city's incorporation and for their century of dedicated service to the United States. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important resolution to recognize the service of Tracy's residents. I am fortunate to represent Tracy, which sits in the rich agricultural region of California's San Joaquin Valley.

Time and again through the last century, Tracy residents have proven their dedication to our country by serving in our armed services. Many Tracy residents have made the ultimate sacrifice, giving their lives defending the freedom we cherish and protecting our Nation from the enemies at home and abroad.

The Tracy area is home to unique military history and tradition. For instance, Camp Tracy, located not far from the city, was the site of significant intelligence operations during World War II. The area is also home to the Defense Distribution Center-San Joaquin, commonly called the Tracy

Defense Depot, which plays a critical role in supplying our men and women serving overseas.

Members of the United States Armed Forces from the City of Tracy have served bravely, and many have lost their lives in World War II, the Korean war, the Vietnam war, the Persian Gulf war and other conflicts of the 20th century. Tracy residents are also serving with distinction in the current battlefields in Iraq and Afghanistan.

□ 1220

The city's newspaper, the Tracy Press, reported on November 11, 2008, that, per capita, the city of Tracy has endured one of the Nation's highest casualty rates in the war in Iraq. Just the other week, I attended an event in Tracy to honor the memory of one of those fallen heroes, and I am always humbled and made proud by the outpouring of support by Tracy residents for our men and women in uniform.

On many weekends back home in California, I visit Tracy to meet with local veterans and discuss the issues that affect their lives. I am committed to making sure that our veterans are cared for and that their families receive the support they deserve. My son Michael joined the service shortly after 9/11, and caring for our men and women in uniform is a deep personal priority. Our country should always recognize communities like Tracy whose residents answer the call to service.

I'm proud to recognize the residents of the city of Tracy on the occasion of their centennial anniversary of the city's incorporation. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution honoring the veterans and residents of Tracy for their dedicated service to our Nation.

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

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

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Congressman MCNERNEY, for introducing the legislation. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 1446.

Today, I rise in support of H. Res. 1446, a bill to recognize the residents of the city of Tracy, California, on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the city's incorporation, for their century of dedicated service to the United States.

In 1869 the Central Pacific Railroad (now Southern Pacific) completed a rail line through the area which is now Tracy. The result of the new rail line was the founding of Tracy on September 8, 1878, named for Lathrop J. Tracy, a grain merchant and railroad director.

Tracy was incorporated in 1910 and it grew rapidly. Although railroad operations began to decline in the 1950s, Tracy continued to prosper as an agricultural area. Today, the city seal reflects this history of railroads and agriculture.

The city of Tracy has a long history of serving our nation's military during war and peacetime. During World War II, Camp Tracy played a role in the intelligence operations which contributed to the war effort. It is now the home

to the Defense Distribution Depot San Joaquin, which serves as a vital distribution center for materials and supplies for the U.S. Armed Forces.

Even today, the city of Tracy continues to support our men and women of the Armed Services and our veterans. SSG Rachelle Renaud, a Tracy native, is one of 100 Army athletes competing at the inaugural Warrior Games at the U.S. Olympic Committee's Colorado Springs, CO, training facility. A veteran of two deployments to Iraq with the 720th Military Police Battalion, she endured severe back pain that led to a double lumbar fusion on her spine. She hasn't regained the feeling in her left leg, but still has the spirit to compete and overcome her injuries. She will be participating in the standing shotput, individual and relay swimming events, cycling, and shooting.

It is through the support of local communities like Tracy that our men and women in uniform find the strength and determination to continue on the tasks ahead.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Congressman MCNERNEY for introducing this legislation, and Chairman FILNER for bringing it to the floor so expeditiously. I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 1446.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. RICHARDSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1446.

The question was taken.

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

HONORING VETERANS OF HELICOPTER ATTACK LIGHT SQUADRON THREE

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1228) honoring the veterans of Helicopter Attack Light Squadron Three and their families, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1228

Whereas Helicopter Attack Light Squadron Three (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as "HAL-3") began its history as detachments of Navy Helicopter Combat Support Squadron One (HC-1) which began helicopter gunship operations in support of Navy "Brown Water", Special Operations, and Army units in the Mekong Delta of South Vietnam on September 19, 1966;

Whereas the detachments of HC-1 adopted the name "Seawolves";

Whereas HAL-3 was officially established on April 1, 1967, in Vung Tau, South Viet-

nam, and was the only active duty Navy helicopter gunship squadron in the history of Naval Aviation;

Whereas during the squadron's existence, the nearly 3,000 veterans of HAL-3 displayed extraordinary courage in support of United States military and political objectives in Vietnam;

Whereas 44 veterans of HAL-3 gave their lives in support of military operations in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam;

Whereas the extraordinary performance of the veterans of HAL-3 earned numerous unit citations including 6 Presidential Unit Citations, 7 Navy Unit Commendations, 1 Meritorious Unit Commendation, a Republic of Vietnam Meritorious Unit Commendation, and the Vietnam Service Medal;

Whereas the valor of the veterans of HAL-3 earned 5 Navy Crosses, 31 Silver Stars, 2 Legion of Merit Medals, 5 Navy and Marine Corps Medals, 219 Distinguished Flying Crosses, 156 Purple Hearts, 101 Bronze Stars, 142 Republic of Vietnam Gallantry Crosses, over 16,000 Air Medals, 439 Navy Commendation Medals, and 228 Navy Achievement Medals, making it possibly the most decorated Navy squadron during the Vietnam War;

Whereas the maintenance and administrative personnel of HAL-3 contributed greatly to the successes of the nine HAL-3 detachments operating throughout the Mekong Delta by providing the detachments with superb maintenance support and logistics;

Whereas HAL-3 flew over 130,000 hours of combat and logistical support;

Whereas HAL-3 inflicted several thousand casualties on enemy forces;

Whereas HAL-3 performed 1,530 medical evacuations;

Whereas HAL-3 delivered over 37,000 passengers and over 1,000,000 pounds of cargo; and

Whereas HAL-3 was disestablished in March 1972 at Binh Thuy, South Vietnam, as part of the Vietnamization program leaving behind it a combat and humanitarian record recognized as bringing great credit upon the United States Navy and its role in the Vietnam War: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the House of Representatives—

(1) honors the service, courage, and sacrifice of the veterans of HAL-3;

(2) honors the families of HAL-3 veterans for their support;

(3) expresses its condolences to the families and comrades of those killed in action; and

(4) recognizes HAL-3 as a unique squadron in the history of naval aviation.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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 House Resolution 1228, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to thank first the Committee on Armed Services for working with us to bring this bill to

the floor. This resolution recognizes and honors the veterans of Helicopter Attack Light Squadron Three and their families and is sponsored by Mr. BOOZMAN of Arkansas. The resolution recognizes the extraordinary courage of the nearly 3,000 veterans of Helicopter Attack Light Squadron Three, also known as HAL-3, who served in Vietnam from 1967 to March of 1972.

The resolution also serves to honor the enormous sacrifice of the 44 members of HAL-3 who gave their lives while serving alongside their comrades in support of military operations in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam. This remarkable unit earned six Presidential Unit Citations, five Navy Crosses, 31 Silver Stars, 219 Distinguished Flying Crosses, and 156 Purple Hearts, among numerous other awards and unit citations, making it possibly the most decorated Navy squadron during the Vietnam War.

Between 1967 and 1972, HAL-3 flew over 130,000 hours of combat and logistical support, inflicted thousands of casualties on enemy forces, performed 1,530 medical evacuations, carried more than 37,000 passengers, and delivered more than 1 million pounds of cargo to their destinations. The unit's expert maintenance and support personnel worked tirelessly to ensure that the squadron's aircraft were operationally ready and that its crews were provided with the daily support needed to accomplish their dangerous and critically important missions.

This resolution serves to honor the families of the HAL-3 veterans for their support and to express our condolences to the families and comrades of those killed in action. Helicopter Attack Light Squadron Three left behind a combat and humanitarian record recognized as bringing great credit upon the United States Navy and its role in the Vietnam War. Passing this resolution is the least we can do to honor the service and enormous sacrifice of the Americans that constituted such a valorous unit in naval aviation history.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, June 28, 2010.

Hon. BOB FILNER,

Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FILNER: I am writing to you concerning H. Res. 1228, honoring the veterans of Helicopter Attack Light Squadron Three and their families. This measure was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H. Res. 1228, and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over this legislation, the Committee on Armed Services will waive further consideration of H. Res. 1228. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the resolution, the Committee on Armed Services does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the

resolution which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction.

Please place this letter and a copy of your response into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 28, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SKELTON: Thank you for your letter regarding House Resolution 1228, "Honoring the veterans of Helicopter Attack Light Squadron Three and their families." The measure was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and sequentially referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

I agree that the Committee on Armed Services has certain valid jurisdictional claims to this resolution, and I appreciate your decision to waive further consideration of H. Res. 1228 in the interest of expediting consideration of this important measure. I agree that by agreeing to waive further consideration, the Committee on Armed Services is not waiving its jurisdictional claims over similar measures in the future.

During consideration of this measure on the House floor, I will ask that this exchange of letters be included in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

BOB FILNER,
Chairman.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, at this point I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the author of this legislation, H.R. 1228, Dr. BOOZMAN of Arkansas. He was former chairman and now ranking member of the Economic Opportunity Subcommittee of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I want to thank Ranking Member BUYER for yielding, and then also I want to thank the chairman, Mr. FILNER, and Ranking Member BUYER for allowing us to bring this resolution forward.

Madam Speaker, I was proud to introduce House Resolution 1228, honoring the veterans of Helicopter Attack Light Squadron Three and their families to recognize the veterans' sacrifices and service to America during the Vietnam War.

Despite the controversy surrounding the Vietnam War, most of the officers and enlisted men who served in the HAL-3 were volunteers. Most of the pilots were fresh out of flight training in Pensacola and most of the junior enlisted were recent graduates of Navy boot camp and technical training schools. Their leaders were also new to combat, coming mostly from shipped-based helicopter squadrons normally assigned to track submarines and haul supplies.

HAL-3 fought from 1967 to 1972. In that time, they earned the respect of Army and Navy units throughout the Mekong Delta for their courage under

fire and their dedication to supporting their comrades on the ground and in small boats patrolling the canals and rivers. They supported Army troop insertions and extractions. Navy SEALs counted on their support in tight situations. Wounded sailors and soldiers benefited from battlefield medivacs. In short, the Seawolves mastered every form of combat helicopter operations.

Here are some of the statistics from the resolution: the nine detachments and home guard of HAL-3 flew 130,000 flight hours in 5 years. They performed 1,530 medical evacuations, inflicted thousands of casualties on enemy forces, transported 37,000 passengers, and hauled a million pounds of cargo. In accomplishing those milestones with a fleet of castoff gun ships and a few slicks, the veterans of HAL-3 were awarded 156 Purple Hearts, five Navy Crosses, 31 Silver Stars, 219 Distinguished Flying Crosses, 101 Bronze Stars, 142 Vietnam Gallantry Crosses, 16,000 Air Medals, and numerous other awards, including six Presidential Unit Citations, the highest recognition given to military units.

Like any combat operation, there was a cost; 44 Seawolves lost their lives and are among the 58,000 immortalized on the Vietnam Memorial. Today, the children and grandchildren of those brave souls can be justifiably proud of the heritage of courage and sacrifice of their fathers and grandfathers.

Madam Speaker, I would especially like to mention citizens of Arkansas who served with HAL-3: George Blackwell, Frank W. Butler, Wayne Campbell, Johnny P. Cruse, James L. Keyes, Terry A. McMellon, William J. Mulcahy, Charles Osborne, James N. Prater, and Mack Thomas. It's been an honor to bring this resolution honoring the HAL-3 Seawolves to the House, and I strongly urge my colleagues to add their names to the roster of those recognizing these American sailors.

□ 1230

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

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

Mr. BUYER. I thank the gentleman for bringing this.

I also want to recognize Hoosiers who also shared danger of combat above the rice paddies and the forests of the Mekong Delta; those who served with HAL-3 from Indiana: J. Howard Cook, Rick Hodge, Melvin Howell, Thomas H. Jackson, Robert L. Redman, and Jay Wakeland.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1228, Honoring the Veterans of Helicopter Attack Light Squadron Three and Their Families and want to express my appreciation to Dr. BOOZMAN for introducing this resolution.

This weekend, we celebrate the 234th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Over the years, our freedoms and the interests of the United States have been defended by over 40 million men and

women and of those, over 1 million have died and 1.6 million have been wounded. I find it ironic that something as beautiful as freedom must be maintained by something as horrible as war.

Within those millions, there is a small group of Navy veterans who hold a unique place in the Navy's history. Those are the veterans of Helicopter Attack Squadron Three, better known as the HAL-3 Seawolves, the only active duty attack helicopter squadron in the Navy's history.

Using hand-me-down Army UH-1B gunships, Seawolf pilots and gunners provided air cover for Navy and Army brown water units in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam. From the squadron's commissioning in 1967 to its decommissioning in 1972, nearly 3,000 sailors wore the black beret of HAL-3, and 44 of those courageous combat veterans are listed among the dead on the Vietnam War Memorial here in Washington. Another 156 were awarded the Purple Heart for their wounds.

These veterans came from every state and every socio-economic background. Most were in their late teens and twenties. Among the officers, most wore the silver bars of a lieutenant junior grade. Most of the enlisted men were airmen and junior petty officers. They were lead by a core of officers and Chief Petty Officers who cared for them, trained them, and shared the dangers of combat above the rice paddies and forests of the Mekong Delta. The sailors who provided maintenance and administrative support to the flight crews were essential to keeping the helicopters flying and are equally worthy of our recognition.

I would especially like to recognize several Hoosiers who served in HAL-3: J. Howard Cook, Rick Hodge, Melvin Howell, Thomas H. Jackson, Robert L. Redman, Jay Wakeland.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution honors the service of all the veterans of HAL-3 and the families of these veterans for their support. We also express our condolences to the families of those 44 who gave the full measure of devotion and finally recognize the Seawolves' unique place in Naval Aviation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, 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 agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1228, 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, 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.

ALEJANDRO RENTERIA RUIZ DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS CLINIC

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4307) to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based

outpatient clinic in Artesia, New Mexico, as the "Alejandro Renteria Ruiz Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4307

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

SECTION 1. NAME OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS COMMUNITY-BASED OUTPATIENT CLINIC, ARTESIA, NEW MEXICO.

The Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Artesia, New Mexico, shall, after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, be known and designated as the "Alejandro Renteria Ruiz Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic". Any reference to such clinic in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the Alejandro Renteria Ruiz Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, sponsored by Mr. TEAGUE of New Mexico, that names the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Artesia, New Mexico, as the Alejandro Renteria Ruiz Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic.

Alejandro Ruiz of Loving, New Mexico, enlisted as an infantryman in the United States Army in 1944. He went on to serve with the 27th Infantry Division in the Pacific theatre of operations during the Second World War.

While advancing with his unit on the island of Okinawa, Private First Class Ruiz and his fellow soldiers came under intense automatic weapons fire from an enemy fighting position on the slopes of a narrow ravine.

In response, Ruiz exposed himself to the hail of bullets on his own initiative and stormed the enemy position. After being repulsed once, he returned to gather more ammunition and made a second assault on the pillbox, singlehandedly neutralizing the enemy position and saving the lives of his fellow soldiers.

For his actions on Okinawa, Private First Class Alejandro Renteria Ruiz was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, which was presented to him by President Truman on June 26, 1946, at the White House in Washington, DC.

Mr. Ruiz went on to serve in the Korean War and eventually retired from the Army as a Master Sergeant in the 1960s.

I'm sad to say that Mr. Ruiz passed away shortly before this bill was formally introduced, but I am very proud to honor his legacy of courage and patriotism by supporting H.R. 4307.

I urge the House to join Mr. TEAGUE in support of this bill and help to commemorate the valor of this great American.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TEAGUE) to explain the bill.

Mr. TEAGUE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of my bill, H.R. 4307, which would name the VA veterans health clinic in Artesia, New Mexico, in honor of Alejandro Renteria Ruiz, a southern New Mexican who was awarded the Medal of Honor during World War II.

Alejandro Ruiz was ultimately a sergeant in the United States Army. He was born and raised in Loving, New Mexico, down in southern Eddy County. When war broke out, he traveled north to Carlsbad and enlisted in the Army. After basic training, he was assigned to the 27th Infantry Division.

The 27th Infantry Division was part of the largest amphibious operation in the Pacific theater, the Allied invasion of Okinawa, code name Operation Iceberg. It was during this invasion that, on April 28, 1945, Private Ruiz' unit was pinned down by machine gun fire from a camouflaged Japanese pillbox. They were unable to advance until Ruiz grabbed an automatic rifle and charged the pillbox, right in the face of machine gun fire and grenades. Unfortunately, his rifle jammed, and one of the enemies attacked Ruiz. Without hesitation, he used the rifle as a club and beat back his enemy. Ruiz then returned to his original position, all the while under fire from machine guns and grenades from the pillbox. On his second attempt to free his unit, Ruiz was able to overtake the enemy pillbox and save the lives of fellow soldiers.

For his actions, he was awarded the Medal of Honor, which was presented to him by President Truman on June 26, 1946, in a ceremony at the White House.

Madam Speaker, it is with great pride that I stand before you to honor this American hero. We should all work every day to remember individuals like Sergeant Ruiz. He and the multitudes of his fellow Americans who battled for the freedom of Europe, Asia, and the Americas left the world a legacy of liberty, security, and prosperity.

After the war, Sergeant Ruiz would tell the story of how he came to serve in the Army. As a young man working for a cattle farmer in Carlsbad, he was told to transport an animal to another farm. Now, I am as familiar with the long, lonely roads of southern New Mexico as much as anyone is, and I can tell you, your mind wanders on those long drives. That day more than a half a century ago, Mr. Ruiz' mind wandered to thoughts of a girlfriend. Well, those thoughts in mind, he drove straight to Barstow, Texas, 122 miles away, to speak with that young

woman, and he brought the cow with him. Seeing as he'd now stolen a cow, Mr. Ruiz was detained, and the judge told Mr. Ruiz he would either be sent to jail for taking the cow or he could enlist in the Army. He chose the Army.

Sergeant Ruiz died on November 20, 2009. He was survived by two children, Selia Ruiz and Alejandro Ruiz, Jr., a sister, seven grandchildren, and six great-grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, Sergeant Ruiz was a member of the Greatest Generation. As that generation grows older and many of them leave this Earth, it is important that their sacrifices, their acts of heroism, their accomplishments, and, of course, their names not be forgotten. It would be a great mistake for us to forget how the lives we live today, the freedoms we cherish, and the comforts we enjoy were earned by the heroism of Sergeant Ruiz, the blood of his fellow soldiers, and the sacrifice of an entire Nation.

Madam Speaker, upon enactment of this bill, the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic located at 1700 West Main Street in Artesia, New Mexico, will bear the name of Alejandro Renteria Ruiz, the son, citizen, and defender of a grateful Nation.

I thank Chairman FILNER for his support, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. BUYER. I would like to thank Mr. TEAGUE for bringing this legislation and thank Mr. FILNER for bringing it to the floor.

Any time I get to read the history and hear the stories of such extraordinary Americans, it's only fitting that we can actually place their name on such buildings that are going to be able to care for so many people. This is a very fitting memorial to his service to country.

Today, I rise in support of H.R. 4307, a bill to rename the Artesia Community Outpatient Clinic after Alejandro Renteria Ruiz, a much decorated World War II veteran who served in the Pacific theater and is a recipient of the Medal of Honor.

Ruiz received the Medal of Honor during the World War II conquest of the Japanese island of Okinawa on April 28, 1945. Master Sgt. Ruiz summoned the courage to charge a Japanese pillbox under a hail of machine gun fire and was able to neutralize it. He singlehandedly saved the lives of his 165th infantry comrades and eliminated an obstacle that would have checked his unit's advance. When his comrades recommended him for the Medal of Honor, Ruiz did not want to hear their accolades, instead choosing to focus on daily battles in Okinawa. Such courage and humility makes for an extraordinary person and soldier.

Ruiz is a hero who continued to serve his nation in the military, serving in the Korean War and retiring as a Master Sergeant in the mid 1960s. He lived at the Veterans Home in Yountville, Calif., near Napa and recently passed away on November 20th, 2009.

Ruiz frequently attended veteran reunions once he retired from the military, as well as Veteran Commemorate Conventions to honor his comrades. At these conventions, he stressed the importance of Japanese and American cooperation and understanding. Even though he had fought the Japanese during the war, he agreed that today America and Japan are friends and allies and fervently upheld a message of peace.

Ruiz is also among forty-three men of Hispanic heritage who have been awarded the Medal of Honor. His story should inspire every American.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4307. Passage of this bill is an appropriate way to honor a great American. I thank Mr. TEAGUE for introducing this bill, and Chairman FILNER for moving this bill to the floor for consideration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FILNER. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TEAGUE) for bringing us this important resolution.

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. 4307.

The question was taken.

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

□ 1240

RESTORATION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5618) to continue Federal unemployment programs.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5618

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 "Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Section 4007 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(A) by striking "June 2, 2010" each place it appears and inserting "November 30, 2010";

(B) in the heading for subsection (b)(2), by striking "JUNE 2, 2010" and inserting "NOVEMBER 30, 2010"; and

(C) in subsection (b)(3), by striking "November 6, 2010" and inserting "April 30, 2011".

(2) Section 2005 of the Assistance for Unemployed Workers and Struggling Families Act, as contained in Public Law 111-5 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note; 123 Stat. 444), is amended—

(A) by striking "June 2, 2010" each place it appears and inserting "December 1, 2010"; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking "November 6, 2010" and inserting "May 1, 2011".

(3) Section 5 of the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-449; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by striking "November 6, 2010" and inserting "April 30, 2011".

(b) FUNDING.—Section 4004(e)(1) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking "and" at the end; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

"(F) the amendments made by section 2(a)(1) of the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2010; and".

(c) CONDITIONS FOR RECEIVING EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—Section 4001(d)(2) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting before "shall apply" the following: "(including terms and conditions relating to availability for work, active search for work, and refusal to accept work)".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Continuing Extension Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-157).

SEC. 3. COORDINATION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION WITH REGULAR COMPENSATION.

(a) CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS NOT INELIGIBLE BY REASON OF NEW ENTITLEMENT TO REGULAR BENEFITS.—Section 4002 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) COORDINATION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION WITH REGULAR COMPENSATION.—

"(1) If—

"(A) an individual has been determined to be entitled to emergency unemployment compensation with respect to a benefit year,

"(B) that benefit year has expired,

"(C) that individual has remaining entitlement to emergency unemployment compensation with respect to that benefit year, and

"(D) that individual would qualify for a new benefit year in which the weekly benefit amount of regular compensation is at least either \$100 or 25 percent less than the individual's weekly benefit amount in the benefit year referred to in subparagraph (A),

then the State shall determine eligibility for compensation as provided in paragraph (2).

"(2) For individuals described in paragraph (1), the State shall determine whether the individual is to be paid emergency unemployment compensation or regular compensation for a week of unemployment using one of the following methods:

"(A) The State shall, if permitted by State law, establish a new benefit year, but defer the payment of regular compensation with respect to that new benefit year until exhaustion of all emergency unemployment compensation payable with respect to the benefit year referred to in paragraph (1)(A);

"(B) The State shall, if permitted by State law, defer the establishment of a new benefit year (which uses all the wages and employment which would have been used to establish a benefit year but for the application of this paragraph), until exhaustion of all emergency unemployment compensation payable with respect to the benefit year referred to in paragraph (1)(A);

"(C) The State shall pay, if permitted by State law—

"(i) regular compensation equal to the weekly benefit amount established under the new benefit year, and

"(ii) emergency unemployment compensation equal to the difference between that weekly benefit amount and the weekly benefit amount for the expired benefit year; or

"(D) The State shall determine rights to emergency unemployment compensation without regard to any rights to regular compensation if the individual elects to not file a claim for regular compensation under the new benefit year."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to individuals whose benefit years, as described in section 4002(g)(1)(B) the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note), as amended by this section, expire after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. REQUIRING STATES TO NOT REDUCE REGULAR COMPENSATION IN ORDER TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDS UNDER THE EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

Section 4001 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-252; 26 U.S.C. 3304 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) NONREDUCTION RULE.—An agreement under this section shall not apply (or shall cease to apply) with respect to a State upon a determination by the Secretary that the method governing the computation of regular compensation under the State law of that State has been modified in a manner such that—

"(1) the average weekly benefit amount of regular compensation which will be payable during the period of the agreement occurring on or after June 2, 2010 (determined disregarding any additional amounts attributable to the modification described in section 2002(b)(1) of the Assistance for Unemployed Workers and Struggling Families Act, as contained in Public Law 111-5 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note; 123 Stat. 438)), will be less than

"(2) the average weekly benefit amount of regular compensation which would otherwise have been payable during such period under the State law, as in effect on June 2, 2010."

SEC. 5. BUDGETARY PROVISIONS.

(a) STATUTORY PAYGO.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled 'Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS.—Sections 2 and 3—

(1) are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-139; 2 U.S.C. 933(g));

(2) in the House of Representatives, are designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles; and

(3) in the Senate, are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, if we fail to act, 1.7 million Americans will lose their unemployment benefits by the end of this week. The House tried to address this issue a month ago as part of a much larger jobs package, but Republican opposition killed the bill in the other body.

America's unemployed workers cannot wait any longer for all of us to do the right thing. Many of them have lost their benefits after just 26 weeks. And we're not talking about people who've had 99 weeks of unemployment. We're talking people 26 weeks of unemployment in a time when we have almost 10 percent unemployed. And that's even as long-term unemployment has reached the highest levels since we've been counting. And yet, only one, one of more than 200 Republicans in Congress has voted to continue the benefits.

So we're bringing up a stand-alone bill to extend unemployment benefits so there can be no excuses. There's no place to hide in this. You are looking the unemployed straight in the face.

If you vote "no" you will be cutting off unemployment benefits to Americans who have worked hard and played by the rules but now find themselves with no job, no savings, and no support.

If you vote "no" you are abandoning unemployed Americans when there are five of them desperately searching for every job that's out there.

If you vote "no" you'll be helping increase the number of homes in foreclosure. If you don't get an unemployment check, you don't have money to pay your mortgage, so your house is going to go in the tank. The number of families declaring bankruptcy and the number of children going hungry will go up in America, in the richest country in the world.

If you vote "no" you're undermining economic recovery by choking consumer demand at a critical time.

And if you vote "no" I honestly don't know how you're able to go home and march in a Fourth of July parade as millions of Americans are left without any way to keep a roof over their head or food on the table for their children.

No excuses this time. No place to hide. We must pass this bill.

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

Here we go again. Another month, another bill extending unemployment benefits and extending the Federal deficit. Only this time, the Democrats have waited now almost an entire month since these programs last expired to come up with a plan for how to extend them, leaving hundreds of thousands of long-term unemployed people without needed benefits. And it's all because the Democrats refuse to pay for these benefits, despite record Federal deficits.

Madam Speaker, I'm one of many on this side who support helping long-term unemployed people. I voted for these benefits. Even though my home State of Michigan recently ended its 4-year run, the highest unemployment rate in the Nation, the pain suffered by our residents remains real.

But the American people know it isn't right to simply add the cost of this spending to our already overdrawn national credit card. They want to help those in need. They also know that someone has to pay when the government spends money. That assistance must not put our fiscal house, as a Nation, in even worse shape. And we're already in terrible shape, thanks to the other side.

The Democrats' trillion-dollar stimulus plan created millions of unemployed workers, instead of millions of promised jobs. We can and should cut that ineffective stimulus spending to pay for extending UI benefits, as my colleague, Mr. HELLER of Nevada, has proposed.

Stimulus hasn't worked. In its wake, nearly 3 million private-sector jobs were lost. Unemployment soared to 10 percent nationwide, and 48 out of 50 states lost jobs. The only thing we stimulated is more government jobs.

Even Democrats now question the wisdom of all that spending, as is evidenced by the fact the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee proposed last week to cut some of it to pay for expending other expired policies.

But instead of that commonsense approach, our colleagues on the other side have brought up this unpaid-for bill, under a process that prevents any amendment, including an effort to pay for this spending. So I expect, because of those reasons, this bill will be defeated. And they know that. They want a campaign issue. Not because Members on both sides oppose helping the unemployed, but because Members reflecting what they're hearing from their constituents, listening to the people they represent, are opposed to adding another \$33 billion to our \$13 trillion mountain of national debt. Our national debt is now more than 90 percent of our total economy.

Look around the world. Countries are sinking in debt. Yet, the Democrat leaders of this House seem among the last to recognize that this reckless spending cannot go on forever.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this deficit-extending bill today so that we can bring up a real bill that allows us to pass and actually pay for these benefits for the long-term unemployed. That's the only road out of this policy dead-end into which the other side's spending ways have driven us.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY), a member of our committee.

Ms. BERKLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for extending me this courtesy.

I am not at all concerned about finding a campaign issue to run on in November. What I'm looking for is relief for the people that I represent.

Nevada's unemployment rate went up last month. We are the highest in the country, officially over 14 percent, probably closer to 20 percent, which means a fifth of the people living in the State of Nevada have no jobs. And the problem is, there's no jobs to have.

When I hear people say, well, we shouldn't extend unemployment benefits because people are going to get accustomed to being on unemployment. Not one of the people I represent that's unemployed has come to me and told me what a picnic it is living on the brink with their unemployment benefits.

You know what they're saying to me? Find me a job, Congresswoman. I want to work.

Until this economy recovers, until people can go back to work we have an obligation and responsibility to keep these families afloat. So let's stop talking about nonsense like campaign issues, and let's start talking about how we're going to save our fellow citizens from going under in such a way that they're never going to be able to bounce back, no matter what happens with this economy.

I strongly support this.

Mr. CAMP. At this time, I yield 3 minutes to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I appreciate and applaud the leadership of Mr. CAMP on job-creating issues in this Congress.

My friend from Washington is correct; there are no excuses on this bill. Democrat leadership has known for months that this would run out for those who need unemployment, and they did nothing. Now it's lapsed for 30 days, and the question is why.

The answer is, to Democrats deficits don't matter. They thought they could attach this bill to a big spending bill and talk the rest of Congress into adding even more to our deficit, and Congress balked. Today they think they can add another \$33 billion to our deficit and Congress will go along with it. But we won't. At a time when Democrats believe deficits don't matter, the rest of the American public says it does matter.

□ 1250

People are frightened by the amount of debt this country owes. They are frightened by how much more dangerous debt is added every day. In fact, every second in America, under the Obama-Democrat budget, every second more is added to the national debt than most average Americans make all year long, every second more debt than most of us make all year long. And there is no end in sight.

Deficits are going to drag this economy down. It's going to put an anchor around the young people's necks, those

of our children and grandchildren. What I think is frustrating is it's so easy to pay for this bill. As Mr. CAMP said, a trillion-dollar stimulus bill. They spent \$3 million on a turtle crossing in Florida; \$50,000 for a hand puppet grant. They have \$390,000, this is hard to believe, they spent \$390,000 of your money at the University of New York at Buffalo to study the relationship between malt liquor beer and smoking marijuana. Those are your tax dollars. That's what we are spending this deficit on.

And what's even I think worse, as bad as the deficit is, if Democrats in Congress succeed in reinstating the moratorium on drilling in deep water, we will add 50,000 direct unemployed to these rolls. We will lose hundreds, if not thousands, of small businesses who won't be able to survive this moratorium.

The White House is determined to reinstate it, even though a Federal judge said it was completely inappropriate. Let's not turn an environmental catastrophe into an economic catastrophe. Bills like this that get ignored, try to run up deficits, moratoriums that kill more U.S. jobs, we can do better than this. I will vote "no," and I urge commonsense Americans who support a balanced budget to vote "no" as well.

Mr. LEVIN. I simply want to say to the gentleman from Texas he will have to go home, if he votes "no," and give an explanation why he voted "no" when 113,000 residents of the State of Texas will have lost unemployment benefits by the end of this week without the enactment of this bill; 113,000.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I received a phone call early this morning from one of my constituents. He said to me, Congressman DAVIS, I have had a job since I was 18 years old. I have always worked, but my unemployment benefits ran out at the end of May. My basement is flooded as a result of the heavy rains. My son is in college and can't find a summer job. Our house is almost in foreclosure. There are no jobs to be found. And now I have no unemployment benefits. What can I do? And the only thing I could say to him was, You can keep looking, you can have faith, and you can have hope.

But there is something that we can do. We can pass 5618, to extend unemployment benefits for you and your family, and for the other hundreds of thousands of families throughout America. That's the very least we can do, and we ought to do it now.

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

Mr. LEVIN. It's now my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished

gentleman from New York, CHARLES RANGEL.

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

Mr. RANGEL. I want to thank the chairman of the committee for yielding.

I guess my appeal has to deal with America. I think that our great country and its successes is really not just due to investments, but the investments that we have in people who are willing to leave their home country to come to this country because they have hopes, they have dreams, they have the energy. And I don't know how you convert that into what makes America the giant that it is, but one thing is abundantly clear: everyone is trying to come to America, and no one is anxious to leave.

This quality of believing in America and believing that you have the opportunity to succeed through hard work is one of the things that I think this recession, this setback, is costing us—something that we can never recover from—and that is the lack of faith. I think the gentleman from Chicago talked about it.

It's not just those who are unemployed now. It's those who are chronically unemployed, those that don't really believe that America's going to give them another chance, and those that are holding on now by their fingernails in the hope that somebody somewhere would allow them to exist.

Some lives cannot be restored. You can't get back that house, you can't get back your credit, you can't get back your kid in college, you can't get back your reputation of being a hard-working person that takes care of their family. And these are personal crises that most people overcome. But can our country overcome it? Can we tell a person that's worked all of his life, and his father and his grandfather, can we say that we have found billions of dollars for the bankers but somehow we are concerned about the deficit when it comes to Americans?

The one quality that we have is we believe in this country, we believe in hard work, and we believe that our country supports that type of thing. We can't talk about the other House, we can't talk about the deficit, we can't talk about Republicans and Democrats. We are talking about the heart of our country, and that is the dreams and the aspirations that we will never let workers down.

So we are not talking about welfare, unwanted children, or any of those things except what our flag is made of; and our flag is made of hope and support from this great country. So I do hope, Madam Speaker, that people try to understand everybody in this Chamber knows somebody that's not going to come back the same way that this crisis has hit them. We have an ability to ease the pain and to save the faith of those people who have not yet reached that point that they know that our country has let them down.

I just thank my colleagues for being sensitive enough to know that we do care, and we want the country to know that this could happen to them. So many people are depending on us. I hope this body will not let them down.

Mr. CAMP. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a distinguished Member, Mr. RICH NEAL.

Mr. NEAL. Thank you for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

Some of the best speeches that I have ever listened to and/or read come from the legendary mayor of Boston, James Michael Curley. And Curley spoke with great empathy about the forgotten man, those individuals who for whatever reason have found themselves outside of the mainstream of economic life. He also would suggest that, in simplicity, that the great ally of civilization was a full stomach. And we need to be reminded of that with the grim economic statistics that America is currently witnessing.

Now, also another very pertinent reminder here that I think that we all ought to recall: in October of 2008, in record time this House voted to come to the aid of Wall Street. It didn't take us long, with the Troubled Asset Relief Program, to keep standing many of those institutions that helped create the problem that we find ourselves currently in.

Now, why is that relevant? There are millions of people across this country who have simply found themselves without work. What does that do to an individual who has spent a career, and after 30 years finds the job is gone? And we treat them as though they are simply a statistic after perhaps they served us in an honorable manner in Vietnam, or currently in Iraq, or Afghanistan, or other theaters around the world?

America's about building community, Madam Speaker. America's about a place where nobody's to be abandoned and nobody's to be left behind. The great bounty of God's work has been to ensure that most people in America have shelter and food. This opportunity to extend unemployment benefits for the American people ought to meet this moment.

Mr. CAMP. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

□ 1300

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I was listening to the tribute to Senator BYRD yesterday on the floor of the Senate, the other body, and I was struck by one comment on his integrity. It was that if Senator BYRD gave you his word you could go to the bank on it.

I rise today to support this legislation because I want the American people to know that this Congress who has

taken their vote really needs to stand by its word. That word is to be there for America during a rainy day. This unemployment insurance extension is not a handout; it's a hand up. Democrats have voted to create thousands of jobs in America but it is not enough.

All the economists will tell you that Americans are not at work because they don't want to work. They are not at work because jobs have not been created, and one of the downfalls of the bailout, for those of us who did vote against it but because of the outpouring of our own constituents who asked us to vote "yes," we voted "yes" for small businesses and businesses in general to create jobs, but if the too-big-to-fail banks refuse to give them loans to create jobs then we are stuck with no job creation at the level we would like.

We need to be able to provide for those who need us now, provide for those without jobs or losing jobs, and get off this high horse of breaking your word to the American people.

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

As I said in my opening comments, there are many people on this side who have and do support helping the long-term unemployed. I voted for these benefits. This will represent the eighth extension of unemployment benefits since July of 2008. Of those eight bills, one has been paid for.

I heard my friend on the other side so eloquently speak of the forgotten man. What about the future of this country? What about the children and grandchildren who are going to be left paying this debt?

The issue isn't should we extend benefits to the unemployed. The issue is should they be paid for or should they simply add to the deficit and further compound our problems.

I happen to serve on the debt commission, the fiscal responsibility commission. We had testimony there from an expert who analyzed 200 years of world history and every country in the world and said that when your national debt gets to 90 percent of your GDP, which we're at now, you end up hurting the economic growth of the country by about 1 percent, and in America, that means 1 million jobs. That means by adding to the debt and deficit, we're costing jobs.

Now, what we need to do is help grow this economy, and let me just say that these unemployment insurance benefits are not paid for in this bill. Of the \$34 billion that would be spent on UI, not a penny is paid for. This bill is declared an emergency, and therefore, this \$34 billion will be added to our already record \$13 trillion debt, but it doesn't have to be that way.

The House actually passed, as I mentioned, one extension bill last fall that was fully paid for, and here's what a colleague of mine on the Ways and Means Committee, a senior Democrat, said in a press release, and this is also found on his Web site: "In passing the

legislation . . . the bill does not increase the deficit . . . the extension is fully paid for."

And here is what the Statement of Administration Policy said about that bill: "Fiscal responsibility is central to the medium-term recovery of the economy and the creation of jobs. The administration therefore supports the fiscally responsible approach to expanding unemployment benefits embodied in the bill."

So, by the administration's logic, the fiscally irresponsible bill before us undermines the medium-term recovery of the economy and the creation of jobs.

Let's vote "no" on this bill today so that we can come back tomorrow and pass a bill that extends unemployment benefits that is fully paid for and does not jeopardize the future of this country and the need for economic growth that is so important to getting us out of this recession.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEVIN. 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. 5618.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

I have listened to my colleague from Michigan who comes here almost alone, and I think those who vote "no" when they go back home are really going to find themselves basically alone, because those who vote "no" have no place to hide.

This is an emergency for 1.7 million people and their families right now; therefore, it's an emergency for the community of the United States of America. And that 1.7 million will grow and grow under this banner that is floated by the minority.

Look, the excuses fall of their own lack of weight. You say we did nothing on the Democratic side. Yes, we passed a bill that extended unemployment insurance. They could not find a single Republican in the Senate to vote for that bill. And so you finger point at those who acted and excuse those who refused to act?

And you bring up the deficit, a deficit that grew under the previous administration. You can't hide behind that. This is an emergency.

You can't hide behind the Republican bill either because, as I understand it, it was for 1 month paid for and that month is gone. You have not come up with any responsible, feasible way to excuse inaction.

Unemployment insurance was extended many times under Republican Presidents, so you don't even have that excuse.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Members will address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. LEVIN. There's no excuse, and so what was done under previous administrations, Republican and Democratic, should be done right today. I'm afraid you don't see that there's an emergency for the families, soon to be 2 million.

And also, let me say in terms of economic growth, when you provide unemployment insurance to people, they spend it. So, if you're worried about growth and consumer demand, put money in the pockets of people who are desperate, who are out of work, who are looking for work. Instead, you turn your back on them.

I want to read a story. I met this person in Hazel Park, Michigan, last weekend. He served 3 years and 9 months in the U.S. Army, including a year tour in Iraq. He has an associate's degree from a community college and a bachelor's degree. He was employed by a loan company, a mortgage company, as a broker, and then the mortgage crisis came and he was laid off. He was unemployed for 3 years, and then he was hired by Kmart as an assistant store manager. He was laid off in 2009, August, due to store closings.

□ 1310

He has currently, approximately, 4 weeks left on his Tier 1 extension, due to expire on July 14. There are 1.7 million people like this gentleman already in this country.

I don't know how you look them in the face. I don't know how you explain a "no" vote. I think the flimsy arguments that are used won't work in this hall and won't work back home.

This is an emergency. I really can't believe that people from the minority are going to come here and vote "no." They are voting "no" for millions. I think they are voting "no" for what is best in the United States of America. We are a community of people. When people lose their jobs and can't find them, we don't simply stand idly by. This is the time for you to stand up, and the only way to stand up is to vote "yes."

I plead on behalf of the millions of people in this country who are out of work, who are looking for jobs, that you provide the unemployment insurance that they have worked for and that should be provided. Don't turn your backs on them. In the end, there will be no excuse, no excuse, no excuse.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this much-needed legislation to extend unemployment insurance benefits through November 2010.

Though we are showing signs of economic recovery, millions of Americans remain out of work through no fault of their own. Without this extension, an estimated 1.7 million individuals will lose their unemployment benefits by July 3, 2010. This legislation would help these individuals and their families by retroactively restoring the benefits that they began losing as early as the end of May. We need to help those families who are struggling to make ends meet.

Protecting the middle class, rebuilding our economy, and providing job growth remains

our top priority. While there has been five consecutive months of job growth, much more work needs to be done to make up for the 8 million jobs lost while we continue to rebuild the economy. We inherited an economic mess that favored corporate special interests at the expense of the middle class. And we are still cleaning up that mess. Extending these benefits is not only the right thing to do for these families, but at the same time it will help the economy as a whole. If individuals are unable to buy food and pay their mortgages or rent, the economy could slide back into recession.

Mr. Speaker, we wouldn't be here if our Republican colleagues in the Senate had blocked previous legislation to extend unemployment benefits. I urge all my colleagues not turn our backs on those Americans who are out of a job and continue to struggle to find work.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5618, Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act. If there is a single federal program that is absolutely critical to people in communities all across this Nation at this time, it would be unemployment compensation benefits. People cannot function without some means to subsist, while continuing to look for work that in many places in the country is just not there. Families have to feed children. Unemployed workers, many of whom rely on public transportation, need to be able to get to potential employers' places of work. Utility payments must be paid.

Most people use their unemployment benefits to pay for the basics. No one is getting rich from unemployment benefits, because the weekly benefit checks are solely providing for basic food, medicine, gasoline and other necessary things many individuals with no other means of income are not able to afford.

Personal and family savings have been exhausted and 401(k)s have been tapped, leaving many individuals and families desperate for some type of assistance until the economy improves and additional jobs are created. The extension of unemployment benefits for the long-term unemployed is an emergency. You do not play with people's lives when there is an emergency. Unemployment is an emergency. Just ask someone who has been unemployed and looking for work, and they will tell you the same.

With a national unemployment rate of 9.7 percent, preventing and prolonging people from receiving unemployment benefits is a national tragedy. In the city of Houston, the unemployment rate stands at 8.3 percent, with more than 241,152 individuals remaining unemployed. Indeed, I cannot tell you how difficult it has been to explain to my constituents who are unemployed that there will be no further extension of unemployment benefits until the Congress acts. Whether the justification for inaction is the size of the debt or the need for deficit reduction, it is clear that it is more prudent to act immediately to give individuals and families looking for work a means to survive the hot summer of 2010—only made more unbearable by this nonsensical approach to their plight.

H.R. 5618 is just the right measure at the right time. The legislation will send a message to the Nation's unemployed, that this Congress is dedicated to helping those trying to help themselves. Until the economy begins to create more jobs at a much faster pace, and the various stimulus programs continue to ac-

celerate project activity in the economy, we cannot sit idly and ignore the unemployed. As such, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5618.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5618.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR RECONSIDERATION AND REVISION OF PROPOSED CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33) to provide for the reconsideration and revision of the proposed constitution of the United States Virgin Islands to correct provisions inconsistent with the Constitution and Federal law.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 33

Whereas Congress, recognizing the basic democratic principle of government by the consent of the governed, enacted Public Law 94-584 (94 Stat. 2899) authorizing the people of the United States Virgin Islands to organize a government pursuant to a constitution of their own adoption;

Whereas a proposed constitution to provide for local self-government for the people of the United States Virgin Islands was submitted by the President to Congress on March 1, 2010, pursuant to Public Law 94-584;

Whereas Congress, pursuant to Public Law 94-584, after receiving a proposed United States Virgin Islands constitution from the President may approve, amend, or modify the constitution by joint resolution, but the constitution "shall be deemed to have been approved" if Congress takes no action within "sixty legislative days (not interrupted by an adjournment sine die of the Congress) after its submission by the President";

Whereas in carrying out Public Law 94-584, the President asked the Department of Justice, in consultation with the Department of the Interior, to provide views on the proposed constitution;

Whereas the Department of Justice concluded that several features of the proposed constitution warrant analysis and comment, including—

(1) the absence of an express recognition of United States sovereignty and the supremacy of Federal law;

(2) provisions for a special election on the territorial status of the United States Virgin Islands;

(3) provisions conferring legal advantages on certain groups defined by place and timing of birth, timing of residency, or ancestry;

(4) residence requirements for certain offices;

(5) provisions guaranteeing legislative representation of certain geographic areas;

(6) provisions addressing territorial waters and marine resources;

(7) imprecise language in certain provisions of the bill of rights of the proposed constitution;

(8) the possible need to repeal certain Federal laws if the proposed constitution of the United States Virgin Islands is adopted; and

(9) the effect of congressional action or inaction on the proposed constitution; and

Whereas Congress shares the concerns expressed by the executive branch of the Federal Government on certain features of the proposed constitution of the United States Virgin Islands and shares the view that consideration should be given to revising those features: Now, therefore, be it

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

SECTION 1. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROPOSED CONSTITUTION FOR UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS.

It is the sense of Congress that Congress—

(1) recognizes the commitment and efforts of the Fifth Constitutional Convention of the United States Virgin Islands to develop a proposed constitution; and

(2) urges the Fifth Constitutional Convention of the United States Virgin Islands to reconvene for the purpose of reconsidering and revising the proposed constitution in response to the views of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

SEC. 2. REVISION OF PROPOSED CONSTITUTION.

Section 5 of Public Law 94-584 (90 Stat. 2900) is amended—

(1) by designating the first, second, third, and fourth sentences as subsections (a), (b), (d), and (e), respectively;

(2) in subsection (b) (as so designated)—

(A) by striking "within" and all that follows through "after" and inserting "within 60 legislative days after"; and

(B) by inserting "or has urged the constitutional convention to reconvene," after "in whole or in part,";

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) (as so designated) the following:

“(c) REVISION OF PROPOSED CONSTITUTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If a convention reconvenes and revises the proposed constitution, the convention shall resubmit the revised proposed constitution simultaneously to the Governor of the Virgin Islands and the President.

“(2) COMMENTS OF PRESIDENT.—Not later than 60 calendar days after the date of receipt of the revised proposed constitution, the President shall—

“(A) notify the convention, the Governor, and Congress of the comments of the President on the revised proposed constitution; and

“(B) publish the comments in the Federal Register.”; and

(4) in subsection (d) (as so designated), by inserting "under subsection (b) (or, if revised pursuant to subsection (c), on publication of the comments of the President in the Federal Register)" after "or modified".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in

which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the joint resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 33 was introduced by the chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Jeff Bingaman, to respond to concerns raised with the fifth proposed constitution for the United States Virgin Islands.

In order to encourage the adoption of their own constitutions, Congress in 1976 enacted legislation to authorize the people of the Virgin Islands and Guam to convene constitutional conventions and write their own local constitutions. This act, Public Law 94-528, sets out parameters that the supremacy of the United States Constitution must be recognized and adhered to as well as a process for the Federal review of any proposed constitution, including 60-day periods for both Presidential and congressional reviews. We are at the very end of the time prescribed for congressional action.

The U.S. Virgin Islands, an unincorporated territory acquired by the United States from Denmark in 1917, is one of only two U.S. States and territories that does not have a constitution written by the people who determine its basic governmental organization and structure. Instead, for more than half a century, the Virgin Islands have been under the governance of a Federal law known as the Revised Organic Act of 1954. Since 1964, the people of the Virgin Islands have attempted five times to write a constitution that brings the territory governance from the people. The first four efforts were unsuccessful.

On December 31, 2009, the Governor of the Virgin Islands submitted to President Obama a constitution drafted by the Fifth Constitutional Convention of the United States Virgin Islands. As required by Public Law 94-584, the President transmitted the constitution to Congress on March 1, 2010, for consideration.

In his submittal letter to Congress, President Obama indicated that he asked the Department of Justice, in consultation with the Department of the Interior, to provide their views on the proposed constitution. The Department of Justice, in a memorandum which accompanied the President's submittal letter, concluded that several features of the proposed constitution warranted analysis and comment and outlined at least eight areas in the proposed constitution that the Department of Justice believes should either be removed from the constitution or modified.

The resolution we are considering today attempts to respond to the concerns about the proposed constitution

raised by the Justice Department by providing for its reconsideration and revision to correct provisions that are inconsistent with the United States Constitution and Federal law. It is a clear statement from Congress that the convention should consider these provisions; although, it does not dictate what the outcome of the "reconsiderations" should be.

This resolution also represents a compromise, and because of the importance of this document and the process to my constituents and to me, I would like to explain the journey that I have gone through as their Representative in the only branch of local or national government with the authority to make any changes.

Regardless of my personal opinion or understanding of the unique circumstances of the U.S. Virgin Islands, the document adopted by the convention does not meet the dictates of the act which authorized its creation.

My initial position was that we as a Congress should exercise our authority and amend it before sending the document back to the people of the Virgin Islands to vote on. I still feel strongly that the people at home are entitled to and deserve a constitutionally sound document upon which to come out and cast their votes. That has not changed.

Yet, after listening to the testimony given in the Congress—and when at home—to the many sides of the issue and after listening to the varied opinions of a broad cross-section of my community, a different position evolved. Despite my misgivings on the constitutionality of the document, my views became more consistent with my long held stance that the people of the territories should be the ones to decide on issues of their self-governance.

The people of the Virgin Islands voted for delegates to the Constitutional Convention. We as a Congress and I as their elected Representative should honor their position and their work on the people's behalf. Further, any provision that is unconstitutional would not stand, and therefore, no one need fear that any rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution would in any way be abridged.

The Senate felt differently. There was a degree of outrage at what appeared on the surface to be a denial of equal protection under the law. Although they first thought to reject the document outright, that was not an option, and so they were prepared to amend it.

The resolution which is before us today represents a compromise that I negotiated and which protects the right of the people of the Virgin Islands to draft and adopt a constitution of their own writing; and I do believe that, although the definitions of native and ancestral could be included to follow the dictates, however, of the authorizing act, any rights and privileges ascribed to them would need to be amended in the reconvening of the convention. There is precedent for the con-

vention's reconvening to address administration concerns, as it happened in the case of the fourth constitutional draft document.

As I stated in my testimony before the Senate, it had been my hope that, once reconvened as prescribed in this resolution, no matter what was or was not done, the resulting document would go directly to the people of the USVI for the vote. I did not prevail in that argument, but given the constraints of time imposed by the other body's late action and the delays in reaching agreement on the resolution's being placed on the suspension calendar, I hope that we will get this to the people in time for the constitution to reconvene.

With that, I ask my colleagues to support the passage of this measure so that we can get it done today and get it to the President for his signature.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of a constitution by the U.S. Virgin Islands will provide additional autonomy for that territory. However, any constitution that is adopted should not be in conflict with the U.S. Constitution, as noted by the extensive comment provided by the U.S. Justice Department.

□ 1320

The House therefore should pass Senate Joint Resolution 33 today to state concerns with the Virgin Islands draft Constitution and urge remedying these issues.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House regarding S.J. Res. 33, which the other body passed on June 17, 2010, and which relates to a proposed Constitution of the Virgin Islands of the United States adopted by the Fifth Constitutional Convention in the territory on May 26, 2009. This particular proposed Constitution was received by the House from the President of the United States with his comments earlier this year, and was read and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources. On March 17, 2010, I chaired an oversight hearing of the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, Oceans and Wildlife for the purpose of receiving testimony about the proposed Constitution. Testimony was received from a representative of the United States Department of Justice and from leaders in the Virgin Islands, including the Governor and the President of and five other Delegates seated to the Fifth Constitutional Convention. Witnesses addressed both the drafting and review process for the proposed Constitution as well as its substance. Most importantly, witnesses emphasized the meaning that the drafting and adoption of a constitution by and for the people of the Virgin Islands holds for our democracy and for an increased level of self-government for them.

An Act of the 94th Congress codified in Title 48 of the United States Code provides for a Congressional review process for any proposed and locally drafted Constitution for either the Virgin Islands or Guam. Both territories are the only organized jurisdictions presently under the U.S. Flag for which local government is not organized pursuant to a locally

drafted and adopted Constitution. Indeed, a principal purpose of the Act of the 94th Congress, U.S. Public Law 94-584, which governs this process, was to enable the people of both territories to organize a government pursuant to a Constitution of their own adoption and structured in accordance with their vision.

Absent such a locally adopted Constitution, the governments of the Virgin Islands and Guam have been organized by and derive legitimacy from separate Acts of Congress, which for all intents and purposes serve as de facto Constitutions for the respective territories. These statutes are the Revised Organic Act of 1954 for the Virgin Islands, which superseded the Organic Act of 1936, and the Organic Act of 1950 for Guam.

The people of the Virgin Islands have duly elected five Constitutional Conventions since the enactment of the Revised Organic Act of 1954. Two Conventions in the Virgin Islands were convened prior to the enactment of U.S. Public Law 94-584—in 1964 and 1972, respectively—and three since—in 1978, 1980, and the most recent, the fifth such Convention convened in 2007. Positive steps toward increased self-government for the people of the Virgin Islands were realized as a result of the work of the 1964 and 1972 conventions, including an amendment by Congress to the Revised Organic Act that allowed for the Governor of the Virgin Islands to be chosen by popular election beginning in 1965. The work of the third and fourth conventions resulted in transmittals of whole proposed Constitutions to the Congress, and similarly served as a continued exercise of and toward greater self-government for the people of the Virgin Islands.

In 1977, one year following the enactment of U.S. Public Law 94-584, a Constitutional Convention was convened in Guam and composed of Delegates elected by the people of Guam. The particular proposed Constitution drafted by that Convention was not ultimately adopted by the people of Guam. Discussion arose then among the voters and leaders of Guam about whether approval of local constitutional government in Guam might preclude or be prejudicial to the exercise of their right to self-determination, and efforts in subsequent years were concentrated predominately on resolving the territory's ultimate political status.

The Fifth Constitutional Convention of the Virgin Islands marks another point in the continued journey of the people of the Virgin Islands toward increased self-governance and their commitment to a democratic form of government. The President noted such in his comments to Congress on this most recent, proposed Constitution. While certain legal questions have been raised regarding several of its features that are noted in the President's comments, the proposed Constitution in and of itself represents significant effort and work undertaken by leaders in the Virgin Islands dedicated to their community and to our democracy.

I commend the leadership that our colleague, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, has brought to bear in this process and in all issues pertaining to governance in the territories. This body is now considering a measure that the Senate has sent to us. I would be remiss if I did not note the implications for my district, Guam. As leaders in Guam may in the future decide to again take up the work to draft and adopt a Constitution locally, it is important that

Congress remain cognizant of and open to such opportunity.

S.J. Res. 33 proposes to amend the underlying statutory scheme governing such a process to allow for formal revision of a proposed Constitution after it has been initially transmitted to the President and Congress. In doing so, it requires a reconvened Constitutional Convention to resubmit a proposed Constitution in any form it may so revise it to the Governor of the Virgin Islands and the President. In amending Section 5 of U.S. Public Law 94-584 for this purpose, S.J. Res. 33 would separate and designate as separate subsections the existing four sentences of such Section. Additionally, it would insert a new subsection (c) in the middle of the existing language to provide for the resubmitting requirement. However, the proposed amendment of the Senate would only insert a reference to the Governor of the Virgin Islands in this instance despite the fact the underlying statute is structured such that the process is to apply both to the Virgin Islands and Guam, respectively. Revisiting this language may become important should leaders in Guam at any point in the future again convene a Constitutional Convention.

Ultimately, it is important for Congress to remain responsive to and supportive of leaders in both territories as they work to advance local self-government and provide for the rule of law.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank my colleague for his support. As we said, we are at the very last few days with which the Congress has been prescribed to act, and I ask for support of this measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, S.J. Res. 33.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOUNTAINHEAD PROPERTY LAND TRANSFER ACT

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1554) to take certain property in McIntosh County, Oklahoma, into trust for the benefit of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1554

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 "Fountainhead Property Land Transfer Act".

SEC. 2. TRANSFER OF LAND; LAND INTO TRUST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Immediately after completion of the survey required under sub-

section (b), the receipt of consideration and costs required under subsection (c), and satisfaction of all terms specified by the Secretary and the Secretary of the Army under subsection (d), administrative jurisdiction of the Property shall be transferred from the Secretary of the Army to the Secretary, and the Secretary shall take the Property into trust for the benefit of the tribe.

(b) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the Property shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary and the Secretary of the Army.

(c) CONSIDERATION; COSTS.—The tribe shall pay—

(1) to the Secretary of the Army fair market value of the Property, as determined by the Secretary of the Army; and

(2) all costs and administrative expenses associated with the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of the Property and taking the Property into trust pursuant to subsection (a), including costs of the survey provided for in subsection (b) and any environmental remediation.

(d) OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The transfer of administrative jurisdiction of the Property and taking the Property into trust shall be subject to such other terms and conditions as the Secretary and the Secretary of the Army consider appropriate to protect the interests of the United States, including reservation of flowage easements consistent with the Acquisition Guide Line for Flowage Easement for the Lake Eufaula project and other applicable policies for that project.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section:

(1) PROPERTY.—The term "Property" means, subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land generally described as the approximately 18 acres of Federal land located in McIntosh County, Oklahoma, within the boundary of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation and located in the northwest quarter of section 3, township 10 north, range 16 east, McIntosh County, Oklahoma, at Lake Eufaula.

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

(3) TRIBE.—The term "tribe" means the Muscogee (Creek) Nation.

(f) GAMING PROHIBITION.—The tribe may not conduct on any land taken into trust pursuant to this Act any gaming activities—

(1) as a matter of claimed inherent authority; or

(2) under any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) and any regulations promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission pursuant to that Act.

(g) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect or limit the application of, or any obligation to comply with, any environmental law, including the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.).

(h) PAYGO.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOREN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1554 would take certain property in McIntosh County, Oklahoma, into trust for the benefit of the Muscogee Creek Nation.

The Creek Nation has over 69,000 enrolled citizens at its headquarters in my district in beautiful eastern Oklahoma. As part of their effort to provide economic development in this very rural area of Oklahoma, the Nation purchased the Fountainhead Lodge and 48 surrounding acres from the State of Oklahoma.

Fountainhead was once touted as the State's premier resort lodge, but the property had fallen into disrepair. The Creek Nation hopes to turn the property into a destination resort at Lake Eufaula, bringing much-needed tourism dollars to this distressed area, one of the poorest in the Nation.

The property included a hotel, recreational building and duplex cabins, as well as 18 acres of Army Corps of Engineers land that came with the property as a lease. A subsequent survey determined that the recreational building was located entirely on the Corps' land. The Corps suggested that they transfer the ownership of the leased land to the Creek Nation to assist in the development of the property.

On April 21, 2010, the Committee on Natural Resources held a hearing on this legislation. The administration testified in support of the bill, but expressed concerns with the manner in which it was drafted. At the full committee markup, I offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute to address their concerns. The bill as amended was favorably reported by voice vote.

Additional changes have been made to H.R. 1554. The bill now prohibits gaming on the lands that are subsequent to this legislation. Further, a provision was added to ensure that if there are hazardous materials on the lands, the Federal Government remains responsible for cleaning them up. Finally, language was added to account for any budgetary impacts this legislation may have.

Enactment of H.R. 1554 would allow the Creek Nation to move forward with their plans to build a full-scale lake resort. This project will bring hundreds of much-needed jobs and economic prosperity to the region. Resolutions of support for this project have been passed by members of the legislature from the Lake Eufaula area, Checotah Chamber of Commerce, City of Henryetta, City of Eufaula, and the Lake Eufaula Association.

I ask my colleagues to support passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an exchange of letters between the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure concerning H.R. 1554.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, June 28, 2010.

Hon. JAMES OBERSTAR,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and
Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your willingness to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 1554, a bill to take certain property in McIntosh County, Oklahoma, into trust for the benefit of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation.

I appreciate your willingness to waive rights to further consideration of H.R. 1554, notwithstanding the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Of course, this waiver does not prejudice any further jurisdictional claims by your Committee over this legislation or similar language. Furthermore, I agree to support your request for appointment of conferees from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure if a conference is held on this matter.

This exchange of letters will be placed in the committee report and inserted in the Congressional Record as part of the consideration of the bill on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

With warm regards, I am

Sincerely,

NICK J. RAHALL II,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, June 28, 2010.

Hon. NICK RAHALL,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RAHALL: I write to you regarding H.R. 1554, a bill to take certain property in McIntosh County, Oklahoma, into trust for the benefit of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation.

H.R. 1554 contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I will not seek a sequential referral of the bill. However, I agree to waive consideration of this bill with the mutual understanding that my decision to forgo a sequential referral of the bill does not waive, reduce, or otherwise affect the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure over H.R. 1554.

Further, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation on provisions of the bill that are within the Committee's jurisdiction. I ask for your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for the appointment of conferees on H.R. 1554 or similar legislation.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's jurisdictional interest in the Committee Report on H.R. 1554 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure in the House.

I look forward to working with you as we prepare to pass this important legislation.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. OBERSTAR, M.C.,
Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma has adequately described the purpose of this bill. I am pleased to lend my support to this bill, which will enable the Muscogee Creek Nation of Oklahoma to acquire land and put it into productive use at no cost to the taxpayer.

I also appreciate the sponsor, the gentleman from Oklahoma, and the chairman of the committee, for ironing out the minor technical concerns that were brought up in relation to gaming in the original version of the bill. I think those improvements add to this bill. This is a good bill as it has been amended, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I also want to particularly thank the chairman for allowing us to have the hearing and for the markup, but I really want to say a special thank you to the ranking member and his staff for working with us on these technical changes and making sure that everything was ironed out.

I want to thank the Creek Nation for all the hard work it has put into this legislation. I want to thank the Chief, the Council, and all the community leaders that have made this possible. I ask for a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1554, 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. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

INDIAN PUEBLO CULTURAL CENTER CLARIFICATION ACT

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4445) to amend Public Law 95-232 to repeal a restriction on treating as Indian country certain lands held in trust for Indian pueblos in New Mexico, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4445

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Indian Pueblo Cultural Center Clarification Act”.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF RESTRICTION ON TREATING AS INDIAN COUNTRY CERTAIN LANDS HELD IN TRUST FOR INDIAN PUEBLOS IN NEW MEXICO.

Public Law 95-232 is amended in the first section in subsection (b) by striking “However, such property shall not be ‘Indian country’ as defined in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code.”.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON GAMING.

Public Law 95-232 is amended in the first section by adding at the end the following:

“(e) PROHIBITION ON GAMING.—Gaming, as defined and regulated by the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), shall be prohibited on land held in trust pursuant to subsection (b).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Indian Pueblo Cultural Center Clarification Act is an important step that will help keep the Indian Pueblo Cultural Center serving our community and our Nation.

Founded in 1976 to celebrate the history and accomplishments of our State’s 19 Indian Pueblos, the IPCC includes a museum that honors the continuing contributions of Pueblo people to our State in their own words. The IPCC continues to serve as a gathering space for Pueblo leaders to meet and discuss issues of importance to the 19 Indian Pueblos.

□ 1330

The IPCC property sits on land that was put into trust for New Mexico’s pueblos in 1978, when the Albuquerque Indian School was closed by the Bureau of Indian Education. However, in recent years, disagreement has arisen about the land’s tax status. This legislation will remove a clause in the current law that states that this land is not “Indian Country,” thereby ensuring that commercial activity on this site remains exempt from State taxation, just like all other trust land.

The bill also includes a clause that explicitly prohibits gaming at the Indian Pueblo Cultural Center site, which has earned the support of the All-Indian Pueblo Council, the State of New Mexico, and the city of Albuquerque. Although it was not the intention of the All-Indian Pueblo Council to engage in gaming at this location, that provision puts to rest any concerns of residents who live nearby.

I thank each of the parties who have come to the table in this effort to bolster a place loved by so many across New Mexico’s First Congressional District and across our Nation. I’d also like to thank my colleagues from New Mexico, Representative TEAGUE and Representative LUJÁN, for their support as well.

Mr. Speaker, the House Natural Resources Committee reported this bill by unanimous consent on June 16 of this year, and I would ask my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 4445.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Mexico has adequately explained the purpose of H.R. 4445. As long as the pueblos and the State of Mexico are comfortable with this legislation, I have no objection to passing it today.

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

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, I would simply urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4445, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4445, 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. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SALMON LAKE LAND SELECTION
RESOLUTION ACT

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2340) to resolve the claims of the Bering Straits Native Corporation and the State of Alaska to land adjacent to Salmon Lake in the State of Alaska and to provide for the conveyance to the Bering Straits Native Corporation of certain other public land in partial satisfaction of the land entitlement of the Corporation under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2340

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 “Salmon Lake Land Selection Resolution Act”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to ratify the Salmon Lake Area Land Ownership Consolidation

Agreement entered into by the United States, the State of Alaska, and the Bering Straits Native Corporation.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AGREEMENT.—The term “Agreement” means the document—

(A) titled “Salmon Lake Area Land Ownership Consolidation Agreement”;

(B) between the United States, the State, and the Bering Straits Native Corporation on July 18, 2007, which was extended until January 1, 2011, by agreement of the parties to the Agreement effective January 1, 2009; and

(C) on file with—

(i) the Department of the Interior;

(ii) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(iii) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(2) BERING STRAITS NATIVE CORPORATION.—The term “Bering Straits Native Corporation” means an Alaska Native Regional Corporation formed under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) for the Bering Straits region of the State.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Alaska.

SEC. 4. RATIFICATION OF AGREEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of this Act, Congress ratifies the Agreement.

(b) EASEMENTS.—The conveyance of land to the Bering Straits Native Corporation, as specified in the Agreement, shall include the reservation of the easements that—

(1) are identified in Appendix E to the Agreement; and

(2) were developed by the parties to the Agreement in accordance with section 17(b) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1616(b)).

(c) CORRECTIONS.—Beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, with the consent of the other parties to the Agreement, may only make typographical or clerical corrections to the Agreement and any exhibits to the Agreement.

(d) GENERAL AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY.—The Secretary may carry out all actions allowed or required under the Agreement.

SEC. 5. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 2340 would ratify an agreement between the United States, the Bering

Straits Native Corporation, and the State of Alaska. The underlying agreement provides for the conveyance of certain Federal lands to the Bering Straits Native Corporation and to the State of Alaska. The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act was enacted in 1971. It was intended to resolve long-standing issues surrounding native land claims in Alaska. Under this act, Alaska Native regional corporations are entitled to a certain amount of public lands. The Bering Straits Native Corporation is one of those regional corporations entitled to certain lands.

In addition, the Alaska Statehood Act grants the State of Alaska the opportunity to select a certain amount of public lands for the State's benefit. Normally, legislation is not required to implement these selections. In this case, however, both the State and the Native corporations selected some of the same lands. After years of negotiations, the parties, along with the United States, arrived at an agreement to resolve this conflict.

I want to commend our colleague, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, for his hard work and dedication to this legislation, and I ask my colleagues to support its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill as sponsored by our colleague from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG). It resolves overlapping selections to the same parcels of land that were filed by the State of Alaska and the Bering Straits Native Corporation pursuant to the Alaska Statehood Act and the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. As we learned during the committee hearing on this bill, there is no opposition to its enactment. So I am pleased to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2340, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2340, 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. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL POLLINATOR WEEK

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1460) recognizing the important role pollinators play in supporting the ecosystem and supporting the goals and ideals of National Pollinator Week.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1460

Whereas bees, birds, butterflies, and other pollinators are vital to sustaining a healthy ecosystem;

Whereas pollinators are responsible for an estimated 1 out of every 3 bites of food that we eat;

Whereas diversity of pollinators is necessary for diversity of plant life and the security of our food supply;

Whereas a decline in pollinators would adversely impact animal species that eat pollinating plants;

Whereas colony collapse disorder has caused an alarming decline in the population of honey bees, one of the most important pollinators;

Whereas the United States Senate designated the last week of June as National Pollinator Week in 2006; and

Whereas the majority of States have recognized June 21–27, 2010, as National Pollinator Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the importance of pollinators in agriculture and in maintaining our diverse ecosystem; and

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Pollinator Week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1460, recognizing the important role that pollinators play in supporting the ecosystem and supporting the goals and ideals of National Pollinator Week.

Approximately three-quarters of the world's 250,000 flowering plants require pollinators to facilitate reproduction. In addition, nearly 130 different crops that provide more than \$15 billion per year in farm gate value would cease to exist without our pollinators. In California alone, some 1.3 million beehives pollinate over 600,000 acres of almond trees. There is no doubt that without the healthy population of pollinators that we currently have, our Nation's

farmers will not be able to continue to grow many of the high quality and nutritious foods that we enjoy today.

The House Agriculture Committee has paid special attention to the issue facing pollinators, holding several hearings in recent years to review the status of pollinator health issues and including funds in the 2008 farm bill to conduct much-needed research on pollinator health. I'm proud to support this resolution brought by my colleague today, which recognizes the importance of pollinators supporting diverse ecosystems and the crops that produce so many of the foods grown across this great Nation. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1340

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I rise in support of House Resolution 1460, recognizing the important role pollinators play in supporting the ecosystem and supporting the goals and ideals of National Pollinator Week.

More than 32 State Governors designated the last week of June as Pollinator Week to bring awareness to the important role pollinators play in our food supply and ecosystem. In my home State of Oklahoma, Pollinator Week was celebrated with a variety of activities and exhibits across the State, including those at the Oxley Nature Center in Tulsa. On a national level, the Pollinator Partnership has launched a Web-based program to highlight specific actions that school groups, farmers, gardeners, and others can take to support pollinators.

It is important that we bring awareness to the importance of pollinators, given the fact that most pollinating species are in a decline. Colony Collapse Disorder, commonly referred to as CCD, continues to plague honeybees and will be a major concern to beekeepers and agricultural communities.

Over the past several years, the honeybee population has experienced a dramatic decline due to a variety of factors, including loss of habitat, introduction of diseases and pests, and migratory stress. All of these factors have contributed to higher operating costs for the pollinator industry as well as the agricultural producers who rely on a readily available supply of pollinator bees.

Pollination activities by honeybees add more than \$15 billion annually to the value of U.S. crops. With one-third of our food supply dependent upon pollination by honeybees, we need to have a solid understanding of CCD and how to eradicate it.

I commend researchers from the Federal and State level as well as the industry, State universities, and State Departments of Agriculture for coming together under the CCD Working Group. I am hopeful that this collective group of experts can get to the bottom of this very important problem.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the valuable

contribution of America's pollinator industry by supporting House Resolution 1460.

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Oklahoma, my good friend, for his support of this resolution.

At this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the author of the resolution, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), who, without his help, we would not have been able to pass the farm bill in 2008. He has been continuously an advocate for pollinator research and for making sure that specialty crops get their due day in the sun.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank my good friend from California for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, today the House is going to consider H. Res. 1460, which honors National Pollinator Week. With the efforts of the Pollinator Partnership, a majority of States and a number of Federal agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, have officially recognized June 21 through June 27, 2010, as a time to reflect upon the importance of, and challenges facing, these species.

The resolution, as offered, acknowledges how vital bees and other pollinators are to our ecosystem and agriculture and supports the goals and ideals of National Pollinator Week.

As mentioned by my colleague, 75 percent of all flowering plant species rely on creatures like birds, bats, bees, and butterflies for fertilization. It would be a misconception, however, to think that pollinators are only important to plants and provide little benefit to us. In fact, one out of every three bites of food that we eat as well as \$20 billion of products in the United States alone are derived from pollinators. In light of those kinds of figures, the security of our food supply clearly hinges on the survival of these species.

National Pollinator Week is a time to reflect upon these contributions and what we can do to help preserve these animals. On a similar note, Mr. Speaker, to further emphasize the importance of this issue, I recently participated in cofounding and am now co-chair of the Congressional Pollinator Protection Caucus, along with Representative TIM JOHNSON, Representative CARDOZA, and Representative HENRY BROWN of South Carolina. The caucus is a bipartisan source of information and discussion related to how natural, political, and economic developments impact the security of pollinators and their habitats.

Last week, a briefing on the future of pollinators and in recognition of National Pollinator Week was held in conjunction with the caucus and was a tremendous success. We are planning more events and briefings to keep Members and their staffs informed on this important issue. I urge all of my colleagues to become members of the

Congressional Pollinator Protection Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, National Pollinator Week provides us with an opportunity to recognize how important pollinators are to the sustainability of our environment and to our food supply.

You know, Mr. CARDOZA, several in my local media and throughout have come forward with all sorts of humor about this; you know, "It bees that way," and "It's the buzz" and a whole bunch of these things. But when all is said and done, I think we all recognize that beyond the humor, this is a critically serious matter for the food supply of this Nation and, indeed, the world.

Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution, and I thank you for yielding me the time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume simply to close by thanking my colleagues Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. JOHNSON for their work on this important issue. It does make a tremendous difference in our ecology, and certainly with a \$15 billion tag, the effect of losing these pollinators on our agricultural economy, it's important to every consumer and every pocketbook.

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

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank my colleague from Oklahoma for his gracious advocacy on behalf of this issue.

And to my colleague from Florida, if your media were to be without the products of these bees, that really, truly would be a news story, Mr. HASTINGS. I want to thank you for your tireless advocacy on behalf of pollinators and on behalf of agriculture generally.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1460.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2010, PART II

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5611) to amend the Inter-

nal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5611

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 "Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2010, Part II".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TAXES FUNDING AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) FUEL TAXES.—Subparagraph (B) of section 4081(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "July 3, 2010" and inserting "August 1, 2010".

(b) TICKET TAXES.—

(1) PERSONS.—Clause (ii) of section 4261(j)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "July 3, 2010" and inserting "August 1, 2010".

(2) PROPERTY.—Clause (ii) of section 4271(d)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking "July 3, 2010" and inserting "August 1, 2010".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 4, 2010.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 9502(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking "July 4, 2010" and inserting "August 2, 2010"; and

(2) by inserting "or the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2010, Part II" before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 9502(e) of such Code is amended by striking "July 4, 2010" and inserting "August 2, 2010".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 4, 2010.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 48103(7) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(7) \$3,515,000,000 for fiscal year 2010."

(2) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—Sums made available pursuant to the amendment made by paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended.

(b) PROJECT GRANT AUTHORITY.—Section 47104(c) of such title is amended by striking "July 3, 2010," and inserting "August 1, 2010,".

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF EXPIRING AUTHORITIES.

(a) Section 40117(l)(7) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "July 4, 2010," and inserting "August 2, 2010,".

(b) Section 44302(f)(1) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking "July 3, 2010," and inserting "August 1, 2010,"; and

(2) by striking "September 30, 2010," and inserting "October 31, 2010,".

(c) Section 44303(b) of such title is amended by striking "September 30, 2010," and inserting "October 31, 2010,".

(d) Section 47107(s)(3) of such title is amended by striking "July 4, 2010," and inserting "August 2, 2010,".

(e) Section 47115(j) of such title is amended by striking "July 4, 2010," and inserting "August 2, 2010,".

(f) Section 47141(f) of such title is amended by striking “July 3, 2010.” and inserting “August 1, 2010.”.

(g) Section 49108 of such title is amended by striking “July 3, 2010.” and inserting “August 1, 2010.”.

(h) Section 161 of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (49 U.S.C. 47109 note) is amended by striking “July 4, 2010,” and inserting “August 2, 2010.”.

(i) Section 186(d) of such Act (117 Stat. 2518) is amended by striking “July 4, 2010,” and inserting “August 2, 2010.”.

(j) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 4, 2010.

SEC. 6. FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS.

Section 106(k)(1)(F) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(F) \$7,813,037,096 for the period beginning on October 1, 2009, and ending on August 1, 2010.”.

SEC. 7. AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT.

Section 48101(a)(6) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(6) \$2,453,539,493 for the period beginning on October 1, 2009, and ending on August 1, 2010.”.

SEC. 8. RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 48102(a)(14) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(14) \$159,184,932 for the period beginning on October 1, 2009, and ending on August 1, 2010.”.

□ 1350

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to give Members 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 5611.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5611, the Airport and Airway Extension Act, Part II.

As you know, the Trust Fund taxes and spending authority are scheduled to expire on July 3. This bill simply extends the authority one more month while we work together on a long-term solution.

Air travel plays a crucial and critical role in our economy and our lives. The world's busiest airport, Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport is located in my congressional district. This airport alone has a direct impact of more than \$32.5 billion on the State of Georgia's economy. At a time when we are considering the importance of jobs and job creation, I would like to note that the airport is the second-largest employer in Georgia with 58,000 workers.

If Congress does not pass the bill, the Trust Fund will lose the revenue that

we need for airport construction and the Nation's air traffic control system.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to come together and support this bipartisan legislation.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise also in support of H.R. 5611. This is a straightforward and non-controversial bill to extend for 1 month, through August 1, the existing FAA authorization law, the excise taxes that support the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and the Trust Fund's expenditure authority. The current FAA authorization, as well as the excise taxes and spending authorities, are currently scheduled to expire on July 3.

This extension will give Congress additional time to consider longer-term FAA reauthorization legislation and to determine whether modifications to the financing structure of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund are appropriate.

I would note, Mr. Speaker, that on March 25, 2010, the House passed the Senate amendment to H.R. 1586, a 4-year FAA reauthorization with an additional amendment, and the two Chambers are continuing to work to resolve their differences.

While the House-passed version of that broader legislation remains controversial for reasons unrelated to the provision within the Ways and Means Committee's jurisdiction, I'm pleased to report that the short-term extension we are considering today is supported by the bipartisan leadership of both the Ways and Means and the Transportation and Infrastructure committees.

It's important that we take this step to extend the current FAA authorization and its related excise taxes and expenditure authorities on a temporary basis, and I'm pleased to join with my colleagues across the aisle in support of this legislation.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5611, the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2010, Part II.

I want to thank my friend, Mr. LEWIS, from the Ways and Means Committee for yielding time to me to allow me to speak on this important legislation. And I thank Chairman OBERSTAR, Ranking Member MICA, and ranking member Mr. PETRI for working with me and all of us together to bring this bill to the floor today.

For the past 3 months, we have been working in a bipartisan manner with

our friends in the other body to bring a comprehensive Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization bill to the floor. We have worked through the majority of both bills, and only a few issues remain.

The bill before us today, H.R. 5611, will provide a short, 1-month extension of the FAA reauthorization bill through August 1, 2010, to allow us to finish our work before we adjourn for the August district work period.

This is a clean extension. Primarily, H.R. 5611 extends aviation taxes to support the Airport and Airways Trust Fund, which funds a large portion of the FAA's budget. The bill also extends the Airport Improvement Program contract authority to allow airports to continue critical safety and capacity enhancement projects.

Aviation is too critically important to our Nation's economy, contributing \$1.2 trillion in output and approximately 11.4 million jobs, to allow the taxes or the funding for critical aviation programs to expire. Congress must ensure that this extension passes today to ensure that our aviation system is not disrupted and continues to function safely.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. And, again, I thank my friend from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) for yielding me time.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Representative DAVIS from Kentucky, for yielding me this time. And I also would like to express my appreciation for the way that my subcommittee chairman, Mr. COSTELLO, and chairman, Mr. OBERSTAR, and my colleague, Mr. MICA from Florida, have all been working on this conference and on this legislation now for longer than we would have liked. It's too bad that we have to do what will be, I guess, our 14th or 15th extension of the existing law. But it is, unfortunately, necessary to do that to give us time to complete work on the conference, which actually is well underway.

In May of last year, we passed the Reauthorization Act of 2009, H.R. 915. This March the Senate passed its own FAA reauthorization bill, which the House took up, amended, passed, and sent back to the Senate. While a conference has not been called, staff from both Chambers have been in informal discussions for months to reconcile the two versions of the bill. And while these discussions have led to tentative agreement on the vast majority of provisions, and there has been good work on both sides of the aisle on this, a number of controversial issues have stalled progress on a final agreement.

I am disappointed, myself, that several issues unrelated to important safety and modernization provisions in the reauthorization package are holding up final agreement on this legislation. Nevertheless, in order to allow the

FAA to continue operating uninterrupted, I support passage of the bill before us to extend FAA's funding and program authorization.

H.R. 5611, the bill before us, would extend the taxes, programs, and funding of the FAA to August 1 of this year. This bill provides just over \$3.5 billion in Airport Improvement Program funding, extends the War Risk Insurance program, and extends other authorities related to Small Community Air Service, airport, and safety programs.

That will ensure that our National Airspace System continues to operate, and that the FAA continues to fund important airport projects while the Congress completes action on a final reauthorization bill.

I want to urge my colleagues to take advantage of these extra 30 days to reach compromise on the few remaining controversial provisions in the FAA bill. This bill contains critical safety provisions that must not be delayed any longer. We owe it to the families of Flight 3407 and to the traveling public to reach agreement and send a good, bicameral, bipartisan FAA bill to our President.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5611.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Just to reiterate, this is very important to continue this extension. It's been achieved in a bipartisan manner and among the relevant committees of jurisdiction. I wholeheartedly support it and encourage my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 5611, which extends the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to extend authorizations for the Airport Improvement Program, and for other purposes. While I support passage of this bill today, I am hopeful that the House and Senate will soon agree on a full reauthorization of these important programs.

This bill offers a necessary extension of one month of these two programs. The Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means Committees each approved these extensions. First of all, the Airport and Airway Trust Fund provides funding for the federal commitment to the nation's aviation system through several aviation-related excise taxes. These taxes are vital to fund the continued maintenance, expansion, and improvement of the nation's airports and airway system. The second program, the Airport Improvement Program, works to maintain and improve the safety and efficiency of air travel.

I urge my colleagues to take advantage of the additional time that these extensions offer in order to reach a compromise with the other body regarding the Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act. It is absolutely essential that the House and Senate resolve their differences quickly so that our nation's air travel system can function safely and efficiently.

This year, Congress has passed legislation to create and maintain jobs in all different sectors in order to improve our economy. If we

allow the authorization of these airport programs to expire, we will take steps in the wrong direction by eliminating the jobs that employ people in these two programs. In fact, the reauthorization of the funding and authority for the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and the Airport Improvement Program is also important for the economy of my Congressional district. The 4th district of Georgia has the second largest airport in Georgia, Dekalb Peachtree Airport, which is responsible for around 7,300 jobs and it generates \$130 million worth of personal income for these employees. If temporary or the eventual permanent reauthorization of these programs fails to pass Congress, it would evidently be devastating for my district, and the Nation.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5611, the "Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2010, Part II".

This bill ensures that aviation programs, taxes, and Trust Fund expenditure authority will continue without interruption pending completion of a long-term Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) reauthorization act. We are very close to resolving all differences with the Senate on the long-term FAA bill. However, because the long-term bill will not be completed before the current authority for aviation programs expires at the end of this week, H.R. 5611 is needed to extend aviation programs, taxes, and expenditure authority for an additional month.

The most recent long-term FAA reauthorization act, the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (P.L. 108–176) expired on September 30, 2007. Although the House passed an FAA reauthorization bill during the 110th Congress, and again last year, the Senate failed to act until March of this year. The FAA has, therefore, been operating under a series of short-term extension acts, the most recent of which expires on July 3, 2010.

Since passage of the Senate bill in March, we have been working diligently to resolve the differences between the House and Senate bills. We have made extremely good progress and are near completion of a final bill. However, given that the current authority for aviation programs expires at the end of this week, a further extension of current law is necessary to continue the financing of aviation programs through August 1, 2010. Based on the hard work that has occurred to date, I am extremely hopeful that Congress will complete action on the long-term FAA reauthorization act in July.

I thank Chairman LEVIN of the Committee on Ways and Means for his assistance in ensuring the continued operation of aviation and highway programs. I also thank Ways and Means Committee Ranking Member CAMP and my Committee colleagues: Ranking Member MICA, Aviation Subcommittee Chairman COSTELLO, and Ranking Member PETRI, for working with me on this critical legislation.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5611.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost three years since the last reauthorization expired in September 2007. As Chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee in 2003, I guided that bill to completion in just seven months.

This had been the longest period of time between reauthorizations in the history of the FAA.

This is the fourteenth in a series of FAA extensions and the sixteenth time we have come to the Floor to keep the FAA in business.

Both bodies have been actively negotiating to produce a final bill that sets priorities and improves our airspace system.

We cannot allow needless, controversial provisions to hijack important initiatives to improve aviation safety and allow the industry to grow.

The situation has delayed bipartisan safety legislation that passed the House last fall and now sits idle. This is simply unacceptable.

I support this fourteenth extension and hope that we can quickly resolve our issues and produce a much-needed FAA Reauthorization bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5611, the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2010: Part II. This Act would extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund as well as extend authorizations for the airport improvement program. The Airport and Airway Trust Fund (AATF) provides much needed funding to assist in our Federal commitment to the Nation's aviation system. Such funding is necessary for the development of our nationwide airport and airway system as well as for investments in air traffic control facilities to meet the current and future projected growth in aviation.

The Trust Fund provides 100 percent of the funding for Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) airport grants, facilities and equipment, and research, engineering, and development. Allocations are also provided to the Airport Improvement Program (AIP), and Facilities and Equipment, (F&E) and funding from the Trust Fund also helps support basic FAA operations.

I would like to emphasize that the AATF trust fund was not created solely to finance aviation infrastructure. Throughout its history, it has financed a wide array of operations including administrative expenses, attributable to the administration of the airport improvement program and research and development, as well as general FAA operations. It is very important that this funding be continued.

While the trust fund pays a large share of the bills for the FAA to operate the national airspace system, a troubling gap has grown between the revenue that comes in and what it costs to govern the FAA. This has sharply driven down the Trust Fund's uncommitted balance; its surpluses from previous years. If this trend continues in our poor economic state where airlines are cutting benefits and increasing prices, the future of American aviation is grim.

Mr. Speaker I am concerned for the future of American aviation—especially for the future of the George Bush Intercontinental Airport located in my home district of Houston, Texas. Current airport standards are not only threatened by decreased FAA funding but also by the proposed merger of Continental and United Airlines, the former of which is based in Houston. Should this merger be allowed, the future of American aviation in regards to customer satisfaction, safety standards, and general flight, would slowly decline. We cannot add to such destruction by denying the FAA appropriate funds through the AATF. As the airline industry continues to grow and serve more and more Americans, it is our duty to the American people to ensure that the future of

airport security, infrastructure and improvement, research and development, continue to develop to better serve our needs.

For these reasons Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 5611, the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2010: Part II.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I fully support H.R. 5611. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes" for this important legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5611.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1400

FIREARMS EXCISE TAX IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2010

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5552) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that the payment of the manufacturers' excise tax on recreational equipment be paid quarterly and to provide for the assessment by the Secretary of the Treasury of certain criminal restitution, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5552

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 "Firearms Excise Tax Improvement Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAX ON RECREATIONAL EQUIPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 6302 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to mode or time of collection) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) TIME FOR PAYMENT OF MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAX ON RECREATIONAL EQUIPMENT.—The taxes imposed by subchapter D of chapter 32 of this title (relating to taxes on recreational equipment) shall be due and payable on the date for filing the return for such taxes.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to articles sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. ASSESSMENT OF CERTAIN CRIMINAL RESTITUTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 6201 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) CERTAIN ORDERS OF CRIMINAL RESTITUTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall assess and collect the amount of restitution

under an order pursuant to section 3556 of title 18, United States Code, for failure to pay any tax imposed under this title in the same manner as if such amount were such tax.

“(B) TIME OF ASSESSMENT.—An assessment of an amount of restitution under an order described in subparagraph (A) shall not be made before all appeals of such order are concluded and the right to make all such appeals has expired.

“(C) RESTRICTION ON CHALLENGE OF ASSESSMENT.—The amount of such restitution may not be challenged by the person against whom assessed on the basis of the existence or amount of the underlying tax liability in any proceeding authorized under this title (including in any suit or proceeding in court permitted under section 7422).”.

(b) EXCEPTION FROM CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS ON ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION.—

(1) NO PETITION TO TAX COURT, NO RESTRICTION ON FURTHER DEFICIENCY LETTERS, ETC.—Subsection (b) of section 6213 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) CERTAIN ORDERS OF CRIMINAL RESTITUTION.—If the taxpayer is notified that an assessment has been or will be made pursuant to section 6201(a)(4)—

“(A) such notice shall not be considered as a notice of deficiency for the purposes of subsection (a) (prohibiting assessment and collection until notice of the deficiency has been mailed), section 6212(c)(1) (restricting further deficiency letters), or section 6512(a) (prohibiting credits or refunds after petition to the Tax Court), and

“(B) subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the amount of such assessment.”.

(2) TIME LIMITATIONS ON ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION.—Subsection (c) of section 6501 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(11) CERTAIN ORDERS OF CRIMINAL RESTITUTION.—In the case of any amount described in section 6201(a)(4), such amount may be assessed, or a proceeding in court for the collection of such amount may be begun without assessment, at any time.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to restitution ordered after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. BUDGETARY PROVISIONS.

(a) TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.—The percentage under paragraph (2) of section 561 of the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act is increased by 0.25 percentage points.

(b) PAYGO COMPLIANCE.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 5552, the Firearms Excise Tax Improvement Act of 2010. It's a bill that I introduced with 54 bipartisan cosponsors, along with my friend and colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), that will strengthen wildlife conservation funding in America by helping firearm and ammunition manufacturers grow their businesses.

H.R. 5552 changes the excise tax payment schedule for firearm and ammunition manufacturers from a biweekly reporting requirement to a quarterly schedule, like every other industry in the country. The bill would also allow the IRS to collect restitution debt that has been court ordered to be paid in criminal tax cases.

This commonsense legislation will allow for the creation of jobs for working families, save money for businesses, increase investment in wildlife conservation, and simplify and make consistent the payment of excise tax across all industries, all of which is paid for and fully compliant with pay-as-you-go budgeting rules.

There is very broad and bipartisan support from both sides of the aisle for this bill. This legislation is supported by every major conservation group, along with the firearms industry. It is in short a win-win-win for families, businesses, and conservation efforts across the country.

I have long been a supporter of conservation efforts. As a former cochair of the Congressional Sportsman's Caucus, I am pleased this bill benefits sportsmen and conservationists alike and continues to contribute critical funding for the development of wildlife restoration projects across the country, ensuring that our natural resources are protected for future generations.

I regularly enjoy spending time outdoors with my family, especially my two little boys. The ability to enjoy outdoor recreational activities like hunting and fishing are not only important for our peace of mind, but back home in Wisconsin it also contributes over \$9.7 billion annually to the Wisconsin economy and supports 129,000 jobs, generating \$570 million in annual State tax revenue. I am sure this is a story that we can talk about from State to State to State.

Also, companies in Wisconsin that manufacture, distribute, and sell firearms, ammunition, and hunting equipment employ as many as 2,050 people in the State and generate an additional 2,300 jobs in supplier and ancillary industries. Across the Nation, these companies employ as many as 183,000 people.

Not only does the manufacture and sale of firearms and hunting supplies create jobs, but the industry also contributes to the economy as a whole. In

fact, the 2010 firearms and ammunition industry was responsible for as much as \$27.8 billion in total economic activity throughout the country.

The firearm and ammunition excise tax is the major revenue source for funding the Wildlife Restoration Trust Fund, also known as the Pittman-Robertson Trust Fund. Last year, firearm and ammunition manufacturers contributed approximately \$450 million to wildlife conservation through the excise tax payments.

All the industry is asking to do, Mr. Speaker, is change the biweekly reporting requirement of the excise tax to a quarterly reporting requirement, just like every other industry. There are stories that were brought to my attention that some of the smaller manufacturers actually had to take out loans in order to meet the biweekly excise tax requirement payment right now, which obviously interrupts their cash flow and makes it tough for them to reinvest in their businesses, expand their operations, and hire more people. We are just fixing that anomaly with this legislation.

I want to thank my friend, my colleague from Wisconsin, for his support for the legislation, as well as the chair and ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee and the staff for helping us get this legislation in order. I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to the various groups who provided invaluable feedback on this legislation, and in particular the National Shooting Sports Foundation, the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, the NRA, the Safari Club International, Ducks Unlimited, and many, many others.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to echo the sentiment from my friend and colleague from Wisconsin. We introduced this legislation together. We have 76 cosponsors. It's a very simple issue.

Number one, we have a Pittman-Robertson fund, which is a user-fee for hunting and fishing. If you buy firearms, you buy ammunition, there is an excise tax that is paid which goes to the Pittman-Robertson Trust Fund for conservation and habitat management.

As the cochair of the Sportsmen's Caucus here in Congress, the largest bipartisan, bicameral caucus in Congress, our job in the caucus is to make sure that we protect not only hunting and fishing rights, but also hunting and fishing habitat. And there is a snafu in the law here, and that's simply what we are trying to clear up. This is a bill that's fully paid for.

This bill is very, very simple. Most of Pittman-Robertson taxes are collected on a quarterly basis. Unfortunately, though, with respect to ammunition and firearms, it's done on a biweekly basis. That is a huge unnecessary bur-

den for manufacturers. There are lots of small manufacturers, Kolar in Racine, Premium Shotguns, you name it. There are lots of small manufacturers out there, and they don't get the cash flow through their business to be able to pay this excise tax on this biweekly basis. They don't get the money from the retailers in time to cover the tax expenses. And therefore what's happening is we are making these manufacturers, especially the smaller ones, have to go out and get loans in order to pay the excise taxes.

All this simply does is harmonize the tax payments schedule to jibe with the other excise taxes that are paid into the Pittman-Robertson fund to a quarterly basis. That simple.

So let's take away this very burdensome regulation, this very burdensome tax compliance regime on small and large manufacturers of firearms and ammunition, harmonize it with the rest of the Pittman-Robertson excise tax collection system, and make sure that these small businesses, which are really struggling, which are the backbone of the conservation funding system, which are huge providers of jobs and recreation in States like Wisconsin and all throughout America, let's just get this cleaned up. Let's pass it. It's bipartisan. It's paid for. This is one of those issues that's sort of rare these days where we have come together to get something that makes perfect common sense.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I rise today in support of H.R. 5552, the Firearms Excise Tax Improvement Act of 2010, a bill to modify the due date for the payment of certain manufacturers' excise taxes, including those imposed on firearms and ammunition.

The bill has the support of Members on both sides of the aisle, as well as the NRA and a number of wildlife conservation groups. This bill is a commonsense fix that will simplify the manner in which manufacturers make payments for excise taxes, which help to finance the Pittman-Robertson conservation fund.

The current schedule requires biweekly deposits owed on the excise taxes. That creates an undue burden on our many small sporting goods and sportsmen's outlets, small businesses like RLC Shooting, Garrett Guns, and Mark's Guns, just in my local community, that support the sportsmen community, hunters and shooters that give a lot back, particularly in the maintenance of the nature areas where they work.

These biweekly tax payments are expensive, they create additional overhead; and, frankly, this time-consuming process consumes dollars that in fact can be used for job creation on the outside.

□ 1410

We believe it could free up as much as \$22 million for these businesses, es-

pecially with small businesses, to grow, to hire jobs, and to have a more positive effect on their community as well as expanding a base of additional customers for that excise tax in the long run. It is a great bill supported by all the associated parties.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this sensible measure.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), a distinguished senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HERGER. I thank my friend from Wisconsin for yielding.

Yesterday, the Supreme Court delivered a victory for our constitutional freedoms by upholding the right of individual citizens to keep and bear arms. To fully honor the Second Amendment, we must also be vigilant against regulations that place unnecessary burdens on manufacturers of guns and ammunition. The requirement for manufacturers to pay Federal excise tax biweekly is costly and does not improve tax compliance or public safety.

H.R. 5552 is a commonsense bill that doesn't add to the deficit and will help ensure law-abiding Americans have access to American-made firearms. It is supported by the NRA and a number of hunting and conservation groups.

I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I simply want to say this is a commonsense solution that ought to be passed. It harmonizes the schedule. It takes a burden off of businesses, and I think the gentleman from California put it well.

Yesterday, we saw a great strike for liberty from the Supreme Court where they reaffirmed the individual's right to keep and bear arms in this country. That is now an issue that has been set by the Supreme Court where individuals have rights in this Nation and that the job of government is to protect our equal, natural rights.

So I think it is very fitting that this, on the day after the Supreme Court reaffirmed the individual's right to keep and bear arms, regardless of where they live in America, as citizens of America, that we ought to help ease this burden on the manufacturers of firearms and of ammunition so that they can get back to the business not of just tax collecting on a biweekly basis but of producing, of selling, of creating jobs, and of getting this country moving again.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I again want to thank my colleagues, Mr. RYAN and those on the Ways and Means Committee, for their strong support of the bill. It has received bipartisan support. I'm not aware of any opposition by any of my colleagues to this legislation.

There's a broad coalition of support outside Congress between the conservation and outdoor recreation community, along with the firearms industry, many people who do care about those opportunities that we enjoy as a shooting sport but also hunting, fishing, recreation.

This merely corrects, as my colleague pointed out, an anomaly that's existed in the Tax Code for too long. It's not fair to single out one industry for a biweekly reporting requirement when everyone else has a quarterly reporting requirement, and, quite frankly, cash flow problems have been an issue. That's the reason why it was brought to our attention. At a time when the economy is languishing, we need to be working with businesses, large and small, to be able to expand job-creating opportunities. This bill is a small step in achieving that.

So I would encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5552, the Firearms Excise Improvement Tax Act of 2010. I would like to thank Chairman LEVIN and Congressman KIND for their leadership in bringing this important bill to the floor.

H.R. 5552 will amend the Internal Revenue Code to require: (1) excise taxes on recreational equipment to be due and payable on the date for filing the return for such taxes (i.e., quarterly); and (2) the Secretary of the Treasury to assess and collect, in the same manner as delinquent taxes are assessed and collected, mandatory orders of restitution for victims of crime. The bill has the support of Members on both sides of the aisle. The funding will also create jobs for Americans across the country.

Mr. Speaker, it must be stated that in a time when firearms are being used to commit heinous crimes against individuals in this country, it is important that we remember to ensure that we use strict measures to ensure that we can track the owners of firearms and requiring such excise taxes is one way to do so.

In this Congress, I introduced H.R. 257, The Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2009—which would amend the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act to: (1) raise the age of handgun eligibility to 21 (currently, 18); and (2) prohibit persons under age 21 from possessing semiautomatic assault weapons or large capacity ammunition feeding devices, with exceptions.

It would also increase penalties for: (1) a second or subsequent violation by a juvenile of Brady Act provisions or for a first violation committed after an adjudication of delinquency or after a state or federal conviction for an act that, if committed by an adult, would be a serious violent felony; and (2) transferring a handgun, ammunition, semiautomatic assault weapon, or large capacity ammunition feeding device to a person who is under age 21, knowing or having reasonable cause to know that such person intended to use it in the commission of a crime of violence.

The bill also would prohibit any licensed importer, manufacturer, or dealer from transferring a firearm to any person (other than a licensed importer, manufacturer, or dealer) unless the transferee is provided with a secure gun storage or safety device. Authorizes the

Attorney General to suspend or revoke any firearms license, or to subject the licensee to a civil penalty of up to \$10,000, if the licensee has knowingly violated this prohibition.

H.R. 257 would prohibit keeping a loaded firearm or an unloaded firearm and ammunition within any premises knowing or recklessly disregarding the risk that a child: (1) is capable of gaining access to it; and (2) will use the firearm to cause death or serious bodily injury. It would also require the parent or legal guardian of a child to ensure that a child attending a gun show is accompanied by an adult.

My bill would also authorize the Attorney General to provide grants to enable local law enforcement agencies to develop and sponsor gun safety classes for parents and children. The bill also expresses the sense of Congress that each school district should provide or participate in a firearms safety program for students.

Yesterday, in its second major ruling on gun rights in three years, the Supreme Court extended the federally protected right to keep and bear arms to all 50 states. We know that the decision will be hailed by gun rights advocates and comes over the opposition of gun control groups, the city of Chicago and four justices.

Justice Samuel Alito wrote for the five justice majority saying “the right to keep and bear arms must be regarded as a substantive guarantee, not a prohibition that could be ignored so long as the States legislated in an evenhanded manner.”

The ruling builds upon the Court's 2008 decision in *D.C. v. Heller* that invalidated the handgun ban in the nation's capital. Moreover, that decision held that the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms was a right the Founders specifically delegated to individuals. The justices affirmed that decision and extended its reach to the 50 states. Today's ruling also invalidates Chicago's handgun ban.

The irony is that there have been 209 homicides so far this year in 2010 in Chicago. We need to strike a reasonable balance between upholding our Second Amendment rights to bear arms, and at the same time ensure that we enact appropriate laws to address criminal behavior and to ensure the health and safety of Americans across this nation.

I hope that we can work towards a reasonable solution whereby gun owners are not deprived of their right to hunt, fish, and use their firearms in law-abiding manners, and also provide the most effective measures to control gun violence and limit injury and death to Americans as a result of unlawful firearm use.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5552, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

HOMEBUYER ASSISTANCE AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2010

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5623) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the homebuyer tax credit for the purchase of a principal residence before October 1, 2010, in the case of a written binding contract entered into with respect to such principal residence before May 1, 2010, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5623

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 “Homebuyer Assistance and Improvement Act of 2010”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF HOMEBUYER CREDIT FOR CERTAIN PURCHASES PURSUANT TO BINDING CONTRACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 36(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “paragraph (1) shall be applied by substituting ‘July 1, 2010’” and inserting “and who purchases such residence before October 1, 2010, paragraph (1) shall be applied by substituting ‘October 1, 2010’”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (B) of section 36(h)(3) of such Code is amended by inserting “, and for ‘October 1, 2010’” after “for ‘July 1, 2010’”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to residences purchased after June 30, 2010.

SEC. 3. APPLICATION OF BAD CHECKS PENALTY TO ELECTRONIC PAYMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6657 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “If any check or money order in payment of any amount” and inserting “If any instrument in payment, by any commercially acceptable means, of any amount”, and

(2) by striking “such check” each place it appears and inserting “such instrument”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATES.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to instruments tendered after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. DISCLOSURE OF PRISONER RETURN INFORMATION TO STATE PRISONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 6103(k)(10) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by inserting “and the head of any State agency charged with the responsibility for administration of prisons” after “the head of the Federal Bureau of Prisons”, and

(2) by striking “Federal prison” and inserting “Federal or State prison”.

(b) RESTRICTION ON REDISCLOSURE.—Subparagraph (B) of section 6103(k)(10) of such Code is amended—

(1) by inserting “and the head of any State agency charged with the responsibility for administration of prisons” after “the head of the Federal Bureau of Prisons”, and

(2) by inserting “or agency” after “such Bureau”.

(c) RECORDKEEPING.—Paragraph (4) of section 6103(p) of such Code is amended by inserting “(k)(10),” before “(1)(6),” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A).

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The heading of paragraph (10) of section 6103(k) of such Code is amended by striking “OF PRISONERS TO FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS” and inserting “TO CERTAIN PRISON OFFICIALS”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to disclosures made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. AMENDMENT OF TRAVEL PROMOTION ACT OF 2009.

(a) TRAVEL PROMOTION FUND FEES.—Section 217(h)(3)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(h)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking “subsection (d) of section 11 of the Travel Promotion Act of 2009.” in clause (ii) and inserting “subsection (d) of the Travel Promotion Act of 2009 (22 U.S.C. 2131(d))”; and

(2) by striking “September 30, 2014.” in clause (iii) and inserting “September 30, 2015.”.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION BEGINNING IN FISCAL YEAR 2011.—Subsection (d) of the Travel Promotion Act of 2009 (22 U.S.C. 2131(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking “For fiscal year 2010, the” in paragraph (2)(A) and inserting “The”;

(2) by striking “quarterly, beginning on January 1, 2010,” in paragraph (2)(A) and inserting “monthly, immediately following the collection of fees under section 217(h)(3)(B)(i)(I) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(h)(3)(B)(i)(I))”;

(3) by striking “fiscal years 2011 through 2014,” in paragraph (2)(B) and inserting “fiscal years 2012 through 2015.”;

(4) by striking “fiscal year 2010,” in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting “fiscal year 2011.”;

(5) by striking “fiscal year 2011,” each place it appears in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting “fiscal year 2012.”; and

(6) by striking “fiscal year 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, or 2014” in paragraph (4)(B) and inserting “fiscal year 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, or 2015”.

SEC. 6. PAYGO COMPLIANCE.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, millions of American families have taken advantage of the home buyer tax credit, giving a much-needed boost to home sales at a time when our housing market needed it most. In a word, this tax credit has worked. It gave a boost to our economic recovery, and it helped first-time buyers achieve their dream, the American Dream of owning a home.

Today’s legislation helps ensure the credit works for people who have followed the terms of the incentive. Under current law, taxpayers that entered into a written, binding contract to purchase a home prior to May 1, 2010, are eligible for the home buyer tax credit so long as the sale was completed prior to July 1, 2010. The bill would extend this closing date from prior to July 1, 2010, to prior to October 1, 2010. As a result, taxpayers that entered into a written, binding contract prior to May 1, 2010, will have until September 30, 2010, and I emphasize that, until September 30, 2010, to complete their home purchase transactions.

This legislation also takes important steps to eliminate instances of fraud

that were recently discovered by the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration relating to prison inmates. Last year, the Oversight Subcommittee chair, Mr. LEWIS, took the lead in examining issues of abuse, and this clearly is one, and so this bill addresses this abuse very effectively.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a necessary step to extend this benefit to those who qualify and the need to facilitate their purchases, and also, it addresses the issue of fraud. This legislation is fully paid for, and I strongly encourage my colleagues to support the bill and follow through on our commitment to thousands and thousands of home buyers who have followed the rules and now should be able to follow through with their purchase.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. I rise in support of H.R. 5623.

Last November, Congress extended the home buyer credit, Mr. Speaker, for buyers who entered into a binding contract by the end of April this year but only if they closed on their house by the end of June. I agree with my colleague from Michigan on the need for this extension, but only those who closed on their houses by the end of June would be eligible.

The slow grinding gears of bureaucracy have left many potential home buyers who could build equity and build for the future out in the cold on this, and by doing this extension, we buy an appropriate amount of time for those who have signed contracts by the April deadline but haven’t closed yet to be able to close. In short, we just need a little more time.

This bill does not extend the deadline for signing a contract to buy a home. The contract still must have been signed before the deadline at the end of April, but it does provide relief for those home buyers who haven’t yet been able to close but who might be depending on the tax credit for their down payment or closing costs. It seems unfair to leave those home buyers in limbo even though they tried to comply with the rules. Denying them the tax credit could cause the deal to collapse, which would put downward pressure on home prices and exacerbate the problems with the housing market.

□ 1420

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to see that this bill responds to a recent report from the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, who found that almost 1,300 incarcerated prisoners claimed over \$9 million in tax credits for homes they supposedly purchased while in prison.

The bill would improve information sharing between the IRS and State prison systems so that the IRS could

obtain information on just who is claiming to have bought a home. Refundable tax credits always attract fraud, and we need to do better to prevent people from claiming benefits to which they are not entitled.

I think this legislation includes sensible changes to improve the administration of the home buyer tax credit, and I urge an “aye” vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my special privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, KATHY DAHLKEMPER.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 5623, the Homebuyers Assistance and Improvement Act of 2010.

I particularly would like to thank the leader, Chairman LEVIN, for helping advance this legislation, which will extend tomorrow’s closing deadline for those eligible for the home buyer tax credit.

The National Association of Realtors estimates that 180,000 families, including over 5,800 in my home State of Pennsylvania alone, signed contracts for new homes by the April 30 deadline, but have not yet finished their closings. One realtor in my district estimated that there are 20 of these such closings which have not been able to be completed yet. Due to the turmoil in the housing market and the overwhelming success of the tax credit, lenders and Federal programs have not been able to keep up with the demand, and that is what has created the backlog.

The Homebuyers Assistance and Improvement Act will provide time to clear this bottleneck and to make sure that these new homeowners are not punished for delays that are out of their control.

As our economy continues on a slow yet steady path toward recovery, we have a responsibility to promote policies that aid in that growth. The Homebuyers Assistance and Improvement Act will do just that, so I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5623.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to applaud the inclusion in this bill of a provision that enhances information sharing between the IRS and State prisons.

Recently, the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration issued a report, finding that at least 1,295 prisoners received \$9.1 million in home buyer tax credits for homes they reported purchasing while incarcerated. We must put a stop to this fraud.

I am a long-time supporter of increased data sharing among agencies to ensure that prisoners do not illegally obtain taxpayer-funded benefits. In the 1996 welfare reform bill, I championed a program that authorized incentive payments to penal institutions for providing information on newly incarcerated individuals. This data sharing

gave the Social Security Administration the information they needed to prevent checks from going to jailed beneficiaries, which saved taxpayers over \$5 billion.

Currently, the IRS shares information with Federal prisons but not with State prisons. The bill before us would change that, and I support its passage.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to insert any extraneous material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, now it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to a very vigorous Representative, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Homebuyers Assistance and Improvement Act of 2010.

The first-time home buyer tax credit has helped bring stability to the struggling housing market in southern Nevada. In total, over 25,000 Nevadans have collected about \$200 million from the credit, which has dramatically reduced the State's excess housing inventory.

In southern Nevada, short sales have become more and more common as lenders and owners are able to avoid the arduous and costly process of foreclosure, and buyers can then purchase homes slightly below market value.

Unlike the traditional sale of a property between an owner and a buyer, however, a short sale must be approved by the holder of the mortgage. In many cases, although a purchase price is agreed to by the seller and the buyer, the lender may not approve the sale for months. Certainly, this has been the case in Nevada. As a result, many first-time home buyers have entered into agreements for short sales prior to the April 30 deadline, but have not yet been able to close on the purchase prices prior to the upcoming June 30 deadline.

According to local experts, the Homebuyers Assistance and Improvement Act of 2010, which is before us now, will extend to October 1, the date by which a purchaser must close a sale of a home in order to obtain the home buyer tax credit. This will allow approximately 3,800 first-time home buyers in southern Nevada to receive the credit. It is a fair solution that will help consumers who have met all of the eligibility requirements for the credit but who have had the timely processing of their loans held up through no fault of their own.

So I thank the chairman for his assistance in moving this forward, and I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may

consume to the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bill before us, the Homebuyers Assistance and Improvement Act of 2010.

For reasons known only to them, our Democrat colleagues in the Senate have been unable or unwilling to reach a compromise addressing the bipartisan concerns about the bundle of extensions still pending across the Capitol. Due to this failure of basic leadership, the National Flood Insurance Program was allowed to expire, as well as a number of other programs.

I mention the Flood Insurance Program specifically because realtors in my district are calling my office morning, noon and night on behalf of clients who cannot close on their new homes without an extension in the Flood Insurance Program. Remember, it is Florida. You need flood insurance. Subsequently, quite a few of these individuals are going to be missing the homebuyer tax credit that they were told they would qualify for.

Say what you will about the tax credit, but in my view, if the government says it is going to do something, like anybody else, it had better follow through. Frankly, at this point, I'm not sure that the Democrat majority is even capable of doing that. If you can't muster up enough votes to ram your agenda through, despite opposition from your own Members, or you are faced with the prospect of actually having to pay for something—isn't that unique?—this government comes to a screeching halt.

On most issues, my constituents and I think this liberal legislative meltdown is a blessing; but on matters where families and small businesses have made financial decisions based on the expectation that the government would keep its word, we do demand and deserve action.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have control of the White House, and they have the majorities in both houses of Congress. They need to stop blaming everybody else and get their act together for the sake of the American people.

Mr. LEVIN. Before I recognize the next distinguished gentleman, I just sit here. Even on a bipartisan supported bill, we get such partisan rhetoric. I hope everybody listens to it.

It is now my privilege to yield 2 minutes, or as much time as he may consume, to a very active Member of Congress, the gentleman from the proud State of Mississippi (Mr. CHILDERS).

Mr. CHILDERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Homebuyers Assistance and Improvement Act of 2010.

This bill is important for home buyers who have met the requirements of

the first-time homebuyer tax credit program but who are now not able to close on their new homes due to circumstances which are out of their control.

□ 1430

With the passage of this act, over 1,500 home buyers in my great State of Mississippi will be able to take advantage of the Homebuyers Tax Credit program, making homes more affordable for families and individuals and creating much-needed jobs.

As a veteran realtor for over 30 years, I have seen firsthand the ups and downs associated with the housing market. Recent signs of recovery in the market are certainly encouraging, but we must follow through and sustain the progress linked to the initial benefits of the homebuyer tax credits.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to support the prospective homeowners in America.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I would encourage all of my colleagues to support H.R. 5623 to continue and extend this program for those who signed up before the April 30 close.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, Mr. THOMPSON, to me dated June 29, 2010, and a letter from me as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to Mr. THOMPSON.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, June 29, 2010.

Hon. SANDER M. LEVIN,

Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Longworth House
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing you regarding the "Homebuyer Assistance and Improvement Act of 2010."

This legislation contains provisions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, have waived further consideration of the measure. I have done so with the understanding that waiving consideration of the bill should not be construed as the Committee on Homeland Security waiving, altering, or otherwise affecting its jurisdiction over subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction.

Further, I request your support for the appointment of Homeland Security conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this or similar legislation. I also ask that a copy of this letter and your response be placed in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of this bill.

I look forward to working with you on this legislation and other matters of great importance to this nation.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, June 29, 2010.

Hon. BENNIE THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
Ford House Office Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THOMPSON, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5623, the Homebuyer Assistance and Improvement Act of 2010.

I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation, and I acknowledge that there are provisions within the bill that are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security. I agree that your inaction with respect to this bill does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 5623.

Sincerely,

SANDER LEVIN,
Chairman.

Mr. LEVIN. I can close very briefly. This bill is meritorious. It deserves bipartisan support, and I hope very much it will receive it. We owe this to the people who have essentially followed the rules who are caught by a closing date.

This is a credit. There is often question about, is the effort of the recovery program and like programs working? This is an example of it working, and in fact working so actively that now it is necessary and I think correct that we make sure that people who have advantaged themselves of it correctly are able to follow through.

So I urge a strong vote.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank Congress members DAHLKEMPER, KRATOVIL and CHILDERS for introducing this important and much-needed piece of legislation.

The mortgage crisis continues to affect millions of Americans, and has greatly interfered with the American dream of home ownership. It is imperative that we help everyday Americans in their effort to remain afloat in light of the ongoing effects of the economic meltdown. For these reasons, I support the proposed amendments to this Act which will extend the closing deadline for the First-Time Homebuyer tax credit to September 30, 2010.

The housing market is an area that was, perhaps, the most largely affected by the economic crisis. As of January, 2010, there were 315,716 foreclosures on properties in the United States reported just within the month. Additionally, 1 in every 409 U.S. housing units received a foreclosure filing in the same month. Texas received the sixth highest number of foreclosure filings in January, 2010. As of March, 2010, the foreclosure rate in Houston, Texas had increased by almost ten percent from the previous month. Although our economy appears to be on the path to recovery, these statistics are still cause for concern.

The programs set in place to counteract the effects of the economic downturn have attracted many ordinary Americans who are desperate to keep their homes. The first-time homebuyer tax credit, specifically, represented positive steps to guide ordinary Americans towards financial recovery. However, it is important to allow all who are eligible, and espe-

cially all who require the help, to benefit from the tax credit by extending the closing deadline. There has been a delay in processing due to all the new mortgages that have resulted from the tax credit. However, ordinary Americans who have attempted to obtain new mortgages, and are sincerely in need of the aid provided through the tax credit should not be punished for the backlog that resulted from factors entirely outside of their control.

We are all familiar with the ongoing effects of the economic meltdown. Jobs have been lost, homes have been foreclosed upon, and many have been left with no source of income or livelihood. In addition, many Americans have been stripped of the ability to achieve a goal that they have, in certain instances, worked decades to attain—owning a home. Extending the tax credit will provide everyday citizens with an opportunity to realize this dream, even in the midst of a recovering economy.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5623, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECOGNIZING HEROIC EFFORTS OF WEST VIRGINIA NATIONAL GUARD AND LOCAL RESPONDERS

Mr. CRITZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1153) recognizing the heroic efforts of the West Virginia National Guard and local responders for their work rescuing 17 individuals from a downed military helicopter on a rugged, snow-covered mountain on the Pocahontas-Randolph county line.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1153

Whereas the West Virginia National Guard and local responders safely and successfully rescued 17 individuals from a downed military helicopter on a rugged, snow-covered mountain on the Pocahontas-Randolph county line;

Whereas, on February 18, 2010, the West Virginia Army National Guard HH-60 Blackhawk helicopter, gallantly piloted by Bluefield, West Virginia, native Major Kevin Hazuka, located the downed aircraft in extremely adverse weather conditions;

Whereas two West Virginia Army National Guard Flight Medics, SSG Nicole Hopkins and SPC Casey Dunfee, were lowered to the landing site to assess the situation and to provide assistance to the injured through the night while emergency response and rescue teams worked their way to the survivors;

Whereas a C-130 Hercules aircraft from the 130th Airlift Wing of the West Virginia Air National Guard orbited the crash site to facilitate communications;

Whereas Snowshoe Mountain Ski Resort provided two snowcats and personnel that were invaluable to the safe evacuation of the injured;

Whereas local West Virginia civilians generously donated the use of their snowmobiles that enabled first responders to reach the site;

Whereas a Shavers Fork Volunteer Fire and Rescue Unit went as far as they could with special equipment and snowmobiles along a railroad grade to where it was still about a 45-minute trek in 5 feet of snow, straight up the side of a mountain with an approximate 50-degree pitch;

Whereas Valley Head Fire Department, Northern Greenbrier EMS, Greenbrier County Ambulance, White Sulphur Springs EMS, Cass Rescue, and Greenbank National Radio Astronomy Observatory operations staff all provided direct critical support for the effort;

Whereas the Pocahontas County Emergency Management, West Virginia State Police, Pocahontas County Sheriff's Department, Pocahontas County 911, and the U.S. Forest Service provided coordination and support efforts; and

Whereas the Bartow-Frank-Durbin Volunteer Fire and Rescue attempted an approach to the crash sight from the North side with support from State of West Virginia Departments of Natural Resources and Highways, neighboring Randolph and Tucker County Sheriff Departments and EMS units, Elkins, Harmon, and Huttonsville/Mill Creek Volunteer Fire Departments, and the American Red Cross: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors the heroic efforts of the West Virginia National Guard and local first responders;

(2) recognizes the countless volunteers, families, and neighbors who assisted in rescuing the 17 individuals; and

(3) recognizes the courage, ability, incredible determination, and willingness of West Virginians to lend a neighborly hand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CRITZ) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1153, recognizing the heroic efforts of the West Virginia National Guard and local responders for their work rescuing 17 people from a downed military helicopter on a rocky, snow-covered mountain on the Pocahontas-Randolph county line. I would like to thank my colleague from West Virginia, Mr. RAHALL, for putting this resolution together.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend this time recognizing the individuals and organizations involved in the execution of this tremendous rescue.

On February 18, 2010, a West Virginia Army National Guard HH-60 Blackhawk helicopter, skillfully piloted by a native of Bluefield, West Virginia, Major Kevin Hazuka, located the downed aircraft in extremely difficult circumstances. The snow and ice of the Pocahontas-Randolph county line at the time was treacherous, and the valor of Major Kevin Hazuka should be commended by all.

I would like to commend Staff Sergeant Nicole Hopkins and Specialist Casey Dunfee, two West Virginia Army National Guard flight medics. Sergeant Hopkins and Specialist Dunfee were lowered to the site in order to provide medical care throughout the night as rescue workers labored their way to the survivors.

Thanks are also deserved to the pilot of the 130th Airlift Wing of the West Virginia National Guard who assisted by orbiting the crash site in a C-130 Hercules aircraft in order to facilitate vital communication.

Volunteers, civilians, service men and women alike all gave a hand to help rescue the survivors. The Snowshoe Mountain Ski Resort assisted by providing invaluable machinery and staff to help evacuate the injured.

Local West Virginians helped by donating snowmobiles that enabled first responders to reach the site. The Shavers Fork Volunteer Fire and Rescue Unit was instrumental in using special equipment and snowmobiles to clear a path to the location of the crash.

The Valley Head Fire Department, Northern Greenbrier EMS, Greenbrier County Ambulance, White Sulphur Springs EMS, Cass Rescue, and Greenbank National Radio Astronomy Observatory staff all provided extremely vital support for the effort. In addition, the Pocahontas County Emergency Management, West Virginia State Police, Pocahontas County Sheriff's Department, Pocahontas County 911, and the U.S. Forest Service also lent a hand in order to help assist the victims of the crash. The coordination and support they provided was also invaluable.

Finally, the Bartow-Frank-Durbin Volunteer Fire and Rescue made a valiant attempt to approach the crash site from the north side with support from the State of West Virginia Departments of Natural Resources and Highways, neighboring Randolph and Tucker County Sheriff Departments and EMS units, Elkins, Harmon, and Huttonsville-Mill Creek Volunteer Fire Departments, and the American Red Cross.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution acknowledges and thanks the West Virginia National Guard, local first responders, and volunteers around the area for their successful efforts to rescue the 17 individuals. House Resolution 1153 recognizes the courage, abil-

ity, and determination of West Virginians.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 1153, which recognizes the heroic efforts of the West Virginia National Guard and local responders for rescuing 17 persons from a Navy helicopter that crashed in the wintry mountains of that State in February of this year. I want to commend Representative NICK RAHALL for sponsoring this legislation.

This incident, precipitated when a Navy helicopter was forced down in remote mountainous terrain, exemplifies all that is best about the National Guard and its ability to work cooperatively and effectively with local civilian responders in crisis situations.

Without the rapid, integrated response of the West Virginia Army and Air National Guard, the volunteer efforts of local citizens, the support of local emergency management services, and perseverance of State and local fire and rescue services and agencies, 17 people could have died from their injuries and from exposure. Thankfully, there were people at every level of government who were trained, equipped, and prepared to respond.

This resolution specifically honors those citizens of West Virginia, but it should also remind each Member to express appreciation to the people in our own States and districts, selfless Americans who willingly sacrifice their comfort and safety for others.

In my own district and State, Guards men and women have adopted a flexible "plug and play" organization model that enables members to report to the closest armory in time of emergency, thereby minimizing the overall response time during events like the unprecedented snowfalls we experienced this winter. Their round-the-clock vigilance exemplifies the spirit of the National Guard emergency personnel at all levels of government.

□ 1440

Thus it is fitting that we honor and thank the soldiers and airmen of the National Guard as well as the first responders and emergency and rescue personnel across our Nation, who, when disaster and tragedy strike, step forward to save and serve their fellow citizens. I urge all Members to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRITZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend and colleague and the sponsor of this resolution, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I first commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CRITZ) for his invaluable support in helping us bring this resolution to the floor today. I know that it is a special recognition to a special group of people. I do support the heroic efforts of our West Virginia National

Guard and our local responders and would urge all of my colleagues to support the pending resolution, H. Res. 1153.

I have personally visited with the National Guard members mentioned herein and the local responders and members of the Bartow, Frank, and Durbin communities' Volunteer Fire Departments in Pocahontas County a couple months ago. On Thursday, February 18, 2010, earlier this year, the heroic actions of West Virginians brought about the highly successful rescue of 17 military personnel who were on board a U.S. Navy helicopter participating in the Operation Southbound Trooper X annual military exercise, which went down in deep, snow-covered, and very rugged terrain in Pocahontas County, West Virginia.

The remarkable rescue was an outstanding and highly coordinated effort on the part of many highly trained professionals as well as private citizens, who worked under very difficult conditions to reach the crew and personnel on board the aircraft, many of whom had been injured in the crash. West Virginians are the best neighbors for whom you could ever wish. It is a truth that has been proven time and again. This historic rescue effort was, thankfully, a rare event, but it was not at all out of character for our State of West Virginia. In fact, it was merely illustrative of the best of our State.

The swift response, the astounding skills and abilities, the enormous courage, and profound determination of all those involved in the rescue operation, from those who serve in and lead our West Virginia National Guard to our local fire, rescue, law enforcement, and first responder units, and the countless volunteers, families, and neighbors nearby, most certainly made the difference between life and death. While no expression of gratitude would ever be sought for such selfless acts, the hope that one good turn deserves another never dims with our West Virginians.

On behalf of my fellow West Virginians and on behalf of my colleague from the neighboring congressional district, Representative SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, we are pleased to support H. Res. 1153, to honor these good deeds and to illuminate them as a beacon for others. I would ask that my fellow Members join in support of this resolution. I, again, thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CRITZ) for his invaluable support as well.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), an original sponsor of this resolution.

Mrs. CAPITO. I'd like to thank my friend from Maryland for recognizing me. I'd particularly like to thank my fellow member of the delegation, Mr. RAHALL, for bringing House Resolution 1153 forward. The occurrence of this crash straddled two of our counties. His is Pocahontas and mine is Randolph. We both know very well that we

don't call West Virginia "Wild and Wonderful" for no reason. This is one of the wildest parts of our beautiful State. And so I want to offer my congratulations to the brave men and women of the 130th Airlift Wing, which is headquartered in Charleston, West Virginia, in my district, and all the first responders and citizens who helped with this rescue.

As we've heard, Major Hazuka of Bluefield, West Virginia, of the 130th Airlift Wing of the National Guard, discovered the Navy Kittyhawk helicopter which had crashed over Randolph and Pocahontas Counties in terrible weather conditions. They acted very, very quickly. I would also like to honor Army National Guard Flight Medics Staff Sergeant Nicole Hopkins and Specialist Casey Dunfee, who were lowered to the landing site to give emergency medical care and to help coordinate the efforts.

The 130th Airlift Wing represents the best of West Virginia, and their heroic response to this crash further establishes their importance to this State. As my colleague from West Virginia so eloquently put it, it didn't surprise any of us. This unit and those around our State and around this Nation are known for their willingness to step up when they're most needed. But the terrain and the weather on that particular day was incredibly dangerous.

I know my colleague from Pennsylvania mentioned all of the different units of first responders that responded that day, but I would like to repeat their names: the West Virginia Civil Air Patrol, the Valley Head Fire Department, the Northern Greenbrier EMS, Greenbrier County Ambulance, White Sulfur Springs EMS, Cass Rescue, and the Greenbank National Radio Astronomy Observatory, which is very close in Pocahontas. I'd also like to thank the Snowshoe Resort for their willingness to share equipment. We also had the Pocahontas County Emergency Management, West Virginia State Police, Pocahontas County Sheriffs Department, Pocahontas County 9/11, U.S. Forest Service, Bartow-Frank-Durbin Volunteer Fire and Rescue, along with the Department of Natural Resources and sheriff departments from the surrounding areas.

As you can see, it was a collegial effort, an enormous effort, and one that when we first received the news of this accident over our local television and radio stations, really had us on the edge of our seats because I think we knew how treacherous a rescue in this area could be at this time of year.

So I'd like to say congratulations. Again, I'd like to thank my colleague Mr. RAHALL for bringing this resolution forward, and I would like to ask my colleagues to join in congratulating not only our first responders and our National Guard, but also take the time to thank their local and State National Guard and local first responders for all the good work they do voluntarily every day for our benefit.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CRITZ) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1153.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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. 5618, House Resolution 1244, H.R. 5552, and H.R. 5623, in each case by the yeas and nays.

Remaining postponed proceedings will resume later in the week.

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

RESTORATION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION 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. 5618) to continue Federal unemployment programs, 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 Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 261, nays 155, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

YEAS—261

Ackerman	Brown, Corrine	Critz
Altmire	Butterfield	Crowley
Andrews	Capito	Cuellar
Arcuri	Capps	Dahlkemper
Baca	Capuano	Davis (AL)
Baldwin	Cardoza	Davis (CA)
Barrow	Carnahan	Davis (IL)
Becerra	Carney	Davis (TN)
Berkley	Carson (IN)	DeFazio
Berman	Castle	DeGette
Bilbray	Castor (FL)	DeLahunt
Bilirakis	Chandler	DeLauro
Bishop (GA)	Chu	Dent
Bishop (NY)	Clarke	Deutch
Blumenauer	Clay	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bocchieri	Cleaver	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bono Mack	Clyburn	Dicks
Boren	Cohen	Dingell
Boswell	Connolly (VA)	Doggett
Boucher	Conyers	Doyle
Boyd	Costa	Driehaus
Brady (PA)	Costello	Edwards (MD)
Braleigh (IA)	Courtney	Edwards (TX)

Ehlers	Lee (NY)	Richardson
Ellison	Levin	Rodriguez
Ellsworth	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (MI)
Eshoo	Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen
Etheridge	LoBiondo	Ross
Farr	Loebsock	Rothman (NJ)
Fattah	Lofgren, Zoe	Royal-Allard
Filner	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Foster	Lujan	Ryan (OH)
Frank (MA)	Lynch	Salazar
Fudge	Maffei	Sanchez, Linda
Garamendi	Maloney	T.
Gerlach	Manzullo	Sanchez, Loretta
Giffords	Markey (MA)	Sarbanes
Gonzalez	Matheson	Schakowsky
Gordon (TN)	Matsui	Schauer
Grayson	McCarthy (NY)	Schiff
Green, Al	McCollum	Schrader
Green, Gene	McCotter	Schwartz
Grijalva	McDermott	Scott (GA)
Gutierrez	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Hall (NY)	McMahon	Serrano
Halvorson	McNerney	Sestak
Hare	Meek (FL)	Shea-Porter
Harman	Meeks (NY)	Sherman
Hastings (FL)	Melancon	Sires
Heinrich	Michaud	Skelton
Heller	Miller (NC)	Slaughter
Higgins	Miller, George	Smith (NJ)
Himes	Mitchell	Smith (WA)
Hinchev	Mollohan	Snyder
Hinojosa	Moore (KS)	Space
Hirono	Moran (VA)	Speier
Hodes	Murphy (CT)	Spratt
Holden	Murphy (NY)	Stark
Holt	Murphy, Patrick	Stupak
Honda	Murphy, Tim	Sutton
Hoyer	Nadler (NY)	Tanner
Inslee	Napolitano	Teague
Israel	Neal (MA)	Thompson (CA)
Jackson (IL)	Obey	Thompson (MS)
Jackson Lee	Olver	Tierney
(TX)	Ortiz	Titus
Johnson (GA)	Owens	Tonko
Johnson (IL)	Pallone	Towns
Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell	Tsongas
Jones	Pastor (AZ)	Turner
Kagen	Payne	Upton
Kanjorski	Pelosi	Van Hollen
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Velázquez
Kennedy	Perriello	Visclosky
Kildee	Peters	Walz
Kilpatrick (MI)	Peterson	Wasserman
Kilroy	Petri	Schultz
Kind	Pingree (ME)	Waters
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Platts	Watson
Kissell	Pollis (CO)	Watt
Klein (FL)	Pomeroy	Waxman
Kosmas	Posey	Weimer
Kucinich	Price (NC)	Welch
Langevin	Quigley	Whitfield
Larsen (WA)	Rahall	Wilson (OH)
Larson (CT)	Rangel	Wu
LaTourette	Reichert	Yarmuth
Lee (CA)	Reyes	Young (FL)

NAYS—155

Aderholt	Campbell	Granger
Adler (NJ)	Cantor	Graves (GA)
Akin	Carter	Graves (MO)
Alexander	Cassidy	Guthrie
Austria	Chaffetz	Hall (TX)
Bachmann	Childers	Harper
Bachus	Coble	Hastings (WA)
Baird	Coffman (CO)	Hensarling
Barrett (SC)	Cole	Hergert
Bartlett	Conaway	Herseth Sandlin
Barton (TX)	Cooper	Hill
Bean	Crenshaw	Hunter
Berry	Culberson	Inglis
Biggert	Davis (KY)	Issa
Blackburn	Djou	Jenkins
Blunt	Donnelly (IN)	Johnson, Sam
Boehner	Dreier	Jordan (OH)
Bonner	Duncan	King (IA)
Boozman	Emerson	King (NY)
Boustany	Fallin	Kingston
Brady (TX)	Flake	Kline (MN)
Bright	Fleming	Kratovil
Broun (GA)	Forbes	Lamborn
Brown (SC)	Fortenberry	Lance
Brown-Waite,	Fox	Latham
Ginny	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (CA)
Burgess	Galleghy	Linder
Burton (IN)	Garrett (NJ)	Lucas
Buyer	Gingrey (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Calvert	Gohmert	Lummis
Camp	Goodlatte	

Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neugebauer

Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Rehberg
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt

Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Walden
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf

[Roll No. 399]

YEAS—412

Bishop (UT)
Cao
Cummings
Engel
Griffith
Hoekstra

NOT VOTING—17

Kirk
McIntyre
Moore (WI)
Oberstar
Putnam
Rush
Schock
Taylor
Wamp
Woolsey
Young (AK)

□ 1515

Messrs. BAIRD, McCAUL, BACHUS, and ADLER of New Jersey changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 398, on this vote, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Stated against:

Mr. LEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 398, to suspend the Rules and pass H.R. 5618, I intended to vote “nay.” While I understand that many Americans, including some in my Congressional District in Western New York, rely on unemployment benefits to survive in these difficult economic times, I believe that it is irresponsible for this Congress to not pay for the extension. We simply cannot afford to tack on an additional \$34 billion in deficit spending.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE CYBER DEFENSE COMPETITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1244) recognizing the National Collegiate Cyber Defense Competition for its now five-year effort to promote cyber security curriculum in institutions of higher learning, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 2, not voting 18, as follows:

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccheri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
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
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Dahlkemper

Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Djou
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Poster
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herse
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinche
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)

Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)

ROSS

Rothman (NJ)

Roybal-Allard

Royce

Ruppersberger

Rush

Ryan (OH)

Ryan (WI)

Salazar

Sanchez, Linda

T.

Sanchez, Loretta

Sarbanes

Scalise

Schauer

Schiff

Schmidt

Schock

Schwartz

Scott (GA)

Scott (VA)

Sensenbrenner

Serrano

Sessions

Sestak

Shadegg

Shea-Porter

Sherman

Shimkus

Shuler

Shuster

Simpson

Sires

Skelton

Slaughter

Smith (NE)

Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)

Snyder

Space

Speier

Spratt

Stark

STEARNS

Stupak

Sullivan

Sutton

Tanner

Teague

Terry

Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)

Thompson (PA)

Thornberry

Tiahrt

Tiberi

Tierney

Titus

Tonko

Towns

Tsongas

Turner

Upton

Van Hollen

Velázquez

Vislosky

Walden

Walz

Wasserman

Schultz

Waters

Watson

Watt

Waxman

Weiner

Welch

Westmoreland

Whitfield

Wilson (OH)

Wilson (SC)

Wittman

Wolf

Wu

Yarmuth

Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Paul

FLAKE

Lujan

Lummis

Lungren, Daniel

E.

Lynch

Mack

Maffei

Maloney

Manzullo

Marchant

Markey (CO)

Markey (MA)

Marshall

Matheson

Matsui

McCarthy (CA)

McCarthy (NY)

McCaul

McClintock

McCollum

McCotter

McDermott

McGovern

McHenry

McIntyre

McKeon

McMahon

McMorris

Rodgers

McNerney

Meek (FL)

Meeks (NY)

Melancon

Mica

Michaud

Miller (FL)

Miller (MI)

Miller (NC)

Miller, Gary

Minnick

Mitchell

Mollohan

Moore (KS)

Moran (KS)

Moran (VA)

Murphy (CT)

Murphy (NY)

Murphy, Patrick

Murphy, Tim

Myrick

Nadler (NY)

Napolitano

Neal (MA)

NOT VOTING—18

Cao

Cummings

Engel

Griffith

Hoekstra

Kirk

LOESACK

Miller, George

Moore (WI)

Oberstar

Peterson

Putnam

SCHAKOWSKY

Schradler

Taylor

Wamp

Woolsey

Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1524

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING THE PASSING OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE MARVIN ESCH

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the matter that I am about to address.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise with considerable sadness to announce

the death of a good friend of most of us in this body. Our former colleague and friend, Congressman Marvin Esch of Ann Arbor has died. He was 82.

Mr. Esch served in the Michigan State House of Representatives from 1965 to 1966. He was then elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, where he represented Ann Arbor and southeastern Michigan through about 1976. In 1976, he made an unsuccessful bid for the United States Senate, losing to our friend and colleague Donald Riegle in the general election.

Mr. Esch was a veteran of both the U.S. Maritime Service and the United States Army. He was indeed proud of helping his constituents to navigate the problems that they were having with the Federal Government, especially widows and veterans, as his family takes pride in saying. In Congress, he pushed for an accelerated end to the Vietnam War, and he worked to create an all-volunteer military.

He counted Gerald Ford as one of his dear friends. They were both University of Michigan graduates, and he stood by him when President Ford was sworn in as the 38th President of the United States on the day that former President Nixon resigned.

He was born in Flint, Pennsylvania, on August 4, 1927. He went on to attend the University of Michigan, where he earned an A.B. in 1950, an M.A. in 1951, and a Ph.D. in 1957. He was a lifelong supporter of University of Michigan sports and took considerable pride in the success of that great school.

After his time in politics, he served as director of public affairs for the U.S. Steel Corporation from 1977 to 1980. From 1981 to 1987, he was the director of programs and seminars for the American Enterprise Institute. After his retirement in 1992, he worked on a number of philanthropic projects with The Communication Group.

He died in his sleep Saturday, June 19, two days after celebrating his 60th anniversary. His wife, Olga, survives him. He is survived also by his brother, Gordon Esch; a sister, Emily Esch of Bigfork, Montana; son, Tom Esch and his wife, Charlene, of Kalispell, Montana; and by grandsons and numerous nieces and nephews.

We all remember him as a kind man who loved to tell and hear stories. He was an optimist who made and cherished lifelong friendships. His relationship with his wife, as well as his relationships with his colleagues, and his hope for the country could best be summed up in the phrase, "And the best is yet to be."

I now yield to my dear friend from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would just briefly like to say I echo the remarks by the dean of the House and the dean of the Michigan delegation.

I knew Marv Esch as a staffer. He was a wonderful man, dedicated to this House and to making things work.

□ 1530

We will all miss him. It is sometimes tough to be a Wolverine, and as you know, he was a great Wolverine.

Mr. DINGELL. I now ask, Mr. Speaker, that the House have a moment of silence in honor of our former colleague and friend, Marvin Esch.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will rise and observe a moment of silence.

FIREARMS EXCISE TAX IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2010

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5552) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that the payment of the manufacturers' excise tax on recreational equipment be paid quarterly and to provide for the assessment by the Secretary of the Treasury of certain criminal restitution, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 6, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 400] YEAS—412

Ackerman	Brady (TX)	Costa
Aderholt	Braley (IA)	Costello
Adler (NJ)	Bright	Courtney
Akin	Broun (GA)	Crenshaw
Alexander	Brown (SC)	Critz
Altmire	Brown, Corrine	Crowley
Andrews	Brown-Waite,	Cuellar
Arcuri	Ginny	Culberson
Austria	Buchanan	Dahlkemper
Baca	Burgess	Davis (AL)
Bachmann	Burton (IN)	Davis (CA)
Bachus	Butterfield	Davis (LA)
Baird	Buyer	Davis (KY)
Baldwin	Calvert	Davis (TN)
Barrett (SC)	Camp	DeFazio
Barrow	Campbell	DeGette
Bartlett	Cantor	DeLahunt
Barton (TX)	Capito	DeLauro
Bean	Capps	Dent
Becerra	Capuano	Deutch
Berkley	Cardoza	Diaz-Balart, L.
Berman	Carnahan	Diaz-Balart, M.
Berry	Carney	Dicks
Biggert	Carson (IN)	Dingell
Bilbray	Carter	Djou
Bilirakis	Cassidy	Doggett
Bishop (GA)	Castle	Donnelly (IN)
Bishop (NY)	Castor (FL)	Doyle
Bishop (UT)	Chaffetz	Dreier
Blackburn	Chandler	Driehaus
Blumenauer	Childers	Duncan
Blunt	Chu	Edwards (MD)
Bocchieri	Clarke	Edwards (TX)
Boehner	Clay	Ehlers
Bonner	Cleaver	Ellison
Bono Mack	Clyburn	Ellsworth
Boozman	Coble	Emerson
Boren	Coffman (CO)	Eshoo
Boswell	Cohen	Etheridge
Boucher	Cole	Fallin
Boustany	Conaway	Fattah
Boyd	Connolly (VA)	Filner
Brady (PA)	Cooper	Flake

Fleming	Linder	Rodriguez
Forbes	Lipinski	Roe (TN)
Fortenberry	LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)
Foster	Loeback	Rogers (KY)
Fox	Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (MI)
Frank (MA)	Lowey	Rohrabacher
Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Rooney
Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Ros-Lehtinen
Fudge	Lujan	Roskam
Gallegly	Lummis	Ross
Garamendi	Lungren, Daniel E.	Rothman (NJ)
Garrett (NJ)	Lynch	Roybal-Allard
Gerlach	Mack	Royce
Giffords	Maffei	Ruppersberger
Gingrey (GA)	Maloney	Rush
Gohmert	Manzullo	Ryan (OH)
Gonzalez	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Goodlatte	Markey (CO)	Salazar
Gordon (TN)	Markey (MA)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Granger	Marshall	Sanchez, Loretta
Graves (GA)	Matheson	Sarbanes
Graves (MO)	Matsui	Scalise
Grayson	McCarthy (CA)	Schakowsky
Green, Al	McCarthy (NY)	Schauer
Green, Gene	McCaul	Schiff
Grijalva	McClintock	Schmidt
Guthrie	Gutierrez	McCollum
Gutierrez	Hall (NY)	McCotter
Hall (NY)	Hall (TX)	McDermott
Hall (TX)	Halvorson	McGovern
Hastings (FL)	Hare	McHenry
Hastings (WA)	Harman	McIntyre
Heinrich	Harper	McKeon
Heller	Hastings (FL)	McMahon
Heller	Hastings (WA)	McMorris
Hensarling	Heinrich	Rodgers
Herger	Heller	McNerney
Herseth Sandlin	Hensarling	Meek (FL)
Higgins	Herger	Meeks (NY)
Hill	Herseth Sandlin	Melancon
Himes	Higgins	Mica
Hinche	Hill	Michaud
Hinojosa	Himes	Miller (FL)
Hirono	Hinche	Miller (MI)
Hodes	Hinojosa	Miller (NC)
Holden	Hirono	Miller, Gary
Holt	Hodes	Miller, George
Honda	Holden	Minnick
Hoyer	Holt	Mitchell
Hunter	Honda	Mollohan
Inglis	Hoyer	Moore (KS)
Inslie	Hunter	Moran (KS)
Israel	Inglis	Moran (VA)
Issa	Inslie	Murphy (CT)
Jackson (IL)	Israel	Murphy (NY)
Jackson Lee	Issa	Murphy, Patrick
(TX)	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Tim
Jenkins	Jackson Lee	Myrick
Johnson (GA)	(TX)	Napolitano
Johnson (IL)	Jenkins	Neal (MA)
Johnson, E. B.	Johnson (GA)	Neugebauer
Johnson, Sam	Johnson (IL)	Nunes
Jones	Johnson, E. B.	Nye
Jordan (OH)	Johnson, Sam	Obey
Kagen	Jones	Olson
Kanjorski	Jordan (OH)	Olver
Kaptur	Kagen	Ortiz
Kennedy	Kanjorski	Owens
Kildee	Kaptur	Pallone
Kilpatrick (MI)	Kennedy	Pascrell
Kilroy	Kildee	Pastor (AZ)
Kind	Kilpatrick (MI)	Paulsen
King (IA)	Kilroy	Payne
King (NY)	Kind	Pence
Kingston	King (IA)	Perlmutter
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	King (NY)	Perriello
Kissell	Kingston	Peters
Klein (FL)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Peterson
Kline (MN)	Kissell	Petri
Kosmas	Klein (FL)	Pingree (ME)
Kratovil	Castle	Pitts
Lamborn	Castor (FL)	Platts
Lance	Chaffetz	Poe (TX)
Langevin	Driehaus	Polis (CO)
Larsen (WA)	Duncan	Pomeroy
Larson (CT)	Edwards (MD)	Posey
Latham	Edwards (TX)	Price (GA)
LaTourette	Ehlers	Price (NC)
Latta	Ellison	Whitfield
Lee (CA)	Ellsworth	Radanovich
Lee (NY)	Emerson	Rahall
Levin	Eshoo	Rangel
Lewis (CA)	Etheridge	Rehberg
Lewis (GA)	Fallin	Reichert
	Fattah	Wu
	Filner	Yarmuth
	Flake	Young (FL)

NAYS—6

Conyers Kucinich Paul
Farr Nadler (NY) Waters

NOT VOTING—14

Cao Kirk Taylor
Cummings Moore (WI) Wamp
Engel Oberstar Woolsey
Griffith Putnam Young (AK)
Hoekstra Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1538

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMEBUYER ASSISTANCE AND IMPROVEMENT 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. 5623) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the homebuyer tax credit for the purchase of a principal residence before October 1, 2010, in the case of a written binding contract entered into with respect to such principal residence before May 1, 2010, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 5, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 401]

YEAS—409

Ackerman Boehner Carter
Aderholt Bonner Cassidy
Adler (NJ) Bono Mack Castle
Akin Boozman Castor (FL)
Alexander Boren Chaffetz
Altmire Boswell Chandler
Andrews Boucher Childers
Arcuri Boustany Chu
Austria Boyd Clarke
Baca Brady (PA) Clay
Bachmann Brady (TX) Cleaver
Bachus Braley (IA) Clyburn
Baird Bright Coble
Baldwin Broun (GA) Coffman (CO)
Barrett (SC) Brown (SC) Cohen
Barrow Brown, Corrine Cole
Bartlett Brown-Waite, Conaway
Barton (TX) Ginny Connolly (VA)
Bean Buchanan Conyers
Becerra Burgess Cooper
Berkley Burton (IN) Costa
Berman Butterfield Costello
Berry Buyer Courtney
Biggart Calvert Crenshaw
Billray Camp Critz
Bilirakis Cantor Crowley
Bishop (GA) Capito Cuellar
Bishop (NY) Capps Culberson
Bishop (UT) Capuano Dahlkemper
Blackburn Cardoza Davis (AL)
Blumenauer Carnahan Davis (CA)
Blunt Carney Davis (IL)
Boccheri Carson (IN) Davis (KY)

Davis (TN) Kildee Paulsen
DeFazio Kilpatrick (MI) Payne
DeGette Kilroy Pence
DeLaunt Kind Perlmutter
Delauro King (IA) Perriello
Dent King (NY) Peters
Deutch Kingston Petri
Diaz-Balart, L. Kirkpatrick (AZ) Pingree (ME)
Diaz-Balart, M. Kissell Pitts
Dicks Klein (FL) Platts
Dingell Kline (MN) Poe (TX)
Djou Kosmas Polis (CO)
Doggett Kratovil Pomeroy
Donnelly (IN) Kucinich Posey
Doyle Lamborn Price (GA)
Dreier Lance Price (NC)
Driehaus Langevin Quigley
Duncan Larsen (WA) Radanovich
Edwards (MD) Larson (CT) Rahall
Edwards (TX) Latham Rangel
Ehlers LaTourette Rehberg
Ellison Latta Reichert
Ellsworth Lee (CA) Reyes
Emerson Lee (NY) Richardson
Eshoo Levin Rodriguez
Etheridge Lewis (CA) Roe (TN)
Fallin Lewis (GA) Rogers (AL)
Farr Lipinski Rogers (KY)
Fattah LoBiondo Rogers (MI)
Filner Loebach Rohrabacher
Fleming Lofgren, Zoe Rooney
Forbes Lowey Ros-Lehtinen
Fortenberry Lucas Roskam
Foster Luetkemeyer Ross
Foxy Lujan Rothman (NJ)
Frank (MA) Lummis Roybal-Allard
Franks (AZ) Lungren, Daniel Royce
Frelinghuysen E. Ruppertsberger
Fudge Lynch Rush
Gallegly Mack Ryan (OH)
Garamendi Maffei Ryan (WI)
Garrett (NJ) Maloney Salazar
Gerlach Manzullo Sanchez, Linda
Giffords Marchant T.
Gingrey (GA) Markey (CO) Sanchez, Loretta
Gohmert Markey (MA) Sarbanes
Gonzalez Marshall Scalise
Goodlatte Matheson Schakowsky
Gordon (TN) Matsui Schauer
Granger McCarthy (CA) Schiff
Graves (GA) McCarthy (NY) Schmidt
Graves (MO) McCaul Schock
Grayson McCollum Schrader
Green, Al McCotter Scott (GA)
Green, Gene McDermott Scott (VA)
Grijalva McGovern Sensenbrenner
Guthrie McHenry Serrano
Gutierrez McIntyre Sestak
Hall (NY) McKeon Shadegg
Hall (TX) McMahan Shea-Porter
Halvorson McMorris Sherman
Hare Rodgers Shimkus
Harper McNeermy Shuler
Hastings (FL) Meek (FL) Shuster
Hastings (WA) Meeks (NY) Simpson
Heinrich Melancon Sires
Heller Mica Skelton
Hergert Michaud Slaughter
Herseth Sandlin Miller (FL) Smith (NE)
Higgins Miller (MI) Smith (NJ)
Hill Miller (NC) Smith (TX)
Himes Miller, Gary Smith (WA)
Hinchey Miller, George Snyder
Hinojosa Minnick Space
Hirono Mitchell Speier
Hodes Mollohan Spratt
Holden Moore (KS) Stark
Holt Moran (KS) Stearns
Honda Moran (VA) Stupak
Hoyer Murphy (CT) Sullivan
Hunter Murphy (NY) Sutton
Inglis Murphy, Patrick Tanner
Insee Murphy, Tim Teague
Israel Myrick Terry
Issa Nadler (NY) Thompson (CA)
Jackson (IL) Napolitano Thompson (MS)
Jackson Lee Neal (MA) Thompson (PA)
(TX) Neugebauer Thornberry
Jenkins Nunes Tiahrt
Johnson (GA) Nye Tiberi
Johnson (IL) Obey Tierney
Johnson, E. B. Olson Titus
Johnson, Sam Oliver Tonko
Jones Ortiz Towns
Jordan (OH) Owens Tsongas
Kagen Pallone Turner
Kanjorski Pascrell Upton
Kaptur Pastor (AZ) Van Hollen
Kennedy Paul Velázquez

Walden Waxman Wittman
Walz Weiner Wolf
Wasserman Welch Wu
Schultz Westmoreland Yarmuth
Waters Whitfield Young (FL)
Watson Wilson (OH)
Watt Wilson (SC)

NAYS—5

Campbell Hensarling McClintock
Flake Linder

NOT VOTING—18

Cao Kirk Sessions
Cummings Moore (WI) Taylor
Engel Oberstar Visclosky
Griffith Peterson Wamp
Harman Putnam Woolsey
Hoekstra Schwartz Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1545

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I was inadvertently detained and missed rollcall No. 401, passage of H.R. 5623, the Homebuyers Assistance and Improvement Act of 2010. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today on rollcall 398 through rollcall 401. Had I been present I would have voted “yes” on all four.

EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT C. BYRD, A SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1484

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Robert C. Byrd, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

Resolved, That a committee of such Members of the House as the Speaker may designate, together with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. I am honored to join you, Chairman RAHALL and Congresswoman CAPITO, in singing the praises of a great man, Senator BYRD. I rise today to remember the extraordinary life and legacy of Senator ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia, a man who loved his State, loved this country, and was a such important part of this Congress.

Throughout his remarkable career, he worked for all Americans, and he never stopped fighting for the people of West Virginia. While we are here, we all take pride in bearing witness to history. Senator BYRD shaped it, and in shaping history, he built a better future for all Americans.

His story was the true embodiment of the American dream. An orphan at a young age, Senator BYRD refused to allow his circumstances to limit the reach of his potential or his ability.

□ 1550

A son of West Virginia's coal country, he was the first in his family to be educated above the second grade. He worked as a butcher and a welder and entered office to serve his community and his neighbors. In doing so, he would ultimately make America a better place for every American.

Though many note his mastery of the Senate, I note that ROBERT BYRD's service began in the Congress here in the House of Representatives in 1953. His service in the House is a source of pride to all of us, though Senator BYRD remarked that he was happy to leave behind the limitations on speaking time that apply on the House floor. In fact, I checked the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD myself on that. In the year that Senator BYRD first came to Congress, I found that in one single floor speech he managed to quote the "Book of Ecclesiastes," Shakespeare's "The Merchant of Venice," Daniel Webster, and Rudyard Kipling, all while discussing trade policy. That was a sign of the great oratory that would come over the next 57 years. In that time, Senator BYRD would become Congress's foremost scholar on the institutions of our democracy. He always spoke truth to power. He served as a voice of reason. He was always a gentleman, charming any friend or foe.

Today, the entire Nation mourns the loss of this great champion, leader, and public servant. For more than 57 years, Congress has benefited from his wis-

dom and passion. For generations to come, ROBERT C. BYRD's name will remain etched in history books for his accomplishments and for his courage.

Senator BYRD has gone home to be with his beloved Erma. We hope it is a comfort to the Byrd family that so many join them in grieving their loss at this sad time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the distinguished Member from West Virginia, the chairman of our Natural Resources Committee, NICK JOE RAHALL, of whom ROBERT BYRD was very proud.

I also am pleased to recognize the Speaker pro tempore, ALAN MOLLOHAN, of whom ROBERT BYRD was very proud, and who he considered a partner. I thank Congresswoman CAPITO for allowing me to speak—in fact, out of order—on the passing of the distinguished American who was larger than life in so many respects.

Today, we honor the life of Senator ROBERT BYRD. History will reflect him as the longest-serving Member Congress has ever seen. But, of course, if it were only longevity that we were honoring, it would simply be the hand of fate that allowed that to happen. But what we really honor is that ROBERT C. BYRD used his longevity to such extraordinary benefit of the people he served in the State of West Virginia, the people of this Nation, and the legislative branch of government. I doubt that there have been any peers to ROBERT C. BYRD in standing on the floor of the United States Senate or of the House of Representatives or in any forum in which he was temporarily present, that any more strong advocacy of the equality and separateness of the legislative branch was made clear.

ROBERT C. BYRD was a giant. He was a giant in terms of character. He grew during the course of his lifetime, which is a mark of a great man. All of us are, to some degree, captives of the environment in which we are raised and in which we live. ROBERT C. BYRD is no different. But ROBERT C. BYRD grew. He grew intellectually. He grew culturally. But he did not, in growing, leave his base. He did not forget the values that he learned in West Virginia—the values of courtesy; of kindness; of caring; of helping; of making sure that the people who were not famous, who did not have power, who did not have positions of note were never, never forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I remember an incident that I'm sure was not unique to me. Early on in my career I went over on an appropriation matter—like you, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Committee. Senator BYRD invited me in. He was then majority leader. He invited me into his office. We sat down. And for the next 45 minutes—which, as a junior Member of the

House, I found extraordinary—he regaled me on the history of the Senate and the books he had written. I was mesmerized in the presence of this giant of the legislative body.

At the end, as I'm sure he did to so many of us, he gave me a rectangular painting of a covered bridge in West Virginia. Mr. OBEY is going to speak at some point in time—and Mr. OBEY has a similar painting hanging in his office. Now it's not the original because BOB BYRD gave it to so many of us. But I looked at that and I thought to myself, What a kind gesture. How impressed I was, this young Member of Congress being accorded this kind of respect from this giant in the United States Senate.

ROBERT C. BYRD will be dearly missed by us all, and he will be missed most of all when very difficult issues confront the legislative body and there is a clamor that the legislature agree with the executive, for whatever reasons; a clamor that all too often emanates from fear of this, that, or the other, and that fear would ignore the constitutional role played by the Congress of the United States. It is then that we will miss Senator BYRD's clarity of intellect, of conscience, of commitment to the Constitution of the United States of America, as well to the rules of the United States Senate. He was a passionate advocate for people, for principle, for the Constitution, and for our country. Senator BYRD, we will miss you. But we will remember fondly your contribution and be ever thankful that we had the opportunity to serve with you.

Some of you remember my dog Charlotte. My dog Charlotte was with me for 15½ years. Some of you will recall for 10 of those years Charlotte came to work with me every day. Charlotte was an English Springer Spaniel. I planted a tree in my yard—it's a dogwood tree—and there's a stone and a bronze plaque for Charlotte. Charlotte was one of the loves of my life. I lived alone with her for 10½ years after Judy passed away.

The first call I got the day after Charlotte passed was from ROBERT C. BYRD saying how sorry he was that I had lost Charlotte. That was an indication of his humanity, of his caring for others.

Yes, he was a great man. But he was a man who understood the pain, the aspirations, and the hopes of all with whom he came in contact.

Thank you, ROBERT C. BYRD, our good and faithful servant.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the gentle lady's yielding.

ROBERT BYRD, a colleague and associate on the Appropriations Committee, this incredible, incredible leader in our committee, has made such a difference over the years. Beyond that, I quickly developed great respect for

his support of the legislative role relative to our constitutional responsibility. And over the decades he has fought administration after administration, Democrat and Republican alike, whose bureaucrats want to take away authority from the legislative branch. His voice was heard consistently reflecting the priorities of this institution. And for that I will never forget him.

□ 1600

As you have just heard from our leader, in recent years, Senator BYRD and I developed a different kind of friendship because of our love for our dogs. Indeed, it was a reflection of this man, the wonderful human side of this man, that has been the experience for me. We will—Arlene, my dog Bruin, and I—miss Senator BYRD.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, it's my honor to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of our House Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, for most of the last 15 years, Senator ROBERT BYRD led the Senate Democrats on the Appropriations Committee. And for roughly that same amount of time, I had the same privilege on the House side, and I got to know him extremely well. I loved ROBERT BYRD. For one thing, he and I shared a love of bluegrass music. I daresay he was the finest fiddler in the history of the Congress, but that's not the real reason that I hold him in such high esteem.

He began as a product of a segregated background, but through sheer intense pursuit of knowledge, understanding, and wisdom, he became a person who is a powerful representative for the cause of equal opportunity for everyone. I can think of no one in the history of the Senate who demonstrated a greater capacity for personal growth than did ROBERT BYRD. He was truly unmatched in his recognition of our obligation to the Constitution and to the institution of the Congress itself.

And the greatest thing about him, in addition to his dedication, was, simply put, he had guts; and he wasn't afraid to demonstrate that on many occasions when the Nation needed to see it demonstrated. He made the point that he never served under any President. He served with many, honorably and with distinction. They really don't make them like him anymore.

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

I rise today to thank my colleague from West Virginia's Third Congressional District (Mr. RAHALL) for offering this resolution, honoring the passing of our senior Senator, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD. I want to thank the Speaker, my other colleague from West Virginia, for his dedication and friendship to Senator BYRD through many more years than I have served here in

this Congress. As the three of us know, this is a difficult time for all West Virginians and the United States Senate.

As my colleagues know, Senator BYRD was an institution not only in West Virginia but also in the United States Senate. Coming from very modest beginnings, the young man from rural Raleigh County, West Virginia, rose from the mountains of Appalachia to become a lion in the greatest deliberative body on Earth, the United States Senate. His path to success is truly emblematic of the American Dream.

Few can travel through our great State of West Virginia without recognizing the effect Senator BYRD had on our State. While he is well recognized for the many roads and buildings that are named in his honor, it is the leadership he displayed in bringing our delegation together when it mattered most for West Virginia that is truly a testament to the effect he has had on our State.

During my tenure—which for him was recent, 10 years—he rallied our delegation to save the 130th Air National Guard unit from being cut, and he began working with all of us towards a consensus on mine safety legislation after the tragic Sago mine incident. He was an able leader and led us all as leaders for West Virginia.

Senator BYRD was also a wonderful ambassador for Appalachia. West Virginians are very proud of our heritage and our strong work ethic throughout our lives, and Senator BYRD continued to share Appalachian culture—we just heard from Mr. OBEY on that—with his colleagues in Washington. Whether it was displaying his musical talents on the fiddle or his dedication to both American and world history or the process of the United States Senate or the protection of our Constitution, Senator BYRD was truly a man of many talents.

I will fondly remember, as I was attending a meeting in Charleston, West Virginia, probably 12 years ago—I knew about his fiddling, but I didn't know about his love of music and his vocal ability—when he joined Kathy Mattea in singing a duet of Amazing Grace. It was a great moment for me, but for him, he was celebrating his three loves: his music, his love of education, and his faith in God.

I also remember—and the other members of the delegation will remember this, too—we were in his office, and he served us lunch in his office. And when it came time for dessert, he asked all of us if we wanted dessert. And since we were all watching our waistlines, we sort of waived off dessert and said, No, we really don't need dessert. It's lunch. I think we are going to pass on dessert.

No, no. We must have dessert. We must have apple pie and ice cream.

And then he proudly told us how he had maintained the same weight for the last 57 years in the United States Congress. I think that's a feat to be celebrated, quite frankly.

He also talked a lot about—and we heard this, too—the love of his dogs. I remember when his beloved Billy died. He was crushed, and he wasn't afraid or ashamed or embarrassed to express the love and the compassion that he had and the companionship he felt with his dog. And I think that's a common bond that a lot of people here in the United States, but also in West Virginia, share.

So with Senator BYRD's passing, West Virginia has truly lost a favorite son. The United States Senate has lost an icon. And as any Senator will tell you, Senator BYRD served as a tremendous mentor in passing on Senate procedure to newly elected Senators. In many ways, Senator BYRD was an institution within the institution of the Senate, and the Senate will not be the same without him.

I will miss Senator BYRD's passion and ardent defense of our Nation's Constitution. He was certainly one of a kind, and I feel privileged to have served with him. I will never forget the advice that he gave me when I first sought his counsel when I first went in, in my first year serving in this body. And he said, "Shelley, you need to be a workhorse, not a show horse." Senator BYRD will always be remembered for his hard work as a workhorse and also for his dedication to representing our great State of West Virginia.

I wish to extend to Senator BYRD's family my deepest sympathies and know that he is at peace and at home with his beloved Erma.

So I would again thank Mr. RAHALL for presenting this. Senator BYRD will certainly be missed. And I want to pay tribute to his tremendous service, sacrifice, strength, honesty, and devotion to our State and Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington, Mr. NORM DICKS, the distinguished chairman of our Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations and a classmate of mine.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I had the great honor of serving in the other body for 8 years as an assistant to Senator Warren G. Magnuson. And during that time, Senator BYRD became the whip in the Senate. I can remember how he was faithfully writing notes every couple of days to Senator Magnuson, "I put this in the RECORD for you." He was absolutely committed to the United States Senate, and he was a forceful advocate.

I have served, as Chairman OBEY has, in many conferences with Senator BYRD. And when there was something that he wanted—and oftentimes to protect the workers of West Virginia on coal mining issues—the Congress responded because he was such a forceful advocate.

And one of the things I respected most about Senator BYRD was his knowledge of the history of the Senate,

the history of the Congress, and his devotion to that history. He would oftentimes talk about historic events and tie them in to current days.

You know, some people may have criticized him on spending issues, but he used to say, and I always used to quote him on this, the Congress can't give up the power of the purse because the power of the purse is in the Constitution; and it's part of the Constitution of the United States, a right that was earned in England when the people of England rose up against kings and demanded that Parliament have the power of deciding how the money was to be spent.

□ 1610

And as has been said by many here, he served with many Presidents, but he was not cowed by the presidency, and he would stand up on the floor of the Senate many times and talk about different wars, different situations we were in, and demand that the Executive appreciate the power of the Congress and respect the power of the Congress. And he served—I think he was elected nine full terms. That's a record that I doubt will ever be matched.

He also went to law school during his time in the Senate. Now, how many people could do that? I mean, it just was remarkable. And I think President Kennedy gave him his degree from American University just a few months before he was, unfortunately, tragically assassinated in Texas.

But ROBERT BYRD is a legendary figure. In my time here in the Congress I had the great fortune of serving on the Appropriations Committee for 34 years. But I served with Senator Magnuson, who became chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Senator BYRD was there throughout that entire time and a lot more.

And I just rise today in respect for him, his legacy, his commitment to the Congress. He had a wonderful family, and I'm sure that they're going to miss him. But they have, I think, the satisfaction of knowing that ROBERT BYRD did a great job, a fantastic job for the State of West Virginia, but also was a great Senator in a national perspective.

And so I just want to say to my colleague and classmate from West Virginia, who I know served on Senator BYRD's staff, and it was a great learning experience that you had in the other body, as I did. And I think it helped to prepare us for work here in the House of Representatives.

So I just would say again that we have lost a great American, a man of tremendous courage and commitment, and someone we respected, and his legacy and memory will live long in the history of the United States of America and in the Congress.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio

(Ms. KAPTUR), a member of the Appropriations Committee as well.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the distinguished dean of the delegation for yielding to me. And with Speaker MOLLOHAN in the Chair this evening, the people of the Buckeye State of Ohio extend our deepest sympathies to the State of West Virginia, to the Byrd family, to all of the staff that served this truly remarkable human being and American, Senator ROBERT BYRD.

There's a great piece of music called "Ode to the Common Man" by Aaron Copeland, and as I'm saying these words this evening, I think of that music and of Senator BYRD's remarkable life. He truly was a wise man of the Legislative branch who belonged to the American people. He gave his life to us. His road had been a hard scrabble one from the very beginning. He's the kind of American that walked a tough road, who when he came here to serve, he never forgot people who came from backgrounds like his.

I had the great joy of serving with him on the Appropriations Committee. And being one of the few women that have ever served on that committee, when I arrived there in the 1990s, I can remember him sitting across from me at a conference committee, kind of looking over his glasses with a glint in his eye at this woman who was a bit younger than he was. He exhibited a great sense of welcome with also some surprise that indeed history in America was changing.

I respected and liked him so very, very much. And I appreciated his kindness to me. He loved history. I hold in my possession an autographed copy from him of "The Roman Republic and the Rule of Law" of the Senate of that era.

I loved speaking with him. I loved being on a program with him a few years ago with Leo Gerard, president of the Steelworkers, and listening to Senator BYRD deliver an impassioned speech about the American worker. He was such an exemplary representative for the working men and women of this country.

His intellect, his humor, his knowledge of the rules and history, his love of this institution and respect for it, and his passion, his passion on every issue that he handled. He had so much to teach all of us.

I happen to be a Democrat. He was a real Democrat. He set the pointer on a compass and that needle to represent all people.

He was a gentleman, he was civil, he was enlightened, he worked so hard. I can remember his telling a story about working on the railroads as a young man. That hard work and that sense of honor he carried with him through his entire service of over a half a century to the people of our country.

I will end with saying, as I think of "Ode to the Common Man," that the enormous courage that he displayed in the last years of his life is a lesson to us all. He continued to serve, despite

illness, despite difficulty, his doggedness, his determination—he truly was an heroic American. I personally shall miss him very, very much.

I thank the people of the State of West Virginia for continuing to send him to this Congress. He made us all better by serving with him. He built a better and more humane America. He was loved by this membership. We wish him Godspeed, and eternal rest grant unto him, O Lord.

I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for allowing me this time tonight to pay tribute to a great and good man and Senator for the ages. In knowing him, we have walked with history, and are grateful.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my deep honor to yield to a close personal friend and fellow member of our congressional delegation from West Virginia, Mr. ALAN MOLLOHAN. Mr. MOLLOHAN chairs the subcommittee on Appropriations on Commerce, Justice, Science and related agencies. He has served on many conferences with the late Senator BYRD as well. And I know Senator BYRD often said he had two sons, and that would be Alan and myself.

I'm very honored to yield such time as he may consume to ALAN MOLLOHAN.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank my friend and colleague from West Virginia for yielding. And I know we have many tender memories of the Senator.

Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sadness that I learned yesterday of the passing of Senator ROBERT C. BYRD. This country knew Senator BYRD as one of the lions of the Senate, a ferocious advocate for his State and a principled spokesman for his beliefs, whether it was his opposition to the war in Iraq or his commitment to improve safety and working conditions in the coal fields of West Virginia.

This Congress, both sides of the Capitol, knew ROBERT C. BYRD as the chief defender of its constitutional prerogatives, an unequalled master of its parliamentary rules, an expert on its history, and one of the ablest legislative tacticians either Chamber has ever seen.

West Virginia knew Senator ROBERT C. BYRD as her own. It's difficult to adequately describe the bond of profound connection between the man and the State. People from outside the State might assume that this connection was built on the senator's legendary success in delivering Federal funds to West Virginia, and that would be wrong.

West Virginians understand how important that success was, of course. We know that those material contributions are literally incalculable in dollars invested, roads paved, buildings constructed, and jobs created. But the bond between Senator BYRD and West Virginia went far beyond that. It is almost as though his personal story not only inspired West Virginians, as it would most Americans, but that it captured so much of our State's culture

and our State's values. That personal history is known throughout the State.

Senator BYRD was the adopted son of a miner who graduated as class valedictorian. He was the manual worker who earned a law degree while serving in the United States Senate. He was the husband who relied for almost 70 years on his beloved wife, Erma. Those qualities of discipline, of integrity, and commitment forged in the mountains of West Virginia and exercised in the halls of Washington speak more strongly to West Virginians than any material measure of his immense contributions to the State.

□ 1620

I cannot imagine ROBERT C. BYRD representing any State other than West Virginia, and it is difficult to imagine West Virginia without Senator BYRD.

I knew Senator BYRD as a mentor. I was first elected to Congress in 1983. And after 28 years, I like to think of myself as a reasonably seasoned veteran of this body. But then I remind myself, before I took my first oath of office, Senator BYRD had already served more years than I have today. Twenty-eight years ago he was already a master of the legislative branch.

From my very first days in this House, Senator BYRD never withheld his support or his counsel. I can remember many times Senator BYRD calling Congressman RAHALL and myself over to his office just to consult, to ask what was going on in West Virginia, or to take counsel himself on what was going on in the House of Representatives, or just to find out what was going on in our personal lives, how our parents were, how our fathers were, how our mothers were. Those were touching moments.

Senator BYRD, many people have asked me, well, what is Senator BYRD really like? You know, he is such a disciplined person in public. People want to know, well, what is he like in private? And I think there are several insights that we have had glimpses of in previous speakers here this afternoon into what he was like as a man beyond a legislator. I can remember his being very touching and very concerned about his dog Billy, and bringing him to the Congress, or if he were home, worrying about how he was getting along. Very concerned and obviously loving toward a pet.

But most poignant was Senator BYRD's relationship with his wife, Erma. It was long. She was his childhood sweetheart. Senator BYRD used to tell the story about courting Erma with another young man's candy. The young man would come to school, and Senator BYRD and him would catch up, and the young man would give Senator BYRD a piece of candy. And Senator BYRD wouldn't eat that candy; he would save it and give it to his future wife, his sweetheart, Erma. That relationship lasted and grew and was warm and inspiring throughout his life. And

her passing a number of years ago was a very sad time in the life of Senator BYRD, obviously. It was also a very sad time in the State of West Virginia. They were a couple to be beloved by West Virginia.

I remember another touching moment, when my father passed almost 10 years ago. Senator BYRD attended the funeral and continued on after the service for about an hour's drive to where Dad was interred. And Senator BYRD after the service, he pulled me aside and told me what a lovely cemetery this was for Dad's resting place.

Finally, I knew Senator BYRD as a friend. I cannot remember a time when he was not in my life. And I will miss my friend. My wife, Barbara, and I offer our deepest condolences and our best wishes to Senator BYRD's family, to his staff, and to that close, wonderful circle of people who knew him and loved him.

Mr. RAHALL. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKS). The gentleman has 14½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gates of heaven opened wide early yesterday morning. West Virginia lost a faithful son, the Senate lost a father's watchful eye, and I lost my mentor and close friend.

I extend my prayers and thoughts to Senator BYRD's daughters, to his grandchildren and great grandchildren, to all his family, and to his staff, especially many of whom have been with him for so long. Sadly but surely, we will not see the likes of ROBERT C. BYRD pass our way again.

He came from humble beginnings. A virtual orphan, he was sent to be reared in the coalfields of our beloved State of West Virginia, enduring the depths of the Great Depression. But he was wealthy beyond belief with richness of values, all instilled in him by his adoptive parents.

A self-taught butcher, a welder, a Sunday school teacher, a student, a self-disciplined scholar with straight A's with 21 credit hours in his first semester of college, a young man still, he wanted to serve. Armed with little more than determination and a fiddle, he successfully entered politics. "Byrd by name, Byrd by nature, let's send Byrd to the legislature." How often he would fiddle that with a tin cup at the end of his fiddle, raising his first campaign funds. I recall, because my late father was the treasurer for those early campaigns of Senator BYRD.

But thus began what would become an unprecedented legislative service. Marshaling sharp focus, unwavering diligence, and old-fashioned hard work, old-fashioned hard work, he rose to remarkable heights of rank and responsibility to service to the Lord, to service to our State and our Nation as well. Yet Senator BYRD always remained true to his own essential nature. He never got above his raisin'.

He could mix with kings and queens and Presidents, and while doing that he never forgot from whence he came, and he always remained deeply proud of his roots. He often remarked he would just as soon be eatin' beans and cornbread and onions and sippin' buttermilk in the hills and hollers of West Virginia as having lavish dinners with kings and queens around the world.

I recall working for him in the Senate Democratic Cloakroom in 1972. During that time, a young man from Delaware by the name of JOE BIDEN was elected to the United States Senate. Within a month or two after Senator-elect JOE BIDEN's ascension to the United States Senate, he lost his first wife in a tragic, tragic car wreck. Senator BYRD turned to me and said, Nick, do you mind if we took a drive up to Wilmington, Delaware, so that we can pay our respects to Senator BIDEN's wife? I said, Sure.

I drove the car. It was a cold, rainy night, late November that 1972. We arrived in Wilmington. We arrived at the funeral home to face a long, long, winding line that was waiting out in the rain to pay their respects. Senator Biden heard we were in that line and sent word out he wanted us to come up and immediately get up front and come inside where it was warm. Senator BYRD said, no, he would not use his office, he would not use his prestige or power to jump in front of anybody already in line in front of him. So we stood in that cold rain, waiting to pay our respects to Senator-elect, at that time, JOE BIDEN's first wife.

The only individual to serve in both houses of the West Virginia Legislature and the U.S. Congress, Senator BYRD also achieved the distinction of holding more elective leadership offices in the United States Senate than anyone in the body's history. His Senate service is the body's longest.

Combined with his tenure in the House, Senator BYRD holds the distinction of serving in Congress longer than anyone else. His achievements and his unrivaled archive of accomplishments were the result of one sole purpose, to serve others. And he never tired of trying to find ways to help a little more, to do a little better.

Striving for the next rung was, for Senator BYRD, a lifelong pursuit. He was forever setting goals. And he challenged himself, his staff, his colleagues, all of us to meet or exceed those goals.

And you know one other remarkable feature about ROBERT C. BYRD. He made political contests, as bitter as they may seem at the time, the foundation for future and lasting friendships. Recall, for example, as I know the gentleman in the chair, Mr. DICKS, can recall very well, Senator BYRD's one-vote victory over the late Senator from Massachusetts, Ted Kennedy, whose son Patrick was just here on the floor.

Perhaps many considered that a bitter contest. But what did Senator BYRD use it for? To establish a lasting and

true friendship with Senator Ted Kennedy from Massachusetts, as we all know who passed shortly before Senator BYRD, and for whom Senator BYRD had nothing but the utmost and kindest words of praise, and truly defined a friendship that perhaps has not been in American politics for some time.

□ 1630

This was a defining quality and a wellspring of immeasurable joy that irrigated ever greater horizons for Senator BYRD. His penchant for setting records and then breaking his own was the inevitable result, but ultimately, we are the ones who reaped the greatest benefit.

In his later years, when anyone questioned age as somehow detrimental to service, Senator BYRD reveled in ticking off the names and ages of the ancients in the Old Testament and their continued service to the Lord: Moses was 120, Senator BYRD would say; Noah lived to be 960; Methuselah at 969 years old; and he would call out, While I am but a spry 85.

At 92, with the longest record of service in Congress well established, Senator BYRD enjoyed public service so much that it is possible he also had the longest, happiest life on record. If only we could have captured the energies produced by his immense job satisfaction. If only we could package them and share them with others.

Senator BYRD was cautious about the use of superlatives. He felt they were tossed around too casually, and although I do not doubt that he is now grimacing a bit at me for saying this, the fact is it is just not possible to speak about Senator BYRD without using superlatives: longest serving, hardest working, most revered, best loved. And the list goes on and on. Yes, he was passionate about people. He was passionate about politics. He was caring. He was all concerned about the lives of all of us in West Virginia.

As we all know, we go through personal trials and tribulations in our family—the loss of a loved one, sibling problems, loss of a job. Senator BYRD, when he was physically able, would so surprisingly show up in West Virginia offering that comforting arm around the shoulder and always telling those afflicted with tragedy to keep the faith in God, to don't let them get you down, keep plugging along. Senator BYRD himself, who never had a bad word to say about anybody despite some of the words that were said about him, was forever the true gentleman.

Many in this body had their own personal remembrances of Senator BYRD. He touched so many of us, encouraged us, taught us, even argued with us. And I can recall the last time perhaps, except for the miners' memorial that he attended this past April in honor of our 29 fallen coal miners, the only time before that he was probably in his home area of Raleigh County, Beckley, West Virginia, was a dinner in which he was

a surprise guest that honored yours truly. And my wife, Melinda, and I fixed up our house, and my wife even set up the "big daddy suite" in our home in West Virginia. That big daddy suite is still there waiting, as it always was, for Senator BYRD to pay a surprise visit.

We are all better for the life of Senator ROBERT BYRD. We owe him generous helpings of gratitude and admiration, and we shall all miss him.

Again, to Senator BYRD's family, we offer our prayers, our never-ending thanks for the fact that they shared Senator BYRD's extraordinary life with a grateful State and a grateful Nation.

Now, our former senior Senator, our late senior Senator is indeed with his beloved wife, Erma, who was always a twinkle in his eye. For 69 years, they were married before her passing some 5 years ago. The Senator is with his beloved Erma, smiling down upon all of us.

We say thank you, Senator BYRD. Thank you for all you've given our great State. Thank you for all you have given our Nation, because we shall miss you.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING DR. JOSEPH GRUNENWALD UPON HIS RETIREMENT FROM CLARION UNIVERSITY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in warm congratulations for Dr. Joseph Grunenwald upon his retirement from Clarion University in Clarion, Pennsylvania.

Dr. Grunenwald faithfully served Clarion for more than 30 years, earning him such honors as the title of president emeritus from the Pennsylvania State system of higher education. He's one of five in the organization's 27-year history to receive this honor, which is awarded to those who exhibit an exemplary record of service. Under his leadership, Clarion's enrollment reached record levels, and the university saw marked improvement in its academic, community, and business programs.

In addition, Dr. Grunenwald serves on the boards of numerous community organizations, attesting to his sincere dedication to the welfare and advancement of Clarion. He is a true example of community service and steadfast effort and deserves to be praised and honored. I am sure that Dr. Grunenwald

will continue to serve his community and foster positive progress.

Congratulations to Dr. Grunenwald. I wish you success and fulfillment in your years of retirement and look forward to working with Clarion University's 16th president, Dr. Karen Whitney.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF SENATOR BYRD

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I was detained when my colleagues were on the floor of the House paying tribute to Senator BYRD and did not want this time to go without acknowledging my deep sympathy to his family and to my good friend from West Virginia and to acknowledge how special this man was to the institution we call Congress and to the freedom that this Nation stands for.

I cannot account for my personal encounters with Senator BYRD, but I can tell you, as someone who respects and loves this institution, what a man who understood the Constitution and rules that were not for selfish reasons, to keep people from being in power, but really it was to empower people.

He had no qualms in standing up against Presidential authority that was wrong in the Iraq War. He had no qualms in fighting to ensure that resources came to his great State. He loved the institution. He was a holder of knowledge, and what we will lose with his passing is that special sensitivity to the rules and to the responsibility we have to not play politics with this institution. We are here to serve America, and Senator BYRD did serve America.

May God rest his soul and may he rest in peace. Senator BYRD, we will miss you.

□ 1640

SEAMAN WILLIAM ORTEGA

(Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Navy Seaman William Ortega. This fallen American hero gave his life on June 18 after a bomb exploded while he was in a patrol vehicle and while he was conducting combat operations against enemy forces in the Helmand Province in Afghanistan.

Seaman Ortega, 23 years old, was a hospital corpsman to the 3rd Battalion, 1st Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force at Camp Pendleton. His battalion is nicknamed the "Thundering Third."

His family stated that Seaman Ortega cherished becoming an American citizen. He enjoyed being named "student of the month" at school and winning first place at the local youth fair.

Throughout middle school and high school, he made the Honor Roll. He was involved in clubs, and he excelled in every sport that he played. After graduating from South Dade High School in 2005, Seaman Ortega went on to study at Florida Career College where he obtained a degree in Web site design.

Then Seaman Ortega joined the military because of the core values military life has to offer. He wanted to give back to a nation that had given him and his family so much opportunity. So, as a hospital corpsman, he was a Navy medic who treated those who were injured in combat.

His sister Aracely Ortega described him as an "awesome brother and an awesome friend." She also said, "He had a lot of respect for this Nation, and he paid the ultimate sacrifice, unfortunately."

For his brave service and sacrifice, Seaman Ortega was posthumously awarded the Purple Heart, the Combat Action Ribbon, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, the NATO Non Article V Medal, and the Sea Service Deployment Ribbon.

He is survived by his parents—William and Marianela Ortega—and by his five sisters, and hundreds gathered, over the weekend in Miami, to pay respect and to pay tribute to this American fallen hero.

Our grateful Nation grieves with his family during this difficult time, and our grateful Nation will never forget William Ortega, a true American hero.

JOBS AND THE ECONOMY

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

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, Democrats in Congress will continue to take America in a new direction, creating good American jobs, lowering taxes for the middle class and small businesses, and building a strong new foundation for the economy and for Main Street.

We continue to see signs of economic recovery resulting from the economic policies of the Democratic Congress and the Obama administration responding to the Bush recession and the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. More must be done to create and save jobs, but the latest signs of recovery include the HIRE Act, a bipartisan bill to create 300 jobs; American Workers, State, and Business Relief Act, tax incentives to spur business innovation and tax cuts; the Small Business and Infrastructure Jobs Tax Act extends aid to States to provide subsidies to employers, including small businesses; and the Home Star bill, which creates much-needed jobs in the manufacturing sector by providing tax rebates to homeowners who install energy-saving products.

Last week, the U.S. Department of Energy announced \$29 million in American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding to develop and expand weatherization training centers across

the country. These projects will provide green job training for local workers in energy efficiency retrofitting and weatherization services.

Congress and the President have worked together to enact an array of broad-based tax cuts for working and middle-class families and small business owners—ending an era of Republican tax breaks focused only on the wealthy. These tax cuts are injecting consumer demand into the economy and spurring job creation.

All totaled, Congress has enacted more than \$800 billion in tax cuts, with another \$285 billion making their way through Congress, such as permanent estate tax relief and the R&D tax credit to spur business innovation.

REPUBLICAN RECORD OF FAILURE

Congressional Republicans threaten to take us back to the failed policies that created the economic crisis—siding with the special interests: Wall Street banks, credit card companies, Big Oil, and insurance companies.

These economic and fiscal policies created the Bush recession—the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression—with job losses of nearly 800,000 a month—and nearly doubled our national debt.

Republicans have voted against every major piece of economic legislation—from the Recovery Act to Wall Street reform—choosing the special interests over American workers, their families and small businesses.

Democrats in Congress will continue to take America in a New Direction, working to create American jobs and a strong new foundation for the economy, protecting Main Street and the middle class. We're getting results.

During the last 3 months of the Bush administration, we lost on average 726,000 jobs. In the last 3 months, we have created an average of 186,000 jobs. The current unemployment rate is 9.9 percent.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HALVORSON). 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.

OUR POLICY IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my continuing and growing concern over our policy in Afghanistan.

As General Petraeus appears before the Senate and as we are being asked to consider tens of billions of dollars in supplemental funding for the war, I believe that now is the time for us to ask tough questions and to demand straight answers.

Of all the problems that President Obama inherited from the Bush administration, Afghanistan is the one that keeps getting more complicated. In just the past few weeks, two brave, young soldiers from my congressional district in Fall River, Massachusetts, lost their lives in Afghanistan. So this

is a big deal, and we need to get it right.

Last December, President Obama told the American people that we would begin to withdraw our forces next July. The American people deserve to know if that plan is still in place and how we are going to get there.

Much has been made about General Stanley McChrystal's comments in Rolling Stone magazine about the Nation's civilian leadership; but frankly, Madam Speaker, this is much bigger than a few ill-considered comments. Indeed, there are other parts of the article that I find to be much more disturbing.

For instance, General McChrystal, himself, referred to the biggest military operation of the year so far, the offensive in Marja, as a "bleeding ulcer."

General McChrystal's chief of operations said that Afghanistan "is not going to look like a win, smell like a win or taste like a win. This is going to end in an argument."

Before the Marja offensive began, General McChrystal personally went to President Karzai's palace to get his consent on the operation. According to the article, "Karzai's staff, however, insisted that the President was sleeping off a cold, and could not be disturbed. After several hours of haggling, McChrystal finally enlisted the aid of Afghanistan's defense minister, who persuaded Karzai's people to wake the President from his nap."

A senior adviser to General McChrystal said, "If Americans pulled back and started paying attention to this war, it would become even less popular."

A senior military official said this, "There's a possibility we could ask for another surge of U.S. forces next summer if we see success here."

So the administration has determined General McChrystal's exit strategy, but it is the exit strategy for the rest of our brave soldiers that I am more worried about it.

Madam Speaker, I voted in 2001 to go to war in Afghanistan—to hunt down al Qaeda and to eliminate their threat, and I would cast that same vote today in a heartbeat. Though, what we are doing in Afghanistan today is far beyond that original authorization. We are engaged in extensive, expensive nation-building in Afghanistan.

Frankly, given the level of unemployment and the severe economic situation we face in the United States, I would rather do a little more nation-building here at home. We have borrowed \$350 billion—added to the debt—for the war in Afghanistan.

My Republican friends have refused to support extending unemployment benefits for our out-of-work Americans because they say we can't afford it. We are told we can't afford to help States' avoiding laying off teachers. We are told we can't afford to improve our roads and bridges or to help more families afford a college education. We are

told we can't afford to prevent foreclosures or to improve child nutrition. Now we are being asked to borrow another \$33 billion for nation-building in Afghanistan.

We don't have the money to help American working families, but when it comes to supporting a corrupt and incompetent Karzai government, we are supposed to be a bottomless pit.

Not so fast, Madam Speaker.

Last week a bipartisan group of us sent a letter to the Speaker, urging that the House not consider the supplemental before some serious questions about our policy in Afghanistan are addressed. Even if we move forward this week, I hope that we are given an opportunity to have a thorough debate on this issue and to get a clean vote on whether or not we should continue our funding at current levels. This is life and death. This is about sending our troops into harm's way. This is about whether or not we can afford to continue this policy.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to think long and hard this week about this critical issue.

U.S. ARMY SPECIALIST MATTHEW CATLETT FROM TEXAS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, we honor a fallen American warrior today—a Texas soldier who gave his life serving this country, this country he loved.

U.S. Army Specialist Matthew Catlett was an infantryman with the 101st Airborne Screaming Eagles out of Fort Campbell, Kentucky—one of the most prestigious and decorated divisions in the entire United States Army.

The Screaming Eagle warriors landed in Normandy on D-day, and fought the Battle of the Bulge—the crucial turning points of World War II. The Screaming Eagles fought in the rice paddies of Vietnam. They've stood vigil in the deserts and towns of Iraq, and they're leading in Afghanistan the fight against the cowards in the desert—the Taliban.

I have been to Iraq and Afghanistan. Let me tell you something, Madam Speaker, that there is no better fighting machine in the world than the 101st. They were the first conventional unit to deploy in support of the American war on terrorism.

The 101st's "Easy Company" was portrayed in the series "Band of Brothers," and like those in the 101st who have so nobly held that line in their storied history, Matthew gave his life with four other fellow soldiers that day. It was the bloodiest day of the war so far this year.

Madam Speaker, this is a photograph of Matthew Catlett. He and his fellow soldiers were killed when their Humvee was hit by an improvised explosive device. That is called an IED. That is the

cowards' way, the Taliban's way, of fighting our troops.

Though, as Shakespeare said, "They shall be remembered—we few, we happy few, we band of brothers; for he today that sheds his blood with me shall be my brother."

□ 1650

Matthew Catlett, this young American hero, was only 23 years of age when he gave his life for this country. There is nothing as noble as the character of a man who so willingly dedicates his life for others. The American warriors serving our military understand that better than anybody. They embody what is meant to be an American, and Matthew Catlett was such a man.

He gave his life on June 7 on a battlefield in Afghanistan, fighting the terrorists who attacked America on September the 11th from that desolate, faraway land.

Matthew grew up in Cypress, Texas. He joined the United States Army right out of Cyprus Ridge High School, always knowing he wanted to be a military man, a soldier in the United States Army. He served a tour of duty in Iraq 3 years ago and had just been redeployed to Afghanistan in April of this year.

Our American warriors make great sacrifices in the heat and the dust and the deserts and the rough, rugged mountains of Afghanistan, where summer temperatures reach almost 120 degrees in the parched desert landscape. Our soldiers track down terrorists under the worst possible conditions, but no matter what hole these cowards try to hide in, our soldiers are able to hunt them down and to keep America safe.

We grieve the loss of this American warrior, but we celebrate and honor his life and his service. We are fortunate that a man like Matthew ever lived. Matthew stood for the best of those American ideals and values exemplified in our fighting infantrymen.

General Robert E. Lee once said, "Duty, then, is the sublimest word in our language. Do your duty in all things. You cannot do more; you should never wish to do less."

Matthew Catlett did his duty. He served this Nation as the fine soldier he always wanted to be. All of his fellow soldiers gave some, but Matthew Catlett gave all in defense of this Nation. He fought for liberty for a people he did not know in a land that he had never been. He was the American breed. He was a rare breed. So we honor our American warrior, and we honor the families left behind who grieve the loss of their loved one.

Specialist Matthew Catlett was buried with full military honors in Houston's Veterans Memorial Cemetery. His draped coffin was surrounded by flags carried by the old war horses of the Patriot Guard. Those are motorcycle riders, mainly Vietnam veterans, that surround fallen soldiers and their families during a time of grief.

So today I extend my prayers and condolences to Matthew's wife, Brytnee; his two young daughters, Ryann and Stephanie; his parents; his relatives; and his friends. Their American warrior is home, his duty is done, and he is at peace.

George Orwell said, "We sleep safely in our beds because rough men stand ready in the night to visit violence on those who would do us harm."

Our grateful Nation will always remember that Specialist Matthew Catlett stood always ready to do his duty for us.

And that's just the way it is.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO MANUTE BOL

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

Mr. PERRIELLO. Madam Speaker, this morning I rose to honor the passing of Ruby Archie, a great hero to all of those in southern Virginia; an educator, a civic leader, and a tireless advocate for fairness. Tonight, I rise for the passing of another individual, Manute Bol, who was laid to rest at the National Cathedral earlier today.

Many know Mr. Bol as the tallest player ever to have played in the NBA. But to those of us who followed issues in Sudan and in Africa, he is a giant for other reasons. He is a giant for his humanitarian work. He is a giant for having stood up for justice and fairness, particularly in Africa's longest-running civil war against the southern Sudanese, where so many Christians and traditionalists have been suffering for so many years.

Too many in our country fight to become famous as an end in itself. Here was an individual of such tremendous character that he used fame as a means to help those less fortunate.

After growing up in Sudan and having a chance to remove himself to the United States, where he could have lived a comfortable life of riches, he chose instead to give everything he had, his money, his time, and his energy, to protect those suffering back in his homeland.

Manute Bol became a hero, not just on the basketball court, but he became a hero to many evangelical Christians, to people of all faiths, to lost boys back in Sudan, and to people all over the world for being a shining example of someone who chose to always stand for justice, a word engraved in the dais behind me, and understanding that as feared as he was as a shot-blocker, he was even more fearless in his own life in standing up. And not just doing the

easy work of writing a check, but always being willing to go back and spend time on the ground, often at great personal risk to his security and to his health, and was even willing to speak out against regimes that were not only enemies of the people of that country, but often of our own.

He was a hero to many of us who looked at the fact that many will look back through history and say, how did we allow 30,000 of God's children to die every day of hunger and preventable disease? Here was a man who not only made this town of Washington proud when he was with the then-Bullets, but all over the country inspired many to say, what can I give, what can I sacrifice, for those who are suffering or not having the blessings that we have?

And he did it all with a tremendous sense of humor. Mr. Bol spent his last few days in my district in Charlottesville, Virginia, at the University of Virginia, and we were honored to have him and so many of his loved ones in for the unfortunate and far too early passing of this great hero.

I hope today people will take a moment not only to say a prayer for him and his family and for all of those in Sudan who continue to suffer, but will take some inspiration from his legacy, of someone who came from very rough circumstances, got to the top of the world, and did nothing but look back to how he could help those less fortunate. He is an inspiration to all of those. He is a giant of a humanitarian. He has been a warrior for justice and fairness, and we honor him today.

AN NCO RECOGNIZES A FLAWED AFGHANISTAN STRATEGY

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. Madam Speaker, I want to share with the House words from George Will. It was a syndicated column that he wrote on the 20th of June of this year. The title is "An NCO recognizes a flawed Afghanistan strategy."

In receipt of a recent email from a noncommissioned officer serving in Afghanistan, he explains why the rules of engagement for U.S. troops are too prohibitive for coalition forces to achieve sustained tactical success.

Receiving mortar fire during an overnight mission, his unit called for a 155 millimeter howitzer illumination round to be fired to reveal the enemy's location. The request was rejected, and I quote, Madam Speaker, "on the grounds that it may cause collateral damage." The NCO says that the only thing that comes down from an illumination round is a cannister, and the likelihood of it hitting someone or something was akin to that of being struck by lightning.

I further read from this article: "Returning from a mission, his unit took casualties from an improvised explo-

sive device that the unit knew had been placed no more than an hour earlier."

I quote again: "There were villagers laughing at the U.S. casualties" and "two suspicious individuals were seen fleeing the scene and entering a home." U.S. forces are no longer allowed to search homes without Afghan National Security Forces personnel present. But when his unit asked the Afghan police to search the house, the police refused on grounds that the people in the house "are good people."

Madam Speaker, Afghanistan is a chaotic situation. As my friend Mr. MCGOVERN said, they have a corrupt government. There is not anything we can do to take a country that has never been a nation to make it a nation.

Madam Speaker, I, along with Congressman JEFF MILLER and Congressman DOUG LAMBORN, have asked the chairman and ranking member of the Armed Services Committee to hold classified hearings on what is called rules of engagement.

□ 1700

I wish I could read this entire article, but I can't because of time. But I want to read the close of George Will's column. And George Will is a conservative. "President Obama has counted on his 2011 run-up to re-election being smoothed by three developments in 2010—the health care legislation becoming popular after enactment, job creation accelerating briskly, and Afghanistan conditions improving significantly."

I further read: "The first two are not happening. He can decisively influence only the third, and only by adhering to his timetable for disentangling U.S. forces from this misadventure."

Madam Speaker, I am on the letter that Mr. MCGOVERN made reference to a while ago. I have Camp Lejeune Marine Base in my district and Cherry Point Marine Air Station. And we're wearing out our military. Madam Speaker, I hope the President will keep his word and have a timetable to get our troops out of Afghanistan.

With that, Madam Speaker, in closing, I would like to ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please in his arms hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. Madam Speaker, I ask God to bless the House and Senate, that we will do what is right in the eyes of God. And I ask God to give wisdom, strength, and courage to President Obama that he will do what is right in the eyes of God. And three times I will say please God, please God, please God, continue to bless America.

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

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

ASKING THE RIGHT QUESTIONS FOR AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. I rise today because when it comes to Afghanistan, we are asking the wrong questions. And with the wrong questions come the wrong answers. Back in December, we asked, Should we send more troops to Afghanistan? We should have been asking, Will a greater military presence make America safer? Then we asked, How can we get millions of pounds of supplies to our troops scattered in remote areas of Afghanistan? We should have been asking, Could getting those supplies to the troops be fueling the very insurgency we are fighting, and is having thousands of U.S. troops stationed throughout Afghanistan making America safer? And now we are asking, Can a new commander in Afghanistan ensure we win the war there? We should have been asking, Is this war winnable, and will it make America safer?

We have to start asking the right questions. The first of these questions is, Where are the terrorists? We have put our blinders on and are so focused on the details of Afghanistan that we are missing the larger picture. The terrorists that we are fighting are no longer only in Afghanistan. They are operating in the ungoverned spaces of Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, Sub-Saharan Africa, and even right here in the United States.

The Christmas Day bomber was from Nigeria. The Times Square bomber was Pakistani American. An increasing number of terror attacks are being plotted right here on American soil. Major Nidal Hasan, who killed 13 people at Fort Hood, Texas, was born in Virginia. An increasing number of extremists from around the world are being connected and motivated by "the virtual Afghanistan" through the Internet.

We are fighting an enemy without borders, and so we must have a strategy without borders. In a world of limited resources, the next question we need to ask is this: How can we best spend our precious tax dollars to make Americans safest? Unfortunately, right now we are allocating most of our resources to Afghanistan, where at most, only 50 to 100 al Qaeda are operating, according to CIA Director Leon Panetta. And every day we read a new report that the billions we are investing are simply flowing to drug lords, corrupt local officials, and even the Taliban.

According to a recent eye-opening report by Subcommittee Chairman Tierney, we learned that the U.S. military is funding a multibillion-dollar protection racket. A good portion of a

\$2.16 billion transportation contract is being paid to corrupt public officials, war lords, and the Taliban to get needed supplies to our troops. We are funding the very insurgency we are fighting. And we recently learned that at least \$3.18 billion in cash has been transferred out of Afghanistan since 2007, mostly to line the pockets of the nation's elite. On top of that, it has also been reported that those same Afghan elite are being shielded from attempts to investigate these cases of corruption.

We simply cannot afford to continue to send billions to Afghanistan only to see it end up in the hands of corrupt officials and the same insurgents we are fighting. We have got to start fighting smarter, not harder, and that starts with asking the right questions. A reassessment of our strategy in Afghanistan is due in December, and one question must be answered: Is this the best way to fight terrorism and keep Americans safe? I fear that with each report of Afghan corruption and each account of terrorism taking root worldwide, the answer to that question is becoming increasingly clear: no.

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from 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.)

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from 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.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Ms. ROSLEHTINEN 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 Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

FINANCIAL REFORM BILL

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, tonight I want to devote extra time to talking about the proposed financial reform bill and the conference committee report that is being worked on this moment that is likely to come before the House later this week. And I wanted to put the discussion tonight into a broader context in hopes that my colleagues will listen and consider the bill to be brought before us.

Let me begin with this statement: bankers hold a very privileged position in our society because in fact they hold the awesome power to create money. Their use of that power can advance our society, or their use of that power can harm us greatly. We are living through a period of great harm. And so we have to ask, When bankers are given power, how much power do we give them and what do we give them power to do?

As we are discussing this this evening, the Financial Services Committee is meeting to take out a proposal that had been a part of the bill that would tax the banks that have done so much harm to us as a society.

It is another example of too much power to too few, especially the few institutions that have hurt our entire Nation. So I rise tonight to offer comments on the so-called regulatory reform conference report, and I want to outline some principles that I hope Members and the American people will consider as this bill is debated later in the week.

One of the key principles that we should seek in trying to correct what is wrong is the type of power that we give to these institutions to create money. Will in fact the power to create money be more broadly distributed across our society, or will the bill concentrate power in the hands of those few banks that have too much power? Will in fact the power to create money and credit accumulation be redistributed to Main Street—to where all of us live—or remain closely held by about six Wall Street and Charlotte-based megabanks? And here are their names: CitiGroup, Goldman Sachs, HSBC, Wells Fargo, Bank of America, Morgan Stanley.

They have a whole lot more power than the people in my community in the financial realm. And why is that? Because chances are, if you talk to your relatives and neighbors, you will find that over half of the money that they are spending to pay for their mortgage or pay for their car loan doesn't go to a local financial institution in the town in which you live. It goes to a distant institution somewhere else that sucks money, sucks wealth, sucks power away from your community and places it somewhere else.

□ 1710

So this is a really threshold question. What does the bill do with the power to create money? It's shocking, but today, two-thirds of the financial assets of this country are held by those six institutions. Before the financial crisis of 2008, they only held a third of the power. Now they have two-thirds of the power. I say that's way too much. That's not a competitive financial system. That's what economists would call an oligopoly, very few having very much and taking it away from the rest of us. So this issue of banking power is critical, and Members, as they read this very long conference report, ought to say, To whom does this devolve power?

Another threshold question is whether the proposed bill will encourage prudent lending or will it allow greater moral hazard by the bill itself pretending to be reform but actually offering the easy money creation of a recent history led by the big banks. What do I mean by that? It used to be when America had a strong middle class, we had a financial system that allowed credit, the creation of money, to be broadly distributed across our country. Probably, to the people in the gallery and people listening on their televisions, you actually knew bankers in

your community that started banks, and you'd have several—dozens of banks locally and there was real credit competition. We've seen all that change as the banks became eaten up by bigger banks and bigger banks yet, and States lost money center banks, and power gravitated to Wall Street and Charlotte, North Carolina, banks.

But in the days when we had really competitive credit in this country, there was a law of our land that said to banks, When you get \$1 in deposit, you can't lend more than \$10. You can't blow money up more than 10 times because, you know what? That's imprudent, and you might make a mistake and, therefore, you have to have very careful underwriting and very careful servicing of those loans. That's all changed.

One of the reasons we're in this financial mess is the Wall Street institutions took a dollar and they blew it up into \$100 where there was no underlying value, there was no way that loan could perform. It would not rise in value if it was a home. Or if it were a commercial loan, it could never produce 100 times more than it was worth at the beginning. So this issue of prudent lending versus moral hazard is an important question in the bill that will be before us.

Thirdly, we have to ask about conflicts of interest in the bill between the credit rating agencies, like Moody's and Standard & Poor's and the banks that employ them to rate them. Will there be a tight fence line that's laid between them or will it simply be finessed? So this issue of "Is conflict of interest really addressed in the bill and shuts the door tight between the rating agencies and the banks, is it sufficient?" Members have to weigh whether it is or not.

Next I would like to turn to derivatives. This is where Wall Street really created money where there's no underlying value. And you can check this in your own community, because now a majority of mortgage loans in this country are actually—the home is not worth as much as the loan is valued at. They call that underwater. They sell overvalued real estate through the derivative instrument and through the way that the loan was leveraged through the bonding of the security. We're all paying the price for this now as home values start to go down, and this year, another 2.4 million Americans appear to be on the verge of losing their homes.

So the question becomes: What kind of margin calls will there be in the bill—capital margin requirements will there be in the bill on derivatives, and how will those derivatives be traded? Will all of them be on exchanges? Will they all be transparent and electronic? What will be exempted? And who will own the exchanges?

From what I hear, it is the same big banks. They're not going to put an exchange in Toledo, Ohio, the largest city that I represent. And this is a big con-

cern because, in fact, if what I've heard, that the capital margins in the bill are 15 to 1, that's a 150 percent increase over what we formally had as the prudent lending rules that existed in banks when we had a solid middle class and a banking system that was functioning for all the people. When it was \$1, you could get \$1 in your bank and you could loan \$10. Now we're seeing the capital margins on derivatives are 1 to 15. Very interesting.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. PERLMUTTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-516) on the resolution (H. Res. 1487) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

FINANCIAL REFORM BILL— Continued

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio may resume.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would like to next turn to the issue of mortgages and the foreclosure rates around this country which are rising in areas such as I represent. Is this bill that is coming out of the Financial Services Committee, in granting all these powers across our financial system, going to do anything to help the American people who are being foreclosed in their homes? You know what the answer is? No. This year we will lose another 2.4 million families.

None of these so-called modification programs are really working, and yet we have a major bill coming to the floor that doesn't address that issue when the very institutions being granted power are the ones that did this to us in the first place. So we should be able to exact from them some type of resolution for the American people who are paying their salaries—literally—by the taxpayer bailout, and yet we're not dealing with the mortgage foreclosure issue.

And why aren't we? Because if you look at who is holding the mortgage today and who is servicing the mortgage, guess what? There's a conflict of interest because over half of the mortgages have second mortgages, and the servicing companies owned by the banks are the same institutions that have a relationship with the banks that hold the second mortgage on the home. So, for example, if J.P. Morgan is servicing your loan but JPMorgan also owns the second mortgage, they have no interest in servicing your loan. And that's going on with all the institutions that I listed earlier. So the bill is silent on the issue of mortgage resolutions, and that is a great tragedy.

Does the bill do anything to even reference those agencies dedicated to fighting the fraud that has crippled our financial system or is the bill silent? The bill is silent. Even though we know we need additional agents at the Department of Justice—and yes, this bill is coming out of the Financial Services Committee—the bill doesn't even have a finding that references the importance of adding financial fraud agents at the Department of Justice, at the SEC, at the FDIC, to go after the wrongdoers because these fraudulent systems were set up at the very highest levels of finance in this country, but the bill remains silent on that.

I mentioned capital margins a little bit earlier. This is really an important issue to get at the question of prudent lending and how much power we grant these institutions and the instruments they create to create money and to check it against the value of the underlying asset. The bill is quite weak on that.

Finally, I would present to my colleagues the question: Does the bill create a truly independent systemic risk council or does it merely politicize risk evaluation through the U.S. Department of Treasury, which has caused such confusion in the markets? Credit has seized up across this country, and Treasury seems to play favorites—always with a bent toward the biggest banks on Wall Street and in Charlotte. So these are threshold questions that the Members have to ask.

Now, one might wonder why I hold these concerns about the financial regulatory reform bill. And the reasons start with the fact that unless we understand how excess has been rewarded and moral hazard has been encouraged inside the financial system, it will happen again, unless we really get at what's wrong and how we've gotten ourselves into this position.

□ 1720

And one of the ways to really understand that is to add up the true cost of the financial crisis we are all living through at this point. A true counting of the cost of the big bank financial crisis to the American people is needed because, unless we understand that, we are on the verge of creating what is called a financial regulatory reform which should aim to prevent similar crises from happening. But we still don't yet have a full accounting of the crisis of 2008 and its causes, and that should really stand as a background to what we do from this point forward.

Almost 2 years ago, I fought against the Wall Street bailout that was called the TARP. I did not vote for it the first time, and I did not vote it for the second time. It gave Wall Street 100 cents on the dollar, when people in my district were being thrown out of their homes, and they were getting zero on the dollar. What's fair about that?

And it wasn't just people in my district. Twenty million Americans, American families—this is not a small

number—are being directly affected, and the real estate values of every single American are being affected by this crisis.

Now, what's coming out of Washington is the orthodox tale being spun by Wall Street's PR firms, that the mega banks are paying us back. Why, they're paying us \$700 billion, which is some of the money that they were given in the fall of 2008, and so the cost to the American taxpayer will be paid back.

Is that really true?

The big banks have narrowed the focus of what is owed back to the American people to what is called the TARP, the Troubled Assets Relief Program, and they're not really talking about the big picture, the economic cost of what they have caused to us, as a society, the real cost of the crisis, the real losses thrust on the American people that go far beyond what is called TARP.

Yes, the American taxpayers need to be paid back for all the damage the Wall Street bankers have caused. But they're taking away the tax in the committee right now, as we're standing here on the floor, to get them to give some of what they are earning back to the American people. That's how much power they have.

We get a true picture of the real cost to the American people as we see millions and millions more of our citizens disgorged out of their homes, while Wall Street's coffers fill up, and they're making greater profits every year. Their bonuses get bigger every year. When Americans are getting pink slips and small businesses can't pay health insurance, there's nothing fair about this playing field.

So tonight I want to shine a light in the very dark corner of where the true cost of the bailout sits. So come and look behind the curtain with me where the wizard is really hiding.

Secretary Geithner, and even Elizabeth Warren, say the banks are paying us back. But all they are paying back is the TARP money, and they're not even paying all of that back. Even if they paid back all \$700 billion, that could not possibly be enough. In fact, there are 12 Treasury programs to bolster Wall Street banks that have cost taxpayers \$727 billion. About half of that is what is being paid back by TARP.

Plus, there are 24 additional programs at the Federal Reserve that assist private banks, and those costs—are you sitting down—\$1.738 trillion dollars. So the total of these federally orchestrated bailouts is \$2.4 trillion, not \$700 billion; \$2.4 trillion and rising. The number is staggering. It's huge.

Wall Street has no intention of paying back \$2.4 trillion to the American people, and no one is holding them accountable, not this Congress, and not the administration.

Now, what has Wall Street done for Main Street? Nothing. All they're doing right now is consolidating their

power, as the bill that comes to us later in the week will do.

Meanwhile, Wall Street big banks are recording record profits and record bonuses last year on the backs of the American people who are struggling without jobs and fighting to keep their homes.

Now, the \$2.4 trillion immediate cost of Wall Street's excesses is expected to rise, and here is why. Treasury has promised unending support, regardless of the dollar amount, for the next 3 years, to two mortgage companies that they took over. They are called Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. They're housing organizations. And the taxpayers are being asked to fill the holes in each institution as both companies continue their death spiral losses.

Already, our taxpayers have been billed \$61 billion on Freddie Mac, and our taxpayers have been billed \$83 billion on Fannie Mae. That's a total, just there, of an additional \$144 billion.

The spiraling bills and costs to our people go far beyond Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. At the heart of the financial crisis is the housing crisis. So one must add in the losses of the Federal Housing Administration, the Veterans Housing Administration, the U.S. Department of Agriculture's housing programs. They are all being tapped to pick up the mistakes of the big banks.

One also has to add the cost to our economy of the decline in the value of your homes and the homes of our neighbors and friends across this country. It affects every single one of our citizens.

And add to that the total cost of all of the unemployment, the loss in earnings that people have suffered, as well as losses that people have suffered in their IRAs and their pension funds. All these losses have resulted from Wall Street's mad money game.

Just Ohio's public pension fund losses alone took a \$480 million hit with the failure of just Lehman Brothers alone. That hole, of all of these accumulated losses that sits at Wall Street's feet, is what it has cost our society.

Now, there's one organization, the Pew Financial Reform Project, that did a report called "The Cost of the Financial Crisis." And it provides some very interesting information. According to Pew, our economy plunged, and I quote, with gross domestic product falling by 5.4 percent and 6.4 percent in the last quarter of 2008 and the first quarter of 2009, the worst 6 months for economic growth since 1958.

And Pew, in their report, created some really great charts that I'm going to discuss this evening. One, that is called "the impact of the crisis on our economy," which means our economy would have grown like this, but, in fact, our economy fell like this. That gap represents huge loss, loss in jobs, loss in wages, loss in wealth.

The Pew brief states, additional negative shock to our economy from the crisis knocked off another 5.5 million jobs, leaving employment at the end of

2009 with 9.5 million jobs lower than the potential of our economy, the anticipated employment, versus what actually happened. And we all know Americans who've lost their jobs. They are actually subsidizing Wall Street with their job loss, with the loss of value in their home. The largest shift of wealth, actually, in American history is going on from Main Street to Wall Street, and Charlotte, and to those six big banks.

□ 1730

These next two charts show the impact of the crisis on household wealth and the impact of the crisis on wages. Both have been damaged severely, and the American people know it. In the district that I represent, our people have suffered this wealth shrinkage. We live it every day. The Pew report states: "American families"—imagine this—"lost \$360 billion in wages and salaries as a result of the weak economy." And the Pew study shows the anticipated wages versus the actual wages.

In addition, the bottom chart shows that the value of families' real estate, which I referenced a little bit earlier, declined sharply over the crisis as well, with a loss of \$5.9 trillion. That was from mid-2007 to March 2009. And a loss of \$3.4 trillion from mid-2008 to March 2009. We have all felt this. We all know this is happening.

Moreover, half the mortgages in our country are now controlled by the big banks. More and more families are sending their mortgage payments directed to Wall Street institutions or to the two institutions located in Charlotte, further moving capital from our local community. Where you would normally pay your mortgage to your local bank or your local credit union, over half those mortgages are flowing off somewhere else, as well now as your car loans. This raids local communities of real money.

The Pew report goes on to say that these wealth losses correspond to more than \$52,900 of loss per household, or \$30,300 per household for the shorter period. In addition, the value of families' equity holdings fell by \$10.9 trillion from the middle of 2007 to the end of March 2009, at a loss of \$97,000 per household. That is real money. That is the loss of your retirement dollars; that's a loss of your real estate. For many families it's the loss of the home itself, lost wages.

Now we are getting a real sense of what Wall Street's false money creation has cost our country. And the question really for Congress is how much do we want to reward the system that yielded us this. Main Street still keeps losing wealth while Wall Street keeps collecting more chips. In fact, we are experiencing the largest transfer of wealth in our country in modern history.

Now, the last chart that I have here talks about the cumulative impact on household wealth from the foreclosure

crisis precipitated by the big banks. With the reduction in our gross domestic product, Americans obviously have lost jobs, wages, and wealth. And as they do that, they cannot hold onto their homes. And we look at some of the projections. This is when the crisis started. You see that Americans were having trouble with foreclosures already, but then it just went down; and it continues to go down here.

We have experienced this steady decline across our country, some areas being hit harder than others. But nobody on Wall Street or in Charlotte banks really seems to care, because modifications, loan modifications aren't being done. And they aren't being done for the reason that I stated earlier, that most of these same big banks, J.P. Morgan, Citigroup, Goldman Sachs, HSBC, Wells Fargo, Bank of America, they hold a lot of the second mortgages on the loans, and they're not willing to work with the servicer to do a principal write-down. That would be the way we would normally resolve a loan on the books in past decades. But that isn't the system that we have today when Wall Street holds the power.

So it's a bleak picture right now for Main Street. And to gain a true picture of the cost of the financial crisis, much more needs to be added to the ledger, not just this little simple discussion they have here saying it's just paying back the Troubled Asset Relief Program, the TARP money. The ledger is much longer than that. And the banks have to pay back more to the American people because TARP doesn't even make a dent in what is actually owed.

One of the most disgusting practices of Wall Street involves their abusive salaries and the bonuses that just keep getting bigger. In 2000, the Standard and Poor's 500 average pay for a CEO on Wall Street was \$13 million every year, \$13 million. By 2007, that had gone up to \$54 million, over \$20 million more. And the average worker in our country at minimum wage makes about \$11,000 a year minimum wage. The average worker makes about \$26,000. And that's as of 2000. And then as of 2007, the minimum-wage worker in our country makes about \$12,000 a year, and the average worker makes about \$31,000. The pay scales are just so out of whack.

CEOs actually made over a thousand times more than someone working minimum wage. So the average wage of a worker in our country is \$32,000; the average wage of the CEOs is about \$9.2 million. We are not even talking in the same league. And I really say to myself if you make the kind of big mistakes that they made, are they really worth that amount of money?

I think that the prudent managers at credit unions in the communities that I represent, our local community bankers, they manage the money much, much better. And that's where we should be placing the power, back in their hands. This bill will not do that.

I really do have a question: Are these big institutions really capable of caring about the American people and about the American Republic? Because they certainly seem hell bent on destroying it. The big banks remain too big; and the crisis enabled them, sadly, to get even bigger and more interconnected. Too big to fail is too big to exist.

I mentioned earlier that the banks before the crisis controlled one-third of the assets in our country. Now they control two-thirds. That means power is moving away from you to someplace far away from you. The concentration of wealth on Wall Street has sucked the lifeblood out of the rest of our economy. Mid-sized and small banks and credit unions are fighting for their lives right now. In fact, 86 more banks have failed this year alone.

Banks are doing more than just banking, the Wall Street ones for sure. They are speculating. This used to not be allowed in our country under an act called the Glass-Steagall Act, which prohibited commercial banks from doing investment, and it prohibited investment firms from taking regular bank deposits. It kept gambling and speculating separate from sound prudent commercial banking. That was until the late 1990s.

In 1999, a bill called the Gramm-Leach-Bliley bill repealed that act and created a new kind of holding company they called a financial holding company. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 4773, the Return to Prudent Lending and Banking Act, which would take the Glass-Steagall separations and carry them beyond the Federal Reserve system to all federally insured depository institutions, including national banks; and require that they separate commercial banking and investment arms, as well as repealing the financial holding company's language from the Gramm-Leach-Bliley act.

The bill before us later this week will not do that. It allows them to conduct this integrated activity under this holding company structure. But separation is what's needed; it is not what will end up being voted on on this floor.

Equally, something called the Volcker rule was watered down in the conference committee. This proposal by American economist and former Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker would have restricted banks from making certain kinds of speculative investments if they are not on behalf of their customers. Volcker has argued that such speculative activity played a key role in the financial crisis of 2007 to 2010, and he is absolutely right. But the conference report that will come before us allows them to keep their hedge funds and their private equity arms up and running. And they can still do some proprietary trading. Do we really want them to do that? Haven't we gone through enough?

Right now Wall Street is choking the life out of our local credit system and

the communities they serve. And let me just give you one example of why it's so difficult for local banks. When the big banks, I call them the big six, made all these mistakes, inside the banking system local institutions, be they banks or credit unions, pay into insurance funds. Well, even if they didn't do anything wrong, they are part of the banking system; and their fees went up. They had to pay more into these insurance funds.

And so some institutions that were paying \$20,000 a year for insurance found their rates going up from \$20,000 to \$40,000 to \$70,000 to \$140,000, and this year \$700,000, both credit unions and banks in the community that I represent, to shore up the national insurance fund because of the losses of the big banks.

□ 1740

What's fair about that?

In my hometown of Toledo, Ohio, this week there was a report that talks about one of our community development credit unions being hurt, and they're being hurt all across our country because these fees are being placed on them even when they didn't do anything wrong. They simply can't earn enough to afford to pay these higher fees. Who's going to win in that game? The very six big institutions that have been rewarded again, and those at the local level trying so hard to hang on are being hurt. The little guys cannot expand, and they can't hire or lend more since revenue has to go to insuring their deposits, and they have to send that here to Washington and they can't lend it out. That's why credit has seized up across our country.

A local bakery said to me the other day, MARCY, I want to add three employees. I want to get a loan locally so that I can add some equipment. I can't get a loan. I said I know exactly why and I know right where the money is, but I can't get to it because it's up on Wall Street and, frankly, I don't want Wall Street making loans to our local banks. I want local banks to make loans to local businesses.

Oh, and by the way, when credit at these small banks and credit unions is seized up and they get in trouble, what's been going on is the big banks have been coming in and buying them up. When they can't make it anymore, they just buy up their deposit bases. So, in coming to work, going out to the airport this week to come back to Washington, I saw a sign go down, National City Bank in Ohio. The sign came down. Another sign went up called PNC out of Pittsburgh, and we are now owned by some institution far, far away from us.

According to the L.A. Times on June 26, 2010, it stated that the proposed reform bill won't help protect small banks nor keep competition alive in our banking system. A return to prudent banking would address this concern. Reinstating and strengthening Glass-Steagall would move our financial system to a more competitive

mode. The bill that's proposed, from everything I know about it, will not do that.

I wanted to reference a report from Bloomberg Businessweek that has two sentences at the beginning of the article that are important, and I quote: "Legislation to overhaul financial regulation will help curb risk-taking and boost capital requirements. What it won't do is fundamentally reshape Wall Street's biggest banks or prevent another crisis." Well, if it can't do that, why would I want to vote for it?

So I want to ask my colleagues this: Does the proposed bill make the necessary changes to prevent the financial crisis of 2008? If it can't, why vote for it? Too many experts don't think it can. Look at your own communities and ask: For whom is our financial system working? When you pay your mortgage or your car loan, where do you send your money? If it isn't to your own community, is it to some distant player somewhere? Do they really care about you? If you're a small business and you're trying to expand your business—and that's the only place in our society creating any jobs right now—why should they get their loan from far away? Why shouldn't it come from an institution close to them?

This morning on the Marketplace Morning Report produced by American Public Media, Bill Radke was interviewing Henry Blodget, editor-in-chief of the Business Insider, on the subject of the financial regulatory reform bill. Mr. Radke stated, "You are one of those observers who believes that even with these new rules, we are at risk of another global crisis. What might that crisis look like?"

And Mr. Blodget responded, "I think the reason that people are saying that is that if you took this legislation and you enacted it in 2005, it would not have prevented the crisis we just had."

Well, if it can't prevent the crisis we just had, what are we doing? What are we about here? So Blodget said, if we enacted the bill that we are going to vote on in 2005, it would not have prevented the crisis we faced in 2008. This certainly can't be real financial regulatory reform. The bill doesn't appear to encourage prudent credit accumulation. It does not allow for that power to be devolved to Main Street.

The bill allows financial power to create wealth, the bankers' awesome power, to be closely held in a few Wall Street and Charlotte-based megabanks. The bill does not address the business model of credit rating agencies or how interwoven these nongovernmental agencies are with the institutions they rate.

The bill does not require that all derivatives be traded through transparent exchanges. The bill does not adequately support both agencies dedicated to finding and fighting fraud in our financial system, and it really doesn't do anything to address the continuing mortgage foreclosure hemorrhage, the crisis going on across our

country. So, if it doesn't do that, why are we just nipping at the edges?

Sadly, the so-called bill seems all too often, in the end, to support the very same big banks and not the American people and the communities in which we live, in the Main Street that all of us are sworn to represent.

The New York Times ran an editorial last week on derivatives, and I really want to reference it because it stated the following: "This is arguably the most important issue for the big banks because real reform will crimp their huge profits from derivative dealmaking."

That's where they take a dollar and turn it into \$35 or a dollar and turn it into \$100. That's gambling, actually. It's not banking; it's gambling.

"It is also arguably the most important issue for the public. The largely unregulated, multitrillion-dollar market in derivatives fed the bubble, intensified the bust, and led to the bailout. Unreformed, it will do so again."

The New York Times article says, "The final bill must ensure that derivatives are traded on transparent exchanges and processed through third-party clearinghouses to guarantee payment in case of default. That would end the opacity that masks the size and risk of derivative deals, like those that caused the bailout of American International Group," AIG. "But to be effective the new rules must be broadly applied."

Another Wall Street expert told a small group of Members of Congress that all derivatives should be openly marketed with transparency on exchanges, and if an institution creates an instrument that is too complex to go through such an open and transparent process, that institution should be subject to higher, in fact, extremely high, capital standards. The bill really doesn't do that.

The amendment offered by Senator BLANCHE LINCOLN in the other body would have forbidden any banks receiving Federal support, such as deposit insurance, from engaging in the trading of swaps. If the amendment had not been weakened, it could have resulted in banks having to spin off their swap businesses, but it seems like it's business as usual in Washington. The amendment was weakened and too many exceptions exist.

Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley, Bank of America, Wells Fargo, Citigroup, and their U.S. colleagues can continue to trade derivatives that are used to specifically hedge the risk that they are undertaking, as well as still being able to trade interest rates and foreign exchange swaps.

For other types of nonstandard instruments, like some credit default swaps, the banks have 2 years to move that business to a subsidiary which is capitalized separately, and some people say there's even language in the bill that would allow them up to 15 years to try to meet some sort of standard. Well, you can't really call that reform.

□ 1750

Bloomberg Businessweek reported last Friday, "U.S. commercial banks held derivatives—" get this—"with the notional value of \$216.5 trillion in the first quarter, of which 92 percent were interest rate or foreign exchange derivatives, according to the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency."

It is not a small amount of money, and very few institutions hold the power to trade them. There are five U.S. banks with the biggest holdings of derivatives, and you probably already know the answer. JPMorgan Chase, Goldman Sachs, Bank of America, Citigroup, and Wells Fargo hold \$209 trillion, or 97 percent of the total, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency said.

You know, when you keep running into the same rhinos, you ought to start recognizing them out there. What is interesting is these very same companies are not doing mortgage modifications through their servicers across our country. So what is allowed in the bill accounts for 92 percent of the held derivatives, and our five biggest mega banks control nearly all of that 92 percent.

So who is this bill helping? Not only are the numbers staggering, but if this is as true as I think it is, did the bill really do anything about derivatives?

With essentially, if not every, commercial end user exempted, did we really do anything to restructure the financial system to avoid letting derivatives create such exposure for an institution that is too big to fail in that we, the government, representing the people of the United States—and you, the American taxpayer—must pay hundreds of billions of dollars to prevent its demise?

So I say to my colleagues: Read the bill. Perhaps read my comments. In the end, ask yourselves the question I began with:

Which bankers do you believe should hold the awesome power to create money? Which bankers have been prudent in their practices? As this bill is debated, do we increase their power or do we decrease their power?

If all we do is abdicate more power to JPMorgan, Citigroup, Goldman Sachs, HSBC, Wells Fargo, Bank of America, and Morgan Stanley, have we really served the American people?

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

THE BUDGET, OUR DEBT AND THE DEFICIT

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I also would like to thank and congratulate the previous speaker for her

outstanding summary of some of the issues that will be facing this House later this week. It is, as she said, a bill that will enhance big banking at the expense of small community banking. Her hard work on this issue is appreciated on both sides of the aisle. Thank you very much to the gentlelady for that excellent summary of the bill. There are so many issues about which, if we could work together on a bipartisan basis, I feel we could come up with better legislation.

What I intend to talk about this evening is an area about which we have not had much bipartisan dialogue. That is, of course, over the budget, our debt and the deficit.

It is official now. We will not have a budget this year. This will be the first time since the Budget Act of 1974 was passed, creating the system we have for budgeting and for making expenditures now, that we will not have had a budget. It is the very first time since 1974. Every year, the House has passed a budget. I believe, almost every year, the Senate has passed a budget. There were years when they haven't agreed, but every year, the House met its obligation and passed a budget.

You know, the current chairman of the House Budget Committee, who, of course, is a member of the majority party, has said, if you can't budget, you can't govern. I couldn't agree more. If you can't budget, you can't govern. We are not going to budget this year. We, therefore, are not going to be governing this year in a manner that the American people expect and deserve, so it is a source of tremendous disappointment for me.

We were also told and learned last week that we will see none of the major appropriations bills before the November election. That is an indication to me that the majority party recognizes that it has overspent for 18 months, that the American people are tired of the overspending, that they are zeroed in on the debt and the deficit, and that they are not going to take it anymore.

There are ideas that the Republican Party has had to reduce the debt and the deficit in order to bring down the size and scope of the Federal Government and to divorce ourselves from the current strategy of big government, big unions, big business. Among the big businesses are those that the gentlelady from the majority party, from Ohio, just talked about in the last half an hour. Always supporting bigger government, bigger business, bigger unions takes away from our communities, which is where the creativity is, which is where the desire to create jobs and families and businesses and households and churches and charitable institutions really grows and thrives. It deletes those kinds of opportunities around our country. It discourages those kinds of opportunities around our country.

Our country is truly at a crossroads now.

We have seen very different reactions on the part of the people in, say, Greece, which is experiencing enormous financial problems—huge debts and deficits. The people there who are demonstrating, rioting and who are out on the streets are those who receive the benefits of the Government of Greece. They are those who are living off the very, very small private sector, which is trying to fund this behemoth of a government with all kinds of social services and entitlement programs that they can't afford because the programs and services are unsustainable, which is sending—plummeting—their country into the kinds of debts and deficits that have gotten them into such deep financial trouble.

All of the world is horribly concerned.

Take that image and compare it to the image of the United States in the last 18 months. You had the so-called Tea Partiers who were out on April 15. They were protesting big spending, protesting big government and protesting later in the year this enormous health care bill that Congress passed over their objections. These are the kinds of people who are up in arms in America and who are out demonstrating and protesting. They are the taxpayers. They are the people who want less government—smaller government—and more efficient government. They are the people who want business to be more accountable and who want government to be more transparent. These are the people who are protesting in the United States, and these are the people who we should be listening to.

In fact, I want to congratulate one Governor who was listening, who has listened and who did a miraculous thing in the last few months. He is the new Governor of the State of New Jersey, Governor Christie.

Governor Christie took over from a big-spending administration. He inherited a big-spending legislature in New Jersey. Yet he ran on an agenda that resonated with the people of New Jersey. He ran on an agenda to cut the debt in the State of New Jersey, and he has done so. He brought forward budgets that cut the government.

The majority in the legislature there said, Oh, my gosh. We can't do that.

So he said, Here is my budget. I am going to make these cuts, and I am going to make these cuts unless you submit to me a budget that is balanced.

Last night, very, very late—in the wee hours of the morning—that very legislature passed Governor Christie's budget. The State of New Jersey, in the signing of that budget by Governor Christie, has become among the most fiscally responsible States in the United States.

It is a miraculous story. It is a story of the American people—in their case, the people of New Jersey—winning out over big government, special interests, entitlement programs we can't afford, and giving new life to small business, individual initiative, freedom.

□ 1800

It is a great example of what this Congress can do come November.

I am going to put up a couple of charts that I want you to see.

This first one is about the changing priorities of this country with regard to spending over time, starting in the 1970s and moving into our current decade.

As you can see, during the late 1960s and early 1970s, the major portion of our budget, almost 50 percent of our Federal budget, was spent on defense. Obviously, this was at the height of and then followed by the waning of the war in Vietnam. This is when the draft was no longer in effect. Ever since then, defense spending has consumed a smaller and smaller part of our Federal budget. It is the brown line. So it is up a little bit with the war on terror, but compared to our other spending, it is still very, very steady, and within the realm it has been over the last 20 years.

Now let's look at Medicare and Medicaid. This is the red line. This is the line that started out as a very small 5 percent component of our budget in the 1970s and has been steadily climbing, and is climbing still to the point where Medicare and Medicaid are going to choke out all other spending if we project it forward.

The two in the middle, Social Security, which has been tremendously flat and pretty steady, actually is going to be funded until the 2030s. But when we hit the 2030s, we are going to see a 25 percent reduction in the benefits paid to those who have paid into Social Security, another problem this Congress needs to address on a bipartisan basis. Then the other, of course, is non-defense discretionary, which over time has followed a wave in between.

So the big changes are the decline in defense spending as a portion of the Federal budget and the massive replacement of this spending in Medicare and Medicaid.

Now, one could say that is a good thing, and indeed it is, that we are not having to spend as big a portion of our Federal budget on defense. But the scary part is that the growth in entitlement programs, Medicare and Medicaid, is going to be unabated and is going to crowd out other investments in our country, because we are going to have to, in addition to all the other things we do, debt finance these programs.

When we debt finance and are paying interest out of every year's budget for interest on the debt, we are crowding out other investments, and by crowding out other investments in our economy, we are marching down the road towards Greece, towards Italy, towards Spain, towards the kind of problems the U.K. has been having, but is changing course on and is going to address, and we wish them the best in those efforts.

Now, where did the money go? These are components of the 2009 deficit

growth in billions. Here is the Federal budget deficit, the places where the Federal deficit tripled in one fiscal year as tax revenues fell and Congress pumped out large sums to stabilize financial institutions and stimulate the economy, creating a tripling in the Federal deficit in one fiscal year. Furthermore, the policies we have enacted will double the debt in five years and triple the debt in 10 years. So the situation that we put ourselves in in the last 18 months creates dire circumstances.

So the components of the 2009 deficit growth occurred due to lower tax receipts, and that is part of our recession, and stimulus, half in spending and half in lower taxes. The Republicans, quite frankly, had a stimulus package that would have created twice as many jobs with half the size of a stimulus, and doing it by infrastructure spending through private sector investment.

The next item, bailouts for financial institutions and the auto industry, bailouts for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Unfortunately, we are not addressing the structural problems with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac in the financial reform bill, in the conference committee, which has concluded its efforts. Then we have unemployment benefits due to the recession which have been running steadily until recently. Then the remainder is a collection of aggregation of other spending. So that explains how our Federal budget has trended the way it has.

This was before we passed ObamaCare. This budget was passed before the health care reform bill, which adds a huge other component to the debt and the deficit. We know that that bill, if you take the years 2010 to 2020, is going to cost over \$1 trillion, half of which is going to come out of cuts in Medicare and the other half out of tax increases. But we are only paying out, as you will recall, six or seven years of benefits for 10 years of taxes and Medicare cuts.

When you combine the first 10 years, where we are actually collecting taxes, cutting spending on Medicare, and combine that 10 years with 10 years of benefits, we are talking about a deficit of \$2.4 trillion, and that would be what it would be going forward.

In other words, we created a program that we knew had a long-term structural deficit that was enormous and did it knowingly, leaving for future generations the tough decisions about how to pay for it.

Creating an entitlement that you know you can't pay for and that creates structural deficits for our children kicks the can down the road to a generation that deserves to inherit a better country. No wonder when you poll the American people, they will say that we inherited a better America from our parents, but our children will not be inheriting as high a standard of living from us as we inherited from our parents. That is unconscionable.

I have been joined this evening by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has made his career in health care and may wish to comment further on that or anything else. I am so pleased you have chosen to join me this evening, and I yield the time to you.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentlelady from Wyoming for hosting this very important hour on this very important need.

The number one issue right now, as you have very appropriately pointed out, is the growing and massive Federal debt. Independents in this country overwhelmingly identify the debt as being the biggest threat to the future well-being of this country.

As I travel around, and the fact that the Democratic majority has not even introduced a budget, the first time since 1976, I raise the question: America is really at a critical crossroads in history. We have a choice. We have a choice to continue the path of taxing, and spending, and borrowing, and the lack of transparency that will result in a choice between that and accountable government. So America really has a choice between becoming Greece or New Jersey.

□ 1810

And Greece, we have all witnessed the fiscal meltdown and chaos that resulted in that country as a result of the massive social spending and out-of-control government. And we've all seen most recently in the Garden State, with the election of accountable and transparent and fiscally responsible leadership, where that State has really started to put its house in order. So this is a little hard for someone who is a lifetime Keystone Stater to say I would choose New Jersey when it came between those two.

We have confirmed that the Federal budget plan for fiscal year 2011 really has been canceled. The cause? Washington Democrats' out-of-control spending spree. This is really a betrayal of hardworking American taxpayers. The House of Representatives has passed a budget every year since the Congressional Budget Act took effect in fiscal year 1976. To be completely accurate, there have been times under Democrats and Republicans when a finished budget was not passed by both Houses, but this is the first time that the House of Representatives has simply decided there's too much peril for the American public to see the numbers that they are pursuing. So they're going to stop the game before the coin is even tossed. We have more than \$13 trillion in debt and a Presidential budget that puts the deficit at \$1.6 trillion and spends \$3.8 trillion. Even the Fed chairman, Ben Bernanke, said this debt is "unsustainable."

Now, faced with similar challenges in our personal budget—and that's something we families do around this country each and every day—there would be a talk around the kitchen table and the children's allowances would be cut,

along with many other luxuries. It is that discussion that the majority party in this Chamber really seems only willing to have under the theory that if they ignore it, it'll go away, or frankly, if they ignore it, maybe the American people won't notice the massive amount of debt that has been accrued over these past 18 months. Unfortunately, the debt will not go away. It is a legacy of debt for our children and grandchildren. And the pain will be transferred to those future generations in the hopes that, frankly, they'll have the guts to face reality. So I thank the gentlelady for hosting this hour on a very, very important topic.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman for joining me. As some of you are aware, AmericaSpeakingOut.com is a Web site where all Americans can go to weigh in about their views on the American debt, deficit, and about ideas to reduce the size and scope of government, and right-size it, make it more efficient, and anything else you have in mind about shaping the activities of this Congress. We very much want to hear from you. AmericaSpeakingOut.com gives you a chance to share your ideas with Members of Congress. And we very much commend it to your attention.

I have a bill that I'd like to discuss that I'd like you to put in a plug for on AmericaSpeakingOut.com, and that is a bill called the Federal Workforce Reduction Act. It is a bill that I'm sponsoring and that I've used this information to help explain.

This year in Congress, when you add up all the spending we've done in the last 18 months, the great growth sector in terms of employment has been government. In fact, when we passed the stimulus bill—and we were told that if we pass the stimulus bill it will keep unemployment under 8 percent, and employment since this has been hovering at around 9.7 percent and as high as 10, 10.1 percent. During that time, 9 million private sector jobs were lost. The entrepreneurial economy lost jobs, and yet the only sector that grew was government.

Government employment has increased by 15 percent during the time when 9 million jobs were lost in the private sector. And this shows you what is happening to Federal Government employment. It actually was pretty high back in 1993, but over the decade of the nineties it declined. Then it experienced right after the 9/11 bump in employment associated with homeland security, it experienced tremendous stability in 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007.

And then you get to 2008 and 2009 and then 2010, where it goes off the charts. It shows that Federal Government employment has absolutely skyrocketed. And further, Federal Government employment has grown in terms of the salaries that are paid. They far exceed average salaries in the private sector. Even here at the U.S. Department of Education in Washington, the average

employee makes twice as much as the average American teacher. Imagine that. The people here in Washington are making twice as much—the bureaucrats dealing with education issues—making twice as much as the classroom teacher in America who's actually teaching the students.

So for these reasons I sponsored the Workforce Reduction Act. And this bill does a couple of things: one, it freezes Federal Government employment; and, secondly, for every year we're running a deficit, we will take vacant positions. When someone retires or someone moves to another job, their position is vacated. Those positions then will go into an employment pool and agencies will have to seek reinstatement of that position so they can hire someone into that position from the employment pool. They'll have to justify it and they'll have to compete for those positions because for every two people who leave their job and vacate a position, only one position survives in the pool, thereby reducing the number of Federal employees through attrition.

We're not firing anybody. We're doing it through attrition. When people retire or leave their job, the number of Federal employees would diminish. The exempt agencies from this plan are Homeland Security, Defense, and Veterans Affairs. Every other agency is subject to it. And this will continue for as long as we run deficits.

The fact that Federal employment has grown by 15 percent when the private sector lost 9 million jobs is just completely unconscionable. It is in furtherance of the big government, big unions, big business agenda that is being advanced through this Congress in the last 18 months, when we should be having small, efficient government. We should be encouraging small business where the job creation is. And we should be encouraging union membership in small relationships that can deal directly with employers on the job site rather than the huge national organizations that have their tentacles in every aspect of every bill that we pass.

So please go to AmericaSpeakingOut.com and weigh in on our thoughts.

We have been joined now by the gentleman from Florida, who is also a distinguished member of this conference. I will yield time to the gentleman from Florida. Thank you for joining us.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Let me first thank you for bringing us together tonight to talk about such an important issue. The news recently has been full of pictures of the G-20 meeting, where the leaders from around the world got together to speak about the economic situation in the world.

And it was rather, I thought, ironic that you had on one side the Canadian leader, plus many European Union leaders, talking about how we have to control spending, we have to control debt and how the world economies are

going, frankly, are on a path towards not being sustainable. And on the other side, pretty much alone, you have the President of the United States, who continues to insist that we need to spend more money and borrow more money in order to have the economy prosper.

Now, we know how well that has worked so far. Think about it. We had the TARP bailout of Wall Street. We had then the so-called "stimulus." And the gentlewoman from Wyoming just spoke about the results of that almost trillion-dollar borrowed money that the Federal Government took from the American people, from small businesses, from families, to spend it because they said they promised that it was going to fix the employment situation and that unemployment would be capped at 8 percent and 3-plus million jobs will be created.

And we know that the only place where jobs have been created, as the gentlewoman just said and showed so eloquently, was government jobs. Yet, private sector jobs have not been created. But wealth has been taken away from families and small businesses in order to spend and misspend and to waste that money.

□ 1820

And then we had the second part of TARP, the second expenditure of TARP, and then we had the Son of Stimulus. We're continuously told that, Well, yes, that's really helping, and it's worked.

You know, how do you know if what you're being told isn't quite accurate? Well, just listen to what they're telling you. The President himself stated that if the so-called stimulus were to pass that unemployment would be capped at 8 percent, would not reach 8 percent. Those are his numbers. That was his benchmark—not mine, not yours, not the gentleman from Pennsylvania's benchmark. That benchmark was established by the President. He established what he said was going to happen, and yet we all know what has happened.

Unemployment is way above that. Job creation has been dismal. We've actually lost millions of jobs after the stimulus passed, and yet we see our President in front of the world saying, number one, it's worked and that we need to do more of it, as if we're living in some weird time warp. Does he and does the leadership in the House not understand what's going on in Europe right now with Greece, for example, where Greece has had to get bailed out by the European Union because, frankly, their debt is so high and their expenditures are so out of control that they've had to bail them out? Do they not understand what's going on in Spain now where everybody says that they are the next one to, frankly, implode economically because their debt is so high, because their expenditures are so high?

It is my understanding that the President of the United States even

called Spain and said, Hey, you have to cut back on expenses. And yet here he pretends as if we live in Disney World, that you can continue to spend people's money—let me restate that. It's not people's money anymore. It's borrowed money—and that there are no consequences, that it's fake, that the words of just about every economist that says this is unsustainable are just, frankly, not true.

So, by the way, if that were not bad enough, where have they spent this hard-earned money? Where has it gone? Now, if I were to tell you all that—I don't know. Pick your government. Pick a government, a neighboring government. I don't know, Guatemala, Argentina, wherever you want. If we said, Hey, you know, the administration there just established a Web page, and the Web page cost \$5 million. We would all go, Oh, my gosh. What have they done? There's a word for that. It's not "waste." I mean, if that happened someplace else, we don't call it waste. We call it corruption. If we see that some government, some President has created a Web page for \$5 million, we'd look at it and we'd say, Something strange is happening here.

The Web page that was created by this administration to track the failed stimulus didn't cost \$1 million. No, it didn't cost \$5 million. The Web page cost \$18 million. Now, you know, I ask the American people, Have you ever heard of an \$18 million Web page? Does that sound like efficient use of your money? Does that make any sense? So you are wondering why it hasn't created jobs. Well, because the money has been wasted. And I am not going to use another word for it, a word that we would use if it happened someplace else. I'm not going to use the word "corruption" for an \$18 million Web page. But it sure smells funny, and it sure shows you that the money is wasted, and it sure demonstrates why it has not created jobs. And we could go on and on and on and on about money going to campaign consultants, stimulus money going to campaign consultants.

And what is the answer? Is the answer of this administration, of this Congress, "Let's take a step back. Let's look at what we've done. It hasn't worked. Our debt is unsustainable, and everybody has told us that"? When Europe tells us that our debt is unsustainable, that becomes pretty evident and pretty obvious; right? When they tell you that we're spending too much money, the Europeans, for God's sake, tell the United States that we're spending too much money and we are incurring too much debt, that should make us at least take a step back. Let's take a step back and figure out it hasn't worked. The administration has spent all this money. They said it would keep unemployment at 8 percent. It is now way over that. They said it was going to create 3.5 million jobs. That hasn't happened. The only jobs created were bureaucrats in Washington.

So you would think they would take a step back and say, okay, the American people have suffered enough through this irresponsibility. Let's do something different. No. They continue to do more of the same thing. They continue to double up, because it's not their money. It's the American people's money. So they say, Let's just double up on it. We wasted all this money and it hasn't created jobs? We're going to do more. We're going to waste more of the taxpayers' money. It is, frankly, totally unacceptable.

I just want to throw out some numbers, and I will yield back. I want to thank the gentlewoman for allowing me to have this time.

What's the problem here? Look, in 2010, the President's budget, what he submitted—and, by the way, Congress did—was \$3.6 trillion. That's the budget that was submitted. Here's the problem: The revenues for that year were \$2.4 trillion. It doesn't require a NASA rocket scientist to understand what the problem is. But that wasn't enough. This year, the President submitted a budget—the President did—and he submitted a budget that's \$3.8 trillion. But here lies the problem: The estimated revenues for this year—remember, \$3.8 trillion. That's what he submitted after he did it last year again, and all of the reasons why last year was a special year and all the past sins and that's why it had to be done last year. Well, now, this year he submits a budget for \$3.8 trillion. But what are the revenue estimates for this year? \$2.6 trillion.

Now, if that was a company or if someone did that at home, they would be bankrupt. And that's precisely where this is leading the greatest, most prosperous, most generous, most decent nation on this planet. And that's not acceptable. That's why even the Europeans are saying, What are you guys doing? And not only are they doing this, but we have results to show how well it's worked. It has been a dismal failure—not because I say so. Because the President established the benchmark, and under the President's own benchmark it has been a dismal failure. There are consequences of this misspending of money. There are consequences for this debt.

I just want to leave you with one last number. Just in the interest payments alone—not the principal—to pay the interest payments by the year 2020, the American people are going to have to pay almost \$1 trillion just in interest payments. That's the President's budget. That's what they claim is going to be the expensing, the cost, the numbers that are going to have to be paid by the American people just to pay the debt that they are incurring.

□ 1830

You know, I want to thank the gentlewoman for bringing us here today to explain, to talk about, this is not monopoly money. This is real. This is our children's and our grandchildren's fu-

ture. This is the future of this, the greatest country on Earth. And we can take a step back. We can salvage the situation. We can create jobs. We can stop this path towards bankruptcy. But we need to do so now.

And the reason the Democratic Congress is not even going to present, it seems, not even going to try to attempt, it looks like, to pass a budget out of the House is because these numbers—they're not my numbers, they're the official numbers—and they must be embarrassed to show the American people the truth so, therefore, they're not even going to present a budget.

I haven't been here that long. But, in the time that I've been here, that's never happened. It's never happened. Not even attempting to present a budget because the numbers are so dismal under their watch. This is not inherited. Under their watch the numbers are so dismal that they don't even want the American people to see those numbers.

Well, you know something? The American people are wise. They're not dumb. You can try to hide the facts, but the facts are there. You can try to not show the numbers, but the numbers are there.

So, again, I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak to the American people, directly to the American people, as to what their government is doing with their money, with their children's money, with their grandchildren's money and with the future of our Nation. I'm sure that we'll be able to reverse it, but we need to start now.

Thank you. I yield back.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman from Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for his very succinct summary of why we haven't seen a budget and why we're not going to see a budget this year. And the answer, of course, is that it is so out of balance, we are spending so much more than we take in that there is a level of embarrassment. Instead of cutting spending, instead of even making a beginning to cutting spending, the answer of the majority party is to not present a budget at all.

I return, again, to the Budget Committee chairman's own words: If you can't budget, you can't govern.

I understand that there used to be, within the Congress, a committee that was, in essence, a counterbalance to the Appropriations Committee. Since the Appropriations Committee spends money, that there was actually a committee that would determine where we could cut, what Federal agencies could be eliminated, which ones could be downsized, which ones could be more efficient. And maybe that's an idea that needs to be resurrected. If you believe that, please go to Americaspeakingout.com and let us know. Weigh in on these ideas. Give us your creative ideas.

I want to especially encourage people who have served in their state legislature to go to Americaspeakingout.com.

States are the great incubators of good ideas. States try out ideas that give the Federal Government a chance to see whether they work or fail. New Jersey's doing that right now. New Jersey's taking the lead. New Jersey's cutting spending. New Jersey's doing it at the request of their constituents. The people in New Jersey are once again in control of the government in New Jersey. And if it works in New Jersey, it's certainly worth a try here in Washington.

One other point I'd like to make that the gentleman from Florida also hit on, and that is, when we're borrowing money from other countries, and have to pay it back with these extraordinary numbers, such as \$1 trillion, every time we borrow we're putting ourselves in the position where we have to pay higher interest.

In the last month, the U.S. Treasury issued some Treasury bonds, and that issue went undersubscribed, which means there were not enough buyers to buy U.S. Treasuries at the interest rate at which they were being offered.

Now, the alternative we have when that occurs is to raise the interest rates because, for heavens sakes, we're on track to need the money, to have to borrow the money. The Treasury can't come back to Congress and say, we couldn't sell them at that interest rate. You all are going to have to cut. That's not the Treasury's job.

The Treasury's job is to issue U.S. treasuries to cover our debt. But when nobody will buy them at the rate for which they're being offered, their only alternative is to raise the interest rate and issue them again.

So the borrower, the purchaser of those debts gets a higher return, and they get it from people who are paying taxes. So more and more of your tax dollars is going to go to pay interest on the national debt.

Problem is, as the gentleman from Florida pointed out, we're not taking in enough money this year to pay what we're going to spend this year. We didn't take in enough money last year to pay what we spent last year. We're not going to take in enough money next year, under current projections, to pay what we're spending next year. And on and on and on.

This is a structural deficit, in other words. There's no end in sight to spending more than we're taking in every year. The only way to fill the gap is to borrow more money. And when we can't sell those debts at an interest rate that will attract buyers, we have to raise the interest rate to attract more buyers. The circle is vicious. It is ugly. And the American people are going to foot the bill, especially the young people that are coming up. And they don't want this on their tab. We're hearing from younger Americans now. They don't want this on their tab. I don't want this on their tab either.

I yield again to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I think you just brought up, frankly, something that's very scary, should be very scary to us. And you mentioned what happened there is—that's how it started in Europe. That's how it started in Greece, and eventually it basically started to collapse, which is why then the European Union had to bail out Greece, and then they had to talk to Spain about not spending any money, about cutting their spending, et cetera. And so when we talk about how—and not us, when economists—around the country, now even around the world, and leaders around the world say it's unsustainable, it's because that's where we are headed if we don't change that.

But you know what adds insult to injury to me?

I represent the great State of Florida. I will tell you it's probably the greatest place to live in the entire planet.

We have a lot of senior citizens, many of whom depend on Medicare for example. Well, we know that Medicare will be going insolvent in I think just, you know, a handful of years—2016 or 2017 is when it goes insolvent. So here we are borrowing and borrowing and spending and spending and borrowing and spending. Are we using that money? Is the Speaker and is the President using that money to shore up Medicare for our senior citizens? Are they using that money to shore up Social Security for our seniors?

No. They've now created a new entitlement that we know we can call the mother of all entitlements. So not only are they not solving the problems that we have, they're creating new entitlements, which is going to add to the fiscal problem that we're already in. So not only are they borrowing and spending more, they're doing so recklessly, while not dealing with the issues that we all know, everybody knows we have to deal with. So that just adds insult to injury.

And when you mentioned that about remember what happened in Greece, it got to the point where then the market said, we're not going to—your debt is so high that we're not going to buy it unless you pay much higher interest rates. And it gets to the point where then it becomes this vicious circle where all you're doing is paying interest, you know, like people get into with credit cards. This administration, this President are doing exactly the same thing to our country. And the American people are starting to understand.

World leaders are starting to tell the United States, slow down. What are you guys doing?

And yet, this Congress, and our President who, I guess—I don't know—I just don't exactly understand what they're looking at. They're looking at the same numbers that we're looking at. And the things they've done have been dismal failures. I mentioned obviously the stimulus.

But let's talk about one more. How about the billions of dollars that the taxpayers dished out to the car companies, automobile companies? Remember, in order for them to not go bankrupt, all right? So what happened? They didn't go bankrupt? No, they actually did go bankrupt, but after the taxpayer, who's struggling, by the way, and they're losing their jobs, and there's no Federal bailout for them, and they're losing their homes, and there's no Federal bailout for them. No, no, no. Take their money to bail out the auto companies because we can't let them go bankrupt. And they went bankrupt anyway.

□ 1840

So I don't know. That's not a failure? Only in Washington do you say I'm going to spend all this money and it's going to stop unemployment from going above 8 percent, and then it goes way above 8 percent and they don't call that failure. Only in Washington. Only in Washington do you take taxpayers' hard-earned money, say that you are going to stop these auto companies from going bankrupt, and then they go bankrupt anyway and you say, oh, we got to do more of the same. It's nuts. It's insane.

But everybody has realized, everybody, including world leaders—again I repeat myself, and then I will stop—but when you have world leaders of France saying to the United States of America you are borrowing and spending too much, if that's not a wake-up call, then what will it take for this President and this Congress to wake up? And you are right, that's why they are not presenting a budget, because their numbers are frankly unsustainable. The American people would go ballistic if they saw their proposals. But you know something? The American people know what's going on anyway. Thank you for your time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman from Florida. Mr. DIAZ-BALART has been a powerful spokesman for responsible Federal budgeting.

I now once again would like to recognize my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), who will be talking further about this issue. And I want to remind people, please do go to AmericaSpeakingOut.com. Also go to the whip's Web site, Mr. CANTOR, who has YouCut on it. Or you can go to the Republican Conference Web site. YouCut is the icon you want to click so you too can vote on ways to cut the Federal budget.

We have identified half a trillion dollars' worth of cuts, and we want to know whether you think they are the right cuts. So please go to YouCut in addition to AmericaSpeakingOut.com.

And again I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

You know, there is a very important number here that the American people need to identify with, and it's a num-

ber that brings it home. It's a number that's very personal in terms of personal responsibility, and that is over \$40,000 per person. That's the amount of debt that each man, woman, and child in this country is responsible for. And that doesn't include entitlements. If we got into Medicare and Social Security, that number would be much larger. But just keeping it within the scheme of excluding entitlements, over \$40,000.

Now, you look at the young people that we have today, and the fact is that we are not—we don't come to each American and collect a check. If we did that, it all would be divided up evenly. And that's a heck of a lot of money. That's a tremendous amount of debt to start your life out with for a young person.

But the fact is, that's not how we do things. You know, we kind of kick the can down the road, as I heard you use that phrase earlier. You know, we divide things up. You know, not everybody pays the same amount. And so this legacy of debt we are really following the next generation, our children, our grandchildren, future generations disproportionately. So what was \$40,000 today will just grow exponentially.

And that legacy of debt is not a legacy—you know, there is not a generation that doesn't want to leave this country better than what we received from our parents. But we are failing. With this Congress, with this President we are failing at the legacy that we are leaving: today, in 2010, a debt of \$40,000 per person.

Now, I really appreciate you pointing out [AmericaSpeakingOut](http://AmericaSpeakingOut.com) and the [YouCut](http://YouCut.com). [YouCut](http://YouCut.com) is just a wonderful tool. It gives the American people voice. Because you know who the experts are in terms of cutting today? The experts at living within their means, of pulling that belt a little tighter? That's the American citizens and the American families. They are the ones that live within their means. They know that in difficult times you have to make difficult choices. That's called showing leadership. That is not something this Congress has done.

And so [YouCut](http://YouCut.com), and [YouCut](http://YouCut.com), it really is brand new. It's 5 weeks old. It hasn't been around that long. The gentlelady from Wyoming pointed out that you can access that through the Republican whip's Web site. And in the first 5 weeks we have identified over \$100 billion in cuts to government. Now, that's the way to tighten the belt on the budget. And that's something the American citizens, the American families do each and every day. They live within their means.

And so that's what's so exciting about [AmericaSpeakingOut](http://AmericaSpeakingOut.com) and [YouCut](http://YouCut.com). This gives the American citizens a voice in this process. The Federal Government and the budget is not something that they are removed from. It's something that they have a voice, they are able to weigh in and share their ideas. And I can't wait to hear

what ideas they submit in the future. And as those ideas come in, they get vetted, they may see their ideas wind up on the YouCut list, where they will have a chance to really, they can vote, go in and pick on where are the next level of cuts that we should levy in terms of making sure that the Federal Government lives within its means just like the American families do.

So I thank the gentlelady for just pointing out those very important resources for the American citizens.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for joining me this evening, in addition to the gentleman from Florida.

We have been trying to point out the structural deficit and debt that this country can no longer absorb and that we have to address. So it does my heart good to see the gentleman from Pennsylvania get so excited about the notion of cutting spending. And we want the American people to share our enthusiasm for cutting spending. We want the American people to weigh in. AmericaSpeakingOut.com and YouCut are two ways that you can do that.

I talk to people in Wyoming every weekend when I go home, and they share with me their thoughts about reducing spending. They see irresponsible spending, inefficient spending. They know where it is. And there are people all over this country who know where it is. So please share with us your ideas so we can create an exciting new agenda for this country that actually takes a slice out of inefficient government, and we get leaner and more able to maneuver, and give more room in our economy to a growing entrepreneurial sector that can create jobs and that isn't shackled by oppressive taxes, but pays an amount of taxes that are commensurate with their ability to unleash their creativity and create jobs and have the money available to borrow and expand and grow and create a vibrant America in our communities, in our churches, in our States, where the great incubators of ideas, where the great spirit of entrepreneurship is really alive and well.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for joining me. Do you have any concluding remarks?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Well, I thank the gentlelady. Just the fact that we have, as our good friend from Florida pointed out, there are many nations across the western world that are working very hard to put their fiscal house in order. They have actually recognized that they have to stop the spending. They have to stop the borrowing. They can't be levying these tremendous taxes on the shoulders of their citizens. They have taken a better path, a path of fiscal responsibility.

Yet in this Congress, with our President, that's not a path we have taken. He went to the G-20 trying to encourage the other world leaders to spend more, to spend their way into prosperity. And really what you do when you spend too much, you spend your

way out of prosperity. And, frankly, this is a country that we have always been the most prosperous Nation in the world, and we are on the wrong path to sustain that. That's something we need to change.

You know, when I travel home, people talk about the spending, they talk about the borrowing, they talk about the taxing. And the thing that they talk about most as a result of that is the word "uncertainty" and how this has created uncertainty within our economy. There are over 20 million small businesses in this wonderful Nation of the United States of America. And these small businesses were created and are grown by entrepreneurs who are willing to take a risk. They work hard, they work long days, they work most days. And many times they do that and take no revenue for themselves. They reinvest in their business to grow the business and grow more jobs and create jobs, family-sustaining jobs.

But today, because of the policies we've seen over the past 18 months, they choose—they are uncertain. They don't know what's coming next. Is it more health care mandates? Is it a premium on energy under cap-and-tax, cap-and-trade? Is it more taxes levied on small businesses? You know, many small businesses are organized as limited liability corporations in such a way that they have been the victim of the increased taxes that this Congress, the Democratic majority, has passed in the past 18 months; the burdens, the tripling the size of the Environmental Protection Agency, agencies such as that that put tremendous regulatory burdens on our job creators.

□ 1850

Well, this uncertainty has created—these folks are, you know what? They're sitting on the sidelines today because they're afraid of what's coming next. As opposed to being a company, an organization, that normally would take a good portion of their profits—and that's not a bad word; that is a good word—and reinvesting those profits—instead of taking those profits, they reinvest them in their company and grow the company; they buy new capital; they build new facilities; they hire more people—they're not doing that right now, and that's why any kind of an increase that we're seeing in rebound in unemployment, which obviously isn't much because we're just under 10 percent, it's been public. It's been all those temporary jobs of the census workers. It's been temporary jobs sustained by the stimulus. And yet the private sector has really been suffering under uncertainty, and the American people deserve better.

I just thank the gentlelady for hosting this hour this evening.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for joining me.

You've been hearing about our concern that this year, for the first time

since we had the Budget Act in 1974, we are not going to pass a budget in the U.S. House, and it's because the majority party does not want the American people focused on how serious the situation is, how huge the gap is between the revenues we take in and the amount of money we're spending.

Imagine a Congress that gets together and is more excited about reducing spending, saving money, finding efficiency, reducing the debt, cutting the deficit, and celebrating it with the American people, in concert with the American people. Imagine going to a tea party where everyone is celebrating the fact that for the first time ever the Federal Government cut spending. That's going to be something to celebrate. That will be something to be proud of.

You can help with it. Go to americaspeakingout.com; go to YouCut, give us your ideas. Let's build the momentum so this Congress can celebrate with the American people the return to a more stable, vibrant, robust American economy, driven by the American people. The American people are still in control of this country. It can get really discouraging sitting around here voting and getting defeated on vote after vote after vote. That's been happening to me for the last 18 months. But the great reward is I know the American people are in control, and I thank you for the opportunity to discuss these issues with you this evening.

TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRITZ). 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. Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege to have the opportunity to address you here on the floor of the House, and a lot of subjects come up here. About every imaginable thing has been debated here on the floor. I've listened to a lot of the dialogue that's unfolded in the previous hour, and I appreciate my colleagues' presentation or discussion of especially the economic and the spending situation, the dire straits that America is in.

And it seems ironic to me, Mr. Speaker, that about a year ago, in fact a little more than a year ago, I sat in the office in Berlin just outside Reichstag and had a conversation with the Chancellor of Germany, Angela Merkel, who made the argument to us that the United States is spending too much money, that the financial crisis—this, I believe, was actually February or March of 2009, and she made the argument that the solution for our economic crisis was not the Federal Government spending more money, Mr. Speaker, but it was about some targeted tax cuts that they had provided for their socialized economy.

European socialized economy, government-managed business, public-private partnerships, that's been some of the problems as to why they haven't had the economic vitality that we've had in the United States, and still as this financial situation unfolded, brought to the American people's attention about September 19, 2008, before the Presidential election I might add, and these discussions were taking place in February and then again in May of 2009 with representatives of the European Union and the leadership over Western Europe, whom I've often been critical of because they didn't let free enterprise flourish, had too many government regulations, had too many taxes, and because of that their economy was bogged down. Entrepreneurs weren't allowed to have the prosperity that they would have in the United States. Our economy grew, their economy stagnated, and that's what we've seen unfold over the last generation or so in the economic comparison between Europe and the United States.

But I found myself in the improbable position of listening to the leadership of the European Union and Western Europe lecture Americans that we should spend less money, not more money. Their plan, I believe, was \$480 billion altogether, \$400 billion in loans and \$80 billion in targeted spending. And the advice was America needs to hold down the spending and we need to adopt a more fiscally responsible budget, spend less money, provide less debt, and not this pass on to the next generations.

Well, that was a year and several months ago when this began, Mr. Speaker, and during the last couple of weeks, we've heard that lecture again from the same person, Angela Merkel of Germany. I'm glad she's making this case. It ought to hit home to our President of the United States. It ought to hit all of us here in this country that we in America, this Congress, over my vociferous objections and that of many of my colleagues voted "no" on a \$700 billion TARP fund and voted "no" on a \$787 billion economic stimulus plan, and in the middle of that, while it was framed, we watched the government takeover of the three large investment banks and AIG and Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and General Motors and Chrysler and the student loan program. We watched the nationalization of our skin and everything inside it in the form of ObamaCare, and the government has now subsequently, within that list that I've just identified, swallowed up over 50 percent of the former private sector activity of our economy and more to come.

Financial services, reaching out to tap in and regulate every credit transaction in America and setting up boards and a whole new regulatory shield, another layer of regulation for our financial institutions, for our large banks, and to a lesser degree, for our independent banks and smaller banks, but not for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac where a lot of this problem came

from, where the taxpayers of the United States now assumed a \$7.5 trillion contingent liability if Fannie and Freddie should go under. We've dumped billions into them, \$40 billion to \$50 billion comes to mind perhaps for each. And if they should become insolvent, the American taxpayers have to keep dumping money into Fannie and Freddie to prop them up because they're part of the takeover where they used to be private. At one time, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were private. Then they were quasi-government. Now, they're completely under the ownership, management, or control of the Federal Government.

All of this has taken place in the last year and half or a little more. We watched it happen. I've argued against it every step of the way, so have some of my colleagues, and quite a number of my good, reliable colleagues have come to the floor, Mr. Speaker, and made this case, made it over and over and over again.

But this situation that Europe has where they have loaned money to each other, the economy of Greece has gone down and been propped up by the European Union, and the economy of Spain has the highest unemployment—I think Greece might have eclipsed them, but for a long time Spain had the highest unemployment in the industrialized world. Their economy is wobbling. Ireland's economy is wobbling, and the European Union countries have loaned money to each other. It's almost like being in a poker game.

And let's just say that, because of all the overhead that's taken out by government, all the regulations taken out by government, if you all sit down in a poker game and the house takes, let's say, 45 percent of every pot, sooner or later the people sitting around the table that are trying to exchange those dollars are exchanging IOUs instead because the house has taken the money.

□ 1900

Government has swallowed up too much of the proceeds of the private sector, and then they have loaned money to each other, and the United States is borrowing money from around the world. In fact, the amount of money that is borrowed from the Chinese is now approaching \$1 trillion. And, yes, Americans have invested into American debt. But this debt is too hard a burden for us to carry.

I put a polling question up on my Web site. The news is full every day of the environmental calamity in the gulf and it goes on every day, and it is sad, and it is tragic, and I think we should turn all our efforts to shutting off the leak and cleaning up the mess, Mr. Speaker. But I asked in the polling question, what is the greatest threat to America, the gulf oil leak or the debt and deficit that this country is carrying? And about 80 percent of the respondents in the poll will say the debt and deficit is a greater threat to America than the gulf oil leak.

That gives me encouragement. That tells me the American people are on target here; that they understand the priorities and they understand the long-term implications of the debt and the deficit that we are carrying now in this economy.

But, Mr. Speaker, those are some of the issues that pick up on the previous speakers within the previous hour, and some concerns come to mind also aside from the economics. And perhaps I will come back to the economic side of this, but I think we need to talk about the rule of law for a little while here tonight.

I often come here to this floor and talk about the pillars of American exceptionalism, those essential components that have made America great. And I have listed them: Freedom of speech, religion, assembly, the right of the people to peaceably assemble and petition the government for redress of grievances, the right to keep and bear arms, which thankfully just this week the Supreme Court has reinforced.

First the Heller case established that it is an individual right to keep and bear arms, and in the case that was settled just this week, I think just yesterday is when the news came out, is that the Second Amendment, the right to keep and bear arms, affects not just the reach of the Federal Government to diminish the gun ownership rights of its citizens, but also the Second Amendment is guaranteed to protect the citizen's right to keep and bear arms from the reach of any political subdivision in America, whether it be States, municipalities, counties, whatever the political subdivisions are.

So the Second Amendment has been established and strengthened twice within this last half a decade or so, first the Heller case and now the case that came out this week. The Second Amendment is another pillar of American exceptionalism, because we know an armed population can defend itself against tyranny.

So the pillars of American exceptionalism being freedom of speech, religion, and the press; the right to peaceably assemble and petition the government for redress of grievances; the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, and we will go right on up the line within the Bill of Rights. Some of them, including the rights to property, which have been subverted by the Kelo decision, and I hope one day that decision is overturned by a Supreme Court that is more prudent and the past Supreme Court that made that decision; the protection against double jeopardy and the right to be tried by a jury of our peers—the list goes on. But most of those pillars of American exceptionalism are within the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

There are a couple of other components that are part of American exceptionalism that are not defined in the Bill of Rights or the Constitution, and that is something where one of

them, one of them, Mr. Speaker, is enshrined in the flashcards that are produced by USCIS, the United States Citizenship Immigration Services. These flashcards rights are little training cards, like you would imagine or see in a classroom that you can learn off of. The flashcard that says 2 plus 2, you snap it over and it says 4; 4 plus 4 is 8; and the list goes on.

But the flashcards for learning to become a naturalized American citizen ask simple questions, questions that you would need to know the answer to if you were going to be a naturalized American citizen. And it would start with, who is the Father of our country? And you flip the card over, George Washington. Who emancipated the slaves? Abraham Lincoln.

Question Number 11, I believe, is, what is the economic system of the United States? Flip that card over, and on the other side it says free enterprise capitalism, Mr. Speaker. The economic system of the United States. That is a pillar of American exceptionalism.

If we didn't have free enterprise capitalism, we would not be a great nation. Our economy could not have competed with that of the rest of the world. We could not have built the industrial giant that supported our people and our troops and the military around the world to win World War II. We would not have emerged as victors in World War II without free enterprise being a driving force that let the industry in America fulfill and supply the demand that we had for 16 million mostly men and also women in uniform in World War II.

We went all over the world with our economy, with our people. We brought American products everywhere in the world. There was a chance for profit. Our factories were running at a fever pitch day and night. We were building bombers and tanks and ships and parachutes, and we were providing supplies for a lot of the rest of the world whose industry had been destroyed. And at the end of World War II, we were the only industrialized country in the world that had an intact industry.

And the dollar was golden. The greenback was strong. It was a silver certificate at the time. And we saw American culture, American values, and American products spread all throughout the world. We provided a large share of the world's manufacturing and industry, and a lot of that was driven because we maintained intact that pillar of American exceptionalism called free enterprise capitalism, that freedom to produce and earn, and, yes, get wealthy, if you can figure out how to do it, keep some of what you earn, keep a lot of what you earn.

And, by the way, the unemployment rate at the end of World War II in this country was 1.2 percent. And when people argue that we have been at historically low unemployment levels and argue that 4.6 percent is that, or that that is a normal unemployment level, I

point them back to the lowest level that we have seen in history, 1.2 percent at the end of World War II. And then the number went up when a lot of our soldiers came home.

But free enterprise capitalism is what has driven the industrialized might of the United States. It has driven our military. It has taken our culture around the world. The desire to trade and market and profit from it has taken the American culture everywhere in the world. Free enterprise capitalism is an exceptional pillar of American exceptionalism.

And another one of those pillars of American exceptionalism is a legitimate, legal immigration system. The Constitution requires that Congress establish a uniform immigration system, so Congress is to do that. And I would say we have done that. It is uniform. It is consistent with the Constitution. We have an Immigration Reform Act that was passed here in this Congress in 1996 and signed into law. We need to have an executive branch that will follow the law.

But the beauty of America's immigration system has been that, up until the last generation or so, maybe the last generation-and-a-half, Mr. Speaker, it has been difficult to come to the United States of America. And the legal system that we had actually screened people out, those who came into Ellis Island, the millions that came into Ellis Island. And I can think of one day that set the record: 11,757 came through the great hall at Ellis Island on, I think I can remember the year and the date, April 15, 1907. A massive number, just like 11,757 people through there. But day by day by day they came through.

About 2 percent of those who had actually been screened before they got on the ship to come to the United States, to immigrate into the United States, even though they were screened, they were screened for good health, for sanity, so-to-speak, they were screened so they had an ability to take care of themselves, they arrived here in the United States of America.

America a century ago was a meritocracy. We didn't have a welfare system that had at this point evolved into a welfare state. It was a meritocracy. We wanted people that were physically healthy, mentally healthy, able to come here and get a job and go to work or start a business and sustain themselves and provide for themselves.

□ 1910

They were screened by conditions that we had then before they got on the ship, generally in Europe at that time, and they were screened again when they arrived at Ellis Island. They were checked physically. Sometimes, yes, they were rushed through. But even though they were screened before they came, about 2 percent were sent back to their home country because they didn't meet the standards here in America.

But almost all of them who came to the United States, almost all of them aspired to the American Dream. And many of them may have believed that the streets were paved in gold and gotten here and were disappointed to find out they were actually paved in dirt, dust, mud, sometimes cobblestones, sometimes horse manure. It wasn't quite the beautiful place that was advertised on the brochures in Europe, but they came. And some of them went back voluntarily because they didn't find the promise that they thought they had.

But all of them had a dream—almost all of them had a dream. And they shared the American Dream. And when they came here, they brought with them the dreamer's vitality, the dreamer's energy, the dreamer's stick-to-it-ive-ness, and the conviction that they could start up a life for themselves, make a life for themselves, and leave this world a better place for their children than it was for them. It's always been an embodiment and a component of the American Dream.

So the legal immigration that came to America did this, Mr. Speaker. And this is the verbal definition of one of the pillars of American exceptionalism—legal immigration skimmed the cream of the crop off of every donor civilization that sent people to the United States. When that happened, we got their vigor, we got their dreams, we got some of their capital, we got all of their work, and we've got their descendents that grew up here in America with that same dream.

And even though it might have been first generation immigrants that might have lived in a shantytown and worked in a boiler factory somewhere, they worked to make life better and they pushed their children to get an education and they taught them that America has embraced us and we have our freedom, we have our liberty here. And you need to defend our country and go out and make sure that you're going to grow up in a better opportunity than the first generation had, and make sure the third generation has more opportunities than the second and the fourth generation more opportunities than the third. And so on and so on.

And so it has been. It's been true with family after family, generation after generation. And it's embodied in a way in my family where I have a grandmother that came from Germany. She raised six sons and a daughter. Of those six sons, five of them put on the uniform to defend our country. Some of them went back to Germany in the Second World War. One was wounded at the Battle of the Bulge. My father went to the South Pacific. They didn't hesitate. They didn't hesitate to go take on the country that their mother had come from. They knew and they believed that they owed this country a debt of gratitude, and they demonstrated it. And that's part of the greatness of America, too.

But that pillar of American exceptionalism, that vitality of the Americans that come here infused with the generational tradition of that vitality, and the multiple generations, has been a significant part of American exceptionalism. And I look at the roots of these causes for American exceptionalism, and I often take this back to the Age of Reason in Greece and Roman law and how the knowledge base that was established by rational thought in the Age of Reason in Greece and the Roman law found its way through the Dark Ages and emerged in the Age of Enlightenment, the English-speaking component of the Age of Enlightenment, to be specific, Mr. Speaker.

As those qualities arrived here in the New World, in America, at the dawn of the Industrial Revolution and a continent that had at that time conceived only unlimited natural resources, low taxation, no regulation, a concept of manifest destiny, of having been the beneficiary of the Age of Enlightenment at the dawn of the Industrial Revolution and had the foundation of our Judeo-Christian values arrived here with those immigrants—most of them; that foundation of value system that comes from the birth of Christ and the redemption that comes with Christ and 1,500 years later also the Protestant reformation and Martin Luther that taught the Protestant work ethic that was picked up by the Catholics. And the Catholics did pretty good with the Protestant work ethic, is my point, Mr. Speaker.

So we've seen this vitality in this giant petri dish of America every component that we can imagine that has been positive has been here in this country, put here by providence—the natural resources, the understanding of the Adam Smithian component of economic theory, the supply and demand invisible hand component of economic theory, the Age of Reason from Greece and the Roman law that found their way through the Dark Ages and emerged as the Age of Enlightenment, all here in the United States of America. It was unlimited natural resources that go along with it.

Those components, driven by the vitality of the immigrants that have come here, have been essential to this Nation rising through the challenges of the ages and facing off against the world when we didn't see ourselves as a world power. We didn't see ourselves as a world power when we found ourselves in the Spanish-American War. And so we have the legacy of that that exists today. Puerto Rico is one of those components. The Philippines is another. That goes around the world pretty well.

We didn't view ourselves as a global power, but we had a global reach after having had the Maine sunk in Havana Harbor. America had a global reach. Even though we didn't, again, see ourselves as a global power, we got in at the tail end of World War I and made a

difference and changed the balance. And now we were a player in the world that needed to be contended with. It's not to go out and find a war to do that. They came to us because we had to defend the liberty and the freedom in the world and align ourselves with people that believed in the same values.

And a generation after World War I, along came World War II. Now, that was a cataclysmic conflict where tens of millions died, and America emerged as the world power and the dominant force in the world until such time as the Cold War began. And even then, 45 years of the Cold War, a Cold War that started I think we can see it with the Berlin Airlift, which the anniversary of it just began a few days ago, but the United States stood strong and we faced off against the Cold War and the Soviet Union, and there was a game going on, a very high-stakes, life-or-death game; even a life-or-death for the planet game going on.

And at the end of it, in about 1984, Jean Kirkpatrick, as Ambassador to the United Nations appointed under Reagan, had stepped down from that post, and she said as she stepped down—and this will be a paraphrase of her quote, Mr. Speaker. She said, What's going on between the United States and the Soviet Union—speaking of the Cold War—is chess and Monopoly on the same board. And the only question is: Will the United States of America bankrupt the Soviet Union economically before they checkmate us militarily?

That race was going on and the Soviet Union was seeking to build more and more missiles to try and gain an advantage that would cause us to have to concede to them or capitulate on foreign policy, at least, at a minimum; but Ronald Reagan came in and pushed the resurgence of our national defense, built the missiles back up again, and in the process of doing so, November 9, 1989, the Berlin Wall came down.

That's the power of an economy and the power of an ideology over a managed economy, a communist economy, a central command economy. That's the power of it all, Mr. Speaker. This country has been a powerfully strong superpower in the world and the only unchallenged superpower in the world in the aftermath of the Wall coming down on November 9, 1989, and subsequently the implosion of the Soviet Union. It took it about another year and a half to finally get itself wound down.

But we are standing here as the unchallenged superpower in the world in significant and essential part because we have a free enterprise economy. Well, we had a free enterprise economy, and now we are getting a managed economy that's someplace over there. It looks like it's to the left of Europe.

They're lecturing us, Don't spend too much money. They didn't argue we shouldn't do so much nationalization. They're guilty of that, too. But there have been a lot more dollars' worth of

private sector economy nationalized by this President than by Hugo Chavez. And that's not a stretch, Mr. Speaker. It's simply a fact that as Hugo Chavez is blown away by tens of millions, hundreds of billions of dollars.

And how do we get this economy back? I'll submit that it isn't going to happen under this President. President Obama is not going to let go of companies that have been taken over by this Federal Government. I asked the question of the Secretary of the Treasury, under oath, and actually I presented it in a written form because we ran out of time in the hearing. The question is, President Obama was elected at least in part because of his challenge to President Bush for President Bush allegedly not having an exit strategy in Iraq.

□ 1920

We've all heard that. That rhetoric is old and we've forgotten about it, but it's back there, and the RECORD is full of it, Mr. Speaker.

So my question to the Secretary of the Treasury, Tim Geithner, was: If the President has been elected in part for his criticism of President Bush for not having an exit strategy in Iraq, what is the exit policy for the Obama administration to divest themselves from the takeover of the banks, insurance companies, Fannie and Freddie, the car companies that I have listed here earlier in this dialogue, Mr. Speaker. What is their strategy for divesting themselves and giving the private sector back to the private sector? The answer that I received—and granted, they're buried, and they're probably short staffed. They took a couple of months. I will give the Secretary of the Treasury credit. At least he answered my letter. Often I don't get letters from the other Cabinet members that we have. And the answer essentially was this—a couple of months to get the letter back, a seven-page letter, and it boils down to: He would know when the time was right to divest the Federal Government from the ownership, management or control of these entities that have been nationalized. He would know when the time was right. There is no written criteria, and he could make the decision then at the right time. In other words, it's really not your business. I'm not going to write down a formula. We may or may not have an intent to divest the Federal Government from the banks and AIG and Fannie and Freddie. They don't intend to let go of Fannie and Freddie. Fannie and Freddie have an implicit guarantee—actually, it's now a specific guarantee. The taxpayers will bail them out. They are not covered in this financial regulatory reform bill, the Barney Frank/Chris Dodd bill that's designed to solve our economic woes.

I have looked down through some of these things that are not very well known about what's in the financial regulatory reform bill. Out of the House, we know it as H.R. 4173. We

know that there is a conference report. They found out that even though the best judgment of the conference committee produced a result, the votes aren't there. So they're going back to change the conference report and see if they can find the votes to get it passed. I am troubled a little by the procedure, Mr. Speaker.

But here are some things that are in it, and they're not likely to come out. I want to speak to the issue of the focus on special provisions for women and minorities that are in the bill. Now I point out, Mr. Speaker, that I've dealt with this for a long time, with set-asides and had to compete against provisions that are written into Federal contracts as set-asides. I have spent a lot of my life as a contractor doing site development work of all kinds, earthmoving, pipe, concrete work, underground work, demolition work. We would do some seeding, some fencing, those kinds of things, and some concrete work.

I bid a lot of contracts in my professional life, and I can think of one in particular that I will use as an example. The Federal Government has set aside special components. Sometimes a contract is set aside for women or minorities, and no one else can bid it. Now, I had a small company, and I had to start from scratch. I didn't have any capital to begin with. I actually had a negative net worth of \$5,000. I convinced a banker to loan me enough money to buy me an old beaten-up bulldozer, and then I started to work. So I had to build capital with sweat equity and moxie and anything else that could be done that was legal and moral and ethical. I tried to outwork my competition and outsmart my competition and slowly build up an operation where I got a second machine, a little capital, another machine, hire another man, buy another machine, hire another man, and get some capital underneath me to get to the point where I could bond these projects. And there are a lot of sad stories along the way. It's a very difficult thing to build the capital to be able to bid some of these projects.

But all the way along the way, I knew that I was disadvantaged. Big money had a big advantage over on me. The people that were wired in and entrenched, they had a significant advantage over me. I was trying to crack into that without the capital, was short on equipment, short on manpower, strong on ambition, willing to work and work longer and harder hours than anybody else would. But the deck was stacked against me. That's why there aren't a lot of people in the business, because the system and the structure is set in such a way with capital requirements, it's capital intensive with equipment and meeting the regulations for employees, et cetera. So I know how hard that is.

But I would need a project that fit our equipment. It needed to be smaller projects. When it got into the millions

of dollars, we didn't have the ability to bond that, especially in the beginning. And so I needed those projects that were down there—\$100,000 project, \$3,200,000 project, maybe a \$300,000 project. And so I would look for the bid notifications to pick up those projects that fit the things that we could do, that were small enough that we could bid the project. And quite often, I would draw a set of plans and there would be a provision on there that would say "minority set-aside." I couldn't bid the projects because it's a project set aside for a minority or maybe a woman-owned business or sometimes either/or. And I have gotten a little sensitive to this.

I recall a larger project. When I got to the point where I could bond the larger projects—and this is a lifetime of work to get to that point, by the way. And I drew a set of plans for a sewer lagoon project in a city, and I remember right where it is and a lot of the details of the specs. But I was familiar with the engineering firm, familiar with the specifications, so I sat down to put the project together. I spent 4 days getting quotes from suppliers and subcontractors, calculating the volume and the quantities that are there, putting the bid together as best I knew, looking at the project and negotiating to make sure that I drew all the best bids that I could from subcontractors, all the best bids that I could from suppliers. And when I put that together, a man has an honorable responsibility to honor the low bid. I'm bidding for a low bid. The people who bid to me as subcontractors and suppliers, I want their best bid. I want their low bid, and I will honor it, and I will keep it confidential until such time as the bids are opened. That's the standard that needs to exist in the industry.

So I spent 4 days doing that. I got my numbers all together. And right before it was time to submit my bid, I gave one last read through the specifications, and in there, it said that there was a percentage of set-asides for minority contractors. I looked—and I think I could guess at the percentage, but I probably better not guess. It is not a large percentage. I will say under 20. But to find a minority contractor that would do a small part of that project—even if I handed it to him—was an impossibility. I went to the list of contractors. I worked the phones. I called other people that I knew, suppliers and contractors, and said, Where is somebody out here that can do the seeding or the fencing or the riprap work or take on any component of this job, any part of it? Is there somebody that can, somebody that will? The answer was no. There was nobody that could be found. And I had to take that 4 days' work and just toss it in the trash and forget it because it was set aside for minority contractors, the component of it was that I couldn't meet.

Now, if somebody was a large construction company and they had an es-

pecially established minority contractor that they used to plug in to those circumstances, they had a bidding advantage, and those types of situations got set up. They got set up in part because the government created a false demand, and we couldn't find people that would do the job, and so there were sometimes contractors set up that didn't have a desire or a knowledge. They were just a straw man that was used to meet regulations.

□ 1930

I recall a project that was about \$5 million in asphalt paving. There was a minority set-aside on the project for a percentage of the project that came to a number, I'm going to guess that number was around \$250,000 to \$300,000 of that needed to be set aside for a minority contractor. They got bids from a couple of minority contractors who know they can inflate their prices because they're only competing against each other. And at the end, the prime contractors, the asphalt pavers, had to take the one minority contractor and add \$100,000 to his price because they didn't have enough dollars to meet their requirement that was set up by the Federal Government.

So think of what it would be like if you came in and did bridge railings or bridge approaches for large paving projects and you were a minority contractor and you could write your own ticket, and your conscience wouldn't let you write that ticket any higher. You'd priced that out.

And then to have them say, well, I'm going to take your bid for \$250,000 to do the bridge railings and the approach here, even though it's half again more, maybe twice as high as the going rate would be if it were bid competitively amongst the other folks in the business. And I'm going to take your price.

And they wouldn't even tell the minority contractor, they would just put the bid in. They'd add the dollars they needed to it. If they got the job they'd have to go to the minority contractor and say, we added another \$100,000 to your price because we needed to have the percentage that's required by the Federal Government. An extra \$100,000 above the asking price.

These are projects that I've worked with that I know, having been involved in them as another bidder on these projects.

So, imagine getting 10 jobs a year like that and being handed a million dollars extra more than you asked for because there's a set-aside. Now, whatever that does to destroy the work ethic and the professionalism of the minority contractor, it is a cheat on the American taxpayer, and it's got to end.

And yet, I lay all this backdrop on here because, Mr. Speaker, I've got the sheet on what happens with the Barney Frank-Chris Dodd bill. It establishes an Office of Minority and Women Inclusion. They will be an agency responsible for diversity in management, employment, and business activities.

Now, I think we ought to have equal opportunity. I've stood up and defended equal opportunity, and my voting record in this Congress is more consistent with equal opportunity than anyone I know, certainly anybody on that side of the aisle because they vote for preferences. These preferences, Ward Connerly and I agree, Proposition 209 in California, I have sought to establish that as part of the law of the land in the state of Iowa, where I believe that the State shall not discriminate against nor grant preferential treatment to any individual or group on the basis of race, creed, color, ethnicity, or national origin. I believe that would be very close to a verbatim quote of title VII of the Civil Rights Act and Proposition 209 in California. The result of that, Ward Connerly's great work in California, in 1995, when they passed Proposition 209 they had quotas. They had set-asides. There was an Asian quota at the University of California Berkley. They wanted to make sure 12 percent of the students were Asian.

Well, Mr. Speaker, 5 years later, after the constitutional amendment in California lifted and ended the preferences, the student body at the University of the California Berkley was 46 percent Asian, not 12 percent. I think that's a good thing, Mr. Speaker. I think it shows how merit rewards people. And maybe it started out in the beginning that there would be a 12 percent quota, a racial set-aside for Asian minorities at the University of California Berkley or any place else out there in California for that matter. But it got turned on its head by the ambition of the people. And when the cap came off and the Constitution protected the merits of the individuals so that no one would be discriminated for or against, shall not discriminate against or grant preferential treatment to any individual or group on the basis of race, creed, color, ethnicity, or national origin. That is a beautiful statement. It's legally sound. It's rationally sound. It's morally sound. And it's consistent with America because it rewards merit. And it says, you will have an equal opportunity with everyone in this country, and no one shall discriminate against you, and no one shall discriminate in your favor either. Equal opportunity. Compete in the marketplace.

Well, this Barney Frank-Chris Dodd financial regulatory reform bill does anything but that, Mr. Speaker. It provides this Office of Minority and Women Inclusion.

If anybody's wondering what the effect is, when you pass legislation that says, this legislation shall be set aside, these taxpayers dollars that are borrowed from the labor of our grandchildren shall be set aside for women and minorities, do you know what that says, Mr. Speaker?

In a rational world, the Greeks would have understood this. They would have probably written it in Greek, but it

would have said anybody but white men. That's what the definition of women and minority set-asides are. They're set aside for anybody but white men. Now, nobody wants to say that out loud, but this legislation is replete with this language. Women and minorities, women and minorities, equal employment opportunity, and the racial, ethnic, and gender diversity of the workforce and senior management. The gender diversity of workforce. The racial, ethnic, and gender diversity of the workforce.

Now, they know they can't do this by law. They know that the Supreme Court has ruled that it has to be, in the case of the two cases of Michigan, it can't be a formula. It can't be a quota set-aside formula. It has to be an individual evaluation if they're going to be able to allow for a bias in favor of a particular minority that they might define. And even though her last dissenting opinion I agreed with strongly, Justice O'Connor's, and that was the Kelo decision—I found myself on exactly the same page with Sandra Day O'Connor, I completely disagreed with the concept that she wrote in the majority opinion in the Michigan case, or cases, but the one that I'm thinking of is when she wrote that we could perhaps go back and revisit the equal protection clause of the Constitution in 25 years, and maybe our society would have matured to the point where we wouldn't need to have a built-in, let's say a built-in diversity quotient.

Well, you don't correct an injustice with another injustice, Mr. Speaker. Two wrongs don't make a right, to put it in simple mother-to-son language or mother-to-daughter, father-to-daughter language. Two wrongs don't make a right. You don't correct an injustice with another injustice.

But equal opportunity, Martin Luther King's dream, that's consistent, logically, morally, legally. And this bill that is now back in conference to be reshaped to try to get the votes to get it to pass, violates many of those rational principles that I think are the purest principles of America; equal opportunity under the law.

This bill provides for and requires increased participation of minority-owned and women-owned businesses and programs, and in contracts of the agency. Increased from what I don't know, but it has to be increased. And it requires that they develop standards to maximize standards and procedures to ensure—this is interesting language—to the maximum extent possible the utilization of minorities, women, and minority-owned and women-owned businesses, and all businesses and activities at all agency levels. It requires each agency to take affirmative steps to seek diversity. Okay. I'm actually pretty good with that. I think that message should go out there. I think there should be ample opportunity for all people to apply for contracts and jobs. That part is all right. They want to partner with the inner city which is,

of course, a code word. And as I look down through this, it reads and drips through with politically correct language. It says at the conclusion here, it says section 113, the regulation of certain nonbank financial companies.

And again, Mr. Speaker, this is the Barney Frank-Chris Dodd bill. Those two fellows that have put this together, they didn't find a way to put any regulation on Fannie and Freddie. But their bill, under the section 113 regulation of certain nonbank financial companies, it says, the council, the regulating council, should consider, and I'll quote: "The importance of the company as a source of credit for low-income, minority, or underserved communities and the impact that the failure of such company would have on the availability of credit in such communities." And that means, when determining whether a U.S. nonbank financial company shall be supervised by the board of governors and subject to prudential standards.

In other words, this importance of the company as a source of credit for low-income minority and underserved communities, and the impact for the failure of such company, it means the government's going to look differently at these companies if they are serving a minority community, which means their capital requirements are likely to be less. Their regulatory requirements are likely to be less. They will give special consideration; it will not be a balanced, even hand of government. That's essentially guaranteed with the language in this legislation.

This justice is not color blind. This lady justice is not color blind. And it's written into the law to give preference.

And so, what it means is, when I read the language, U.S. nonbank financial companies shall be—let's see—when these conditions, when determining whether a U.S. nonbank financial company shall be supervised by the board of governors and subject to prudential standards. We also know this legislation allows for the Federal Government to determine which financial institutions go into receivership, the standards by which they may set the conditions of that receivership, they can determine the successor owner.

□ 1940

So if a financial institution should be shaky or deemed shaky, then the Secretary of the Treasury, with the assent of the FDIC and the Fed, can close down an institution, they can turn it and sell it, they can take it over themselves and run it and operate it as a federally operated institution simply by determining that.

Maybe it's not too big to fail, though they may make that determination, too; but it might be an agency, a company that is essential to the low-income communities, low-income minority or underserved communities. That gives them the latitude to treat it differently than any other financial institution.

When government gets involved, huge money gets lost. And when liberals get involved and progressives get involved, huge principles of liberty and freedom are sacrificed away to try to reach some kind of a formula of what they think that America should be like.

Martin Luther King never asked for this. I have read almost every one of his speeches, and many of his writings. I heard all of it. I can think of nothing in his writings or his speeches that I disagree with. He stuck to American principles. But this Congress under Pelosi leadership, this President has not stuck to American principles. They have gone all the other way to driving America off the abyss, into a managed socialist economy, and trying to write formulas in here where they pick winners and losers, and giving the Federal Government the authority to shut down or subsidize or set the price on financial institutions. All of this is anathema to America and the American Dream.

We can't have this vitality of this country if we are going to have the Federal Government controlling the movement of our lives in this fashion, writing prescriptions for equality of results, and granting bureaucrats and actually charging bureaucrats with an obligation to produce equality of results as opposed to equality of opportunity.

You know, it's the outreach part I don't necessarily object to. Go ahead and do the outreach. Let the people know in the majority minority colleges that there is jobs and opportunities out there. Take it out there where they can hear it and understand those opportunities. But don't hold it away from the other institutions either. But this President has driven an agenda that pits Americans against Americans.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, that given the time that I have left I would transition into this. It's a case that I have raised over and over again. It's one I am committed to continue raising, and that is apparently the White House has given an order of more than a year ago to the Justice Department to cancel the prosecution in the most open-and-shut case of voter intimidation in the history of America. I have spoken about this before on the floor; I have spoken about it within the media. I have tracked this case, and I know a little about it.

The story I am looking at, though, is in yesterday's Washington Times. Monday, June 28, 2010, the Washington Times. The title of it is "Inside the Black Panther Case." The subtitle, "Anger, Ignorance and Lies." This is an article written by J. Christian Adams. He writes about the New Black Panther case.

Now, to lay the backdrop and the image for this, many of us have seen this on YouTube. In the elections of 2008 in Philadelphia at a polling loca-

tion, the New Black Panthers were organized there, and allegedly in other places. These New Black Panthers are not like the old Black Panthers. These are, I think, more dangerous than the old Black Panthers. But they were there in paramilitary uniforms, including berets, standing in front of the polling place, with a billy club in their hand, smacking it in their hand, and intimidating voters that came in, calling people crackers and many other intimidating components of language.

We've seen that video on YouTube. This is the most open-and-shut voter intimidation case in America, and I will say in the history of America because we didn't have a voter intimidation law until the Civil Rights Act was passed in 1965.

So this article, written by Christian Adams, who has just resigned as an attorney, he is a lawyer based in Virginia, and he served as a voting rights attorney at the Justice Department until this month. And so we have J. Christian Adams wrote this article into the Washington Times. And, Mr. Speaker, I am going to seek to put it into the RECORD:

"On the day President Obama was elected, armed men wearing the black berets and the jackboots of the New Black Panther Party were stationed at the entrance of a polling place in Philadelphia. They brandished a weapon and intimidated voters and poll watchers. After the election, the Justice Department brought a voter intimidation case against the New Black Panther Party and those armed thugs. I and other Justice attorneys diligently pursued the case and obtained an entry of default after the defendants ignored the charges. Before a final judgment could be entered in May of 2009, our superiors ordered us to dismiss the case.

"The New Black Panther case was the simplest and most obvious violation of Federal law I saw in my Justice Department career. Because of the corrupt nature of the dismissals, statements falsely characterizing the case and, most of all, indefensible orders for the career attorneys not to comply with lawful subpoenas investigating the dismissal, this month I resigned my position as a Department of Justice attorney."

I continue the article by J. Christian Adams, former DOJ attorney: "The Federal voter intimidation statutes we used against the New Black Panthers were enacted because America never realized genuine racial equality in elections. Threats of violence characterized elections from the end of the Civil War until the passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965. Before the Voting Rights Act, blacks seeking the right to vote and those aiding them were victims of violence and intimidation. But unlike the Southern legal system, Southern violence did not discriminate. Black voters were slain, as were

the white champions of their cause. Some of the bodies were tossed into bogs, and in one case in Philadelphia, Mississippi, they were buried together in an earthen dam."

Temporarily close quote and point out the irony of the brutal tragedy in Philadelphia, Mississippi, and I have been there, Mr. Speaker, and the New Black Panthers intimidating voters in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the City of Brotherly Love. Philadelphia, Mississippi, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, City of Brotherly Love, billy clubs, calling people crackers, scaring them away from the polls.

I will continue with the quote: "Based on my firsthand experiences, I believe the dismissal of the Black Panther case was motivated by a lawless hostility toward equal enforcement of the law. Others still within the Department share my assessment. The Department abetted wrongdoers and abandoned law-abiding citizens victimized by the New Black Panthers. The dismissal raises serious questions about the Department's enforcement neutrality in upcoming midterm elections and the subsequent 2012 Presidential election. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has opened an investigation into the dismissal of the DOJ's skewed enforcement priorities. Attorneys who brought the case are under subpoena to testify, but the Department ordered us to ignore the subpoena, lawlessly placing us in an unacceptable legal limbo.

"The Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, Tom Perez, has testified repeatedly that the facts and law did not support this case. That claim is false. If the actions in Philadelphia do not constitute voter intimidation, it is hard to imagine what would, short of the actual outbreak of violence at the polls. Let's all hope this administration has not invited that outcome through the corrupt dismissal.

"Most corrupt of all, the lawyers who ordered the dismissal—Loretta King, the Obama-appointed acting head of the Civil Rights Division, and Steve Rosenbaum—did not even read the internal Justice Department memorandums supporting the case and investigation. Just as Attorney General Eric Holder, Jr., admitted that he did not read the Arizona immigration law before he condemned it, Mr. Rosenbaum admitted that he had not bothered to read the most important Department documents detailing the investigative facts and applicable law in the New Black Panther case. Christopher Coates, the former Voting Section chief, was so outraged at this dereliction of responsibility that he actually threw the memos at Mr. Rosenbaum in the meeting where they were discussing the dismissal of the case. The Department subsequently removed all of Mr. Coates' responsibilities and sent him to South Carolina.

"Mr. Perez also inaccurately testified to the House Judiciary Committee that

Federal rule number 11 required the dismissal of the lawsuit. Lawyers know that rule 11 is an ethical obligation to bring only meritorious claims, and such a charge by Mr. Perez effectively challenges the ethics and professionalism of the five attorneys who commenced the case.”

□ 1950

“Yet the attorneys who brought the case were voting rights experts and would never pursue a frivolous matter. Their experience in election law far surpassed the experience of the officials who ordered the dismissal.

“Some have called the actions in Philadelphia an isolated incident, not worthy of Federal attention. To the contrary, the Black Panthers in October 2008 announced a nationwide deployment for the election. We had indications that polling-place thugs were deployed elsewhere, not only in November 2008, but also during the Democratic primaries, where they targeted white Hillary Rodham Clinton supporters. In any event, the law clearly prohibits any isolated incidents of voter intimidation.

“Others have falsely claimed that no voters were affected. Not only did the evidence rebut this claim, but the law does not require a successful effort to intimidate it; it punishes even the attempt,” to intimidate.

“Most disturbing, the dismissal is part of a creeping lawlessness infusing our government institutions. Citizens would be shocked to learn about the open and pervasive hostility within the Justice Department to bringing civil rights cases against nonwhite defendants on behalf of white victims. Equal enforcement of justice is not a priority of this administration. Open contempt is voiced for these types of cases.

“Some of my co-workers argued that the law should not be used against black wrongdoers because of the long history of slavery and segregation. Less charitable individuals called it ‘payback time.’ Incredibly, after the case was dismissed, instructions were given that no more cases against racial minorities like the Black Panther case would be brought by the Voting Section.

“Refusing to enforce the law equally means some citizens are protected by the law while others are left to be victimized, depending on their race. Core American principles of equality before the law and freedom from racial discrimination are at risk. Hopefully, equal enforcement of the law is still a point of bipartisan, if not universal, agreement. However, after my experience with the New Black Panther dismissal and the attitudes held by officials in the Civil Rights Division, I am beginning to fear the era of agreement over these core American principles has passed.”

That’s the end of the article written by J. Christian Adams, Department of Justice attorney with considerable experience, and this is a case that I’ve

been intimately familiar with for over a year.

Certainly, like many Americans, I’ve seen the video, and there’s no excuse for canceling the most open-and-shut voter intimidation case in America, and since 1965, we’ve not had a case that we know of that’s been this bad. I don’t know what could possibly come forward that would render a case worthy of prosecution by the Holder Attorney General’s office or by the President of the United States.

We know that there is significant influence from the White House into the Justice Department. One of the ways and one of the reasons we know that is because Attorney General Holder testified before the Judiciary Committee, in the same hearing where he infamously admitted that he hadn’t read Arizona’s immigration law, he also conceded that the President had directed him to use the Justice Department to seek to invalidate Arizona’s immigration law. Now, that’s Presidential interference and influence, and for the Justice Department, and Eric Holder in particular, to testify that day that they’re not a political operation, they’re not influenced by politics, they’re only influenced by the rule of law, I think this case that was in the Washington Times yesterday, expert and written by J. Christian Adams, belies that point.

HONORING MARK ROGERS AS PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL AUCTIONEERS ASSOCIATION

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mark Rogers of Mount Airy, North Carolina. Mark is an accomplished auctioneer and real estate broker and has been in the business for nearly 30 years.

Over his distinguished career, Mark has conducted auctions in a dozen States, selling estates, farm machinery, equipment, and real estate at public auction. As a real estate broker, he served as the regional vice president of the North Carolina Association of Realtors in the early 1990s. He was also the president of the local Board of Realtors in 1987 and was named Realtor of the Year for the local board in 1986. It should come as no surprise then to learn that Mark was elected to be president of the National Auctioneers Association last year and takes office this July.

What’s remarkable about this achievement is that Mark’s father, Bracky Rogers, who founded the family’s real estate and auction business in 1964, has also served as the president of the National Auctioneers Association. When Mark takes over as president, he and his father will be the first father-son duo to have both been elected president of the association.

Before being elected as the National Auctioneers Association’s president,

Mark served as president of the North Carolina Auctioneers Association in the 1990s and in 2003 was inducted into the Auctioneers Association of North Carolina Hall of Fame. He was elected director for the National Auctioneers Association in July 2003, treasurer in July 2007, and vice president in July 2008.

Just as impressive as his professional qualifications is the personal character that commends him as an exemplary North Carolina citizen. He is known as an active participant in his community, giving back and reaching out to those who need a helping hand.

Among his many pursuits in the community is his work with Habitat for Humanity, The Shepherd’s House, and with Young Life of Surry County. He’s also a member of First Baptist Church of Mount Airy. He and his wife, Deidre Blackmon Rogers, have been married for more than 25 years and are active in their children’s activities.

The people of Mount Airy are proud to have such a committed businessman as part of the community. He is an asset to the State of North Carolina and to the people of Mount Airy. Today, I congratulate him on becoming the president of the National Auctioneers Association and wish him the very best during his tenure.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o’clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. KILROY) at 8 o’clock and 30 minutes p.m.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4173, DODD-FRANK WALL STREET REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 4173) to provide for financial regulatory reform, to protect consumers and investors, to enhance Federal understanding of insurance issues, to regulate the over-the-counter derivatives markets, and for other purposes:

[The text of the conference report will appear in book II of this issue.]

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution providing for the use of the catafalque situated in the Exhibition Hall of the Capitol Visitor Center in connection with memorial services to be conducted in the United States Senate Chamber for the Honorable Robert C. Byrd, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today until 12 p.m. on account of travel delays due to inclement weather.

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. MCGOVERN) to revise and

extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WEINER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PERRIELLO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIGLEY, 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. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, July 1 and 2.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, June 30 and July 1.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on June 28, 2010 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 2194. To amend the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 to enhance United States diplomatic efforts with respect to Iran by expanding economic sanctions against Iran.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Resolution 1484, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 30, 2010, at 10 a.m., as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable ROBERT C. BYRD.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to Public Law 111-139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of the bill H.R. 1554, the Fountainhead Property Land Transfer Act, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 1554, THE FOUNTAINHEAD PROPERTY LAND TRANSFER ACT, AS AMENDED

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010–2015	2010–2020
Net Increase or Decrease (–) in the Deficit													
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	0	–2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	–2	–2

Pursuant to Public Law 111-139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of the bill H.R. 2340, the Salmon Lake Land Selection Resolution Act, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CBO ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 2340, THE SALMON LAKE LAND SELECTION RESOLUTION ACT, AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES ON JUNE 16, 2010

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010–2015	2010–2020
Net Increase or Decrease (–) in the Deficit													
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Pursuant to Public Law 111-139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of the bill H.R. 5552, the Firearms Excise Tax Improvement Act of 2010, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CBO ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 5552, THE FIREARMS EXCISE TAX IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2010, AS PROVIDED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ON JUNE 29, 2010

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010–2015	2010–2020
Net Increase or Decrease (–) in the Deficit													
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	82	–32	–30	–11	–6	–155	151	–2	–1	–1	–1	–151	–4

Sources: Congressional Budget Office and Joint Committee on Taxation.
Note: Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Pursuant to Public Law 111-139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of the bill H.R. 5618, the Restoration of Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 2010, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CBO ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 5618, THE RESTORATION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2010, AS INTRODUCED ON JUNE 28, 2010

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010–2015	2010–2020
Net Increase in the Deficit													
Total Changes	8,545	24,684	218	214	148	76	56	2	0	0	0	33,885	33,943
Less: Designated as Emergency Requirements ^a	8,545	24,684	218	214	148	76	56	2	0	0	0	33,885	33,943
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Memorandum: Components of the Emergency Designations:													
Change in Outlays	8,545	24,495	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33,040	33,040
Changes in Revenues	0	-189	-218	-214	-148	-76	-56	-2	0	0	0	-845	-903

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
 Note: Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.
^aSection 5 of the bill would designate Sections 2 and 3 as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

Pursuant to Public Law 111-139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of the bill H.R. 5623, the Homebuyers Assistance and Improvement Act of 2010, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CBO ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 5623, THE HOMEBUYERS ASSISTANCE AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2010 AS INTRODUCED ON JUNE 29, 2010

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010–2015	2010–2020
Net Increase or Decrease (–) in the Deficit													
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact ^a	19	124	2	-27	-13	-126	24	4	-6	-6	-6	-20	-9

^aH.R. 5623 would amend the tax code in several ways, including extending the homebuyer tax credit for certain purchases; the bill also would amend the Travel Promotion Act to authorize the collection of additional fees and extend authority to spend those fees.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

8137. A letter from the Director — National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Competitive and Noncompetitive Nonformula Federal Assistance Programs — Administrative Provisions and Subpart K for Biomass Research and Development Initiative (RIN: 0524-AA61) received June 15, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8138. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a certification on the review of the Advance Threat Infrared Countermeasures/Common Missile Warning System, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433a; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8139. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a certification on the review of the DDG 1000 Zumwalt Class Destroyer Program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433a; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8140. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a certification on the review of the Wideband Global SATCOM (WGS) program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433a; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8141. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a certification on the review of the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433a; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8142. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a certification on the review of the Remote Minehunting System (RMS) program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433a; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8143. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a certification on the review of the Apache Block 111 (AB3) program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433a; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8144. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a quarterly report on withdrawals or diversions of equipment from Reserve component units for the period of January 1, 2010 through March 31, 2010, pursuant to Public Law 109-364, section 349; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8145. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition regulation Supplement; Multiyear Contract Authority for Electricity from Renewable Energy Sources (DFARS Case 2008-D006) received June 15, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8146. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8131] received June 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8147. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] received June 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8148. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft bill “To authorize United States participation in, and appropriations for the United States contribution to, the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program, a multi-donor trust fund administered by the World Bank”; to the Committee on Financial Services.

8149. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department’s final rule — National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)—Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program—Rehabilitation Engineering Research Centers (RERCs) Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Numbers: 84.133E-1 and 84.133E-

3 received June 15, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

8150. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Service, Department of Education, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 84.215J received June 15, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

8151. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Final Rule Relating to Time and Order of Issuance of Domestic Relations Orders (RIN: 1210-AB15) received June 15, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

8152. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Weatherization Assistance for Low-Income Persons: Maintaining the Privacy of Applicants for and Recipients of Services [Docket No.: DOE-EERE-OT-2010-0004] (RIN: 1904-AC16) received June 10, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8153. A letter from the Office of Managing Director, AMD-PERM, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Amendment of parts 1, 21, 73, 74, and 101 of the Commission’s Rules to Facilitate the Provision of Fixed and Mobile Broadband Access, Educational and Other Advanced Services in the 2150-2162 and 2500-2690 MHz Bands [WT Docket No.: 03-66] received June 15, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8154. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Technical Amendment to Part 766 of the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No.: 100603238-0235-01] (RIN: 0694-AE93) received June 15, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8155. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting update to the letter sent on June 18, 2009 regarding the Pan Am 103 bombing; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8156. A letter from the Associate Director, PP&I, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Iranian Transactions Regulations received June 16, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8157. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2009 through March 31, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8158. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a copy of the report entitled, "Auditor's Certification of the Department of Mental Health's FY 2008 Performance Accountability Report"; pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8159. A letter from the Federal Co-Chair, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting the Commission's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2009 through March 31, 2010, pursuant to Section 5(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8160. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation; GSAR Case 2008-G503, Rewrite of GASR Part 505, Publicizing Contract Actions [GSAR Amendment 2010-02; GSAR Case 2008-G503 (Change 45) Docket 2008-0007; Sequence 11] (RIN: 3090-AI71) received June 10, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8161. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Inspector General's semiannual report to Congress for the reporting period ending March 31, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8162. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2009 through March 31, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8163. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Long Term Care Insurance Program: Eligibility Changes (RIN: 3206-AL92) received June 14, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8164. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Decision-Making Authority Regarding the Denial, Suspension, or Revocation of a Federal Firearms License, or Imposition of a Civil Fine [Docket No.: AFT 17F; AG Order No. 3160-2010 (2008R-10P)] received June 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8165. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report of obligations and unobligated balances of funds provided for Federal-aid highway and safety construction programs for fiscal year 2008 as of September 30, 2008, pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 104(j); to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8166. A letter from the U.S. House of Representatives, Clerk, transmitting annual compilation of financial disclosure statements of the members of the board of the Office of Congressional Ethics, pursuant to rule XXVI, clause 3, of the House Rules; (H. Doc. No. 111-127); to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and ordered to be printed.

8167. A letter from the U.S. House of Representatives, Clerk, transmitting the annual compilation of personal financial disclosure statements and amendments thereto required to be filed by Members of the House with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, pursuant to rule XXVI, clause 1, of the House Rules; (H. Doc. No. 111-128); to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and ordered to be printed.

8168. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—State Cemetery Grants (RIN: 2009-AM96) received June 10, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

8169. A letter from the Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Loan Guaranty: Elimination of Redundant Regulations (RIN: 2900-AN71) received June 15, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

8170. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Contributed Property [TD 9485] (RIN: 1545-BF28) received June 11, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8171. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Passive Activity Losses And Credits Limited (Rev. Rul. 2010-16) received June 11, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8172. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — New Markets Tax Credit (Rev. Rul. 2010-17) received June 11, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8173. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2010-47] received June 11, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8174. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Qualifying Therapeutic Discovery Project Credit [Notice 2010-45] received June 16, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8175. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Technical Amendment Language Change from "Wholly" to "Fully" [Docket No.: SSA-2009-0062] (RIN: 0960-AH16) received June 15, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8176. A letter from the Acting Director, Acquisition Policy and Legislation Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Department of Homeland Security Acquisition Regulation; Restrictions on Foreign Acquisition (HSAR Case 2009-004 [Docket

No.: DHS-2009-0081] (RIN: 1601-AA57) received June 15, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

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. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1487. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-516). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 4173. A bill to provide for financial regulatory reform, to protect consumers and investors, to enhance Federal understanding of insurance issues, to regulate the over-the-counter derivatives markets, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-517). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. PEETERS):

H.R. 5622. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the identification of corporate tax haven countries and increased penalties for tax evasion practices in haven countries that ship United States jobs overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mrs. DAHLKEMPER (for herself, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 5623. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the homebuyer tax credit for the purchase of a principal residence before October 1, 2010, in the case of a written binding contract entered into with respect to such principal residence before May 1, 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Homeland Security, and Energy and Commerce, 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, considered and passed.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Ms. FOX):

H.R. 5624. A bill to simplify and expedite access to the Federal courts for injured parties whose rights and privileges under the

United States Constitution have been deprived by final actions of Federal agencies or other government officials or entities acting under color of State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. SCHAUER):

H.R. 5625. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to study the feasibility of the hydrological separation of the Great Lakes and Mississippi River Basins; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 5626. A bill to protect public health and safety and the environment by requiring the use of safe well control technologies and practices for the drilling of high-risk oil and gas wells in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 5627. A bill to amend the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act to assist small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, 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. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself, Mr. HARE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HOLT, Mr. POLIS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SHEAPORTER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Mr. SESTAK):

H.R. 5628. A bill to end the use of corporal punishment in schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Ms. HIRONO):

H.R. 5629. A bill to ensure full recovery from responsible parties of damages for physical and economic injuries, adverse effects on the environment, and clean up of oil spill pollution, to improve the safety of vessels and pipelines supporting offshore oil drilling, to ensure that there are adequate response plans to prevent environmental damage from oil spills, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Natural Resources, 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. BOOZMAN:

H.R. 5630. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for qualifications for

vocational rehabilitation counselors and vocational rehabilitation employment coordinators employed by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 5631. A bill to establish the Gulf Coast Conservation Corps under the direction of the President in order to create jobs cleaning up the oil spill and restoring the Gulf of Mexico and surrounding areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN (for herself and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 5632. A bill to improve choices for consumers for fuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN:

H.R. 5633. A bill to improve choices for consumers for vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 5634. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that oil and gas drilling and production operations on the outer Continental Shelf must have in place the best available technology for blow-out preventers and emergency shutoff equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. MAFFEI:

H.R. 5635. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out activities for the restoration, conservation, and management of Onondaga Lake, New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 5636. A bill to establish Federally Qualified Behavioral Health Centers and to require Medicaid coverage for services provided by such Centers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. JONES, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. MANZULLO):

H.R. 5637. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and title 10, United States Code, to allow contracting officers to consider information regarding domestic employment before awarding a Federal contract, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. SESTAK:

H.R. 5638. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the qualifying advanced energy project credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 5639. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude executive branch officers and employees from non-

recognition rules relating to the sale of property to comply with conflict-of-interest requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 5640. A bill to establish a National Rape Kit Database; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ORTIZ (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 291. Concurrent resolution celebrating 130 years of United States-Romanian diplomatic relations, congratulating the Romanian people on their achievements as a great nation, and reaffirming the deep bonds of trust and values between the United States and Romania, a trusted and most valued ally; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H. Res. 1484. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable Robert C. Byrd, a Senator from the State of West Virginia; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H. Res. 1485. A resolution expressing support for designation of September 2010 as "National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CLAY:

H. Res. 1486. A resolution expressing support for designation of June 11, 2011, as "National Minority Golf Awareness Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. ISSA):

H. Res. 1488. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 113: Mr. DJOU.
 H.R. 116: Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 571: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
 H.R. 636: Ms. FOXX.
 H.R. 645: Mr. ALTMIRE.
 H.R. 745: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. GIFFORDS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHILDERS, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 1067: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 1079: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 1240: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
 H.R. 1362: Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 1569: Ms. HIRONO and Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 1925: Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 2000: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 2031: Mr. REHBERG.
 H.R. 2103: Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 2406: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia and Mr. HOEKSTRA.
 H.R. 2429: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 2443: Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 2455: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. MCMAHON.
 H.R. 2480: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
 H.R. 2483: Mr. MCKEON.
 H.R. 2553: Mr. ARCURI.
 H.R. 2568: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

- H.R. 2575: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 2697: Mr. BRIGHT.
H.R. 2855: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3006: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 3069: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 3077: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 3108: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 3212: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 3345: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 3359: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3441: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3488: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 3564: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 3721: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 3729: Mr. REYES and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 3745: Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 3781: Mr. CHILDERS.
H.R. 3786: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 3839: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 3994: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 4037: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4116: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 4175: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 4181: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 4197: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 4210: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 4226: Mr. VAN HOLLLEN.
H.R. 4278: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 4509: Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 4544: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 4596: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HALL of New York, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 4604: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 4638: Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 4642: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4645: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. HILL.
H.R. 4662: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 4676: Mr. SABLAN and Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 4692: Mr. BOCCIERI.
H.R. 4693: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 4753: Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 4787: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 4796: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POSEY, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 4812: Mr. BOCCIERI.
H.R. 4832: Mr. TEAGUE.
H.R. 4871: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 4886: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 4914: Mr. MCMAHON and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 4947: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 4958: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 4959: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ELLISON, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 4972: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 4993: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HARE, Ms. KILROY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. SCHAUER.
H.R. 5001: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 5029: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 5040: Mrs. CAPPS and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 5044: Mr. FARR and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 5081: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
H.R. 5096: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 5111: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 5141: Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 5173: Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H.R. 5200: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 5211: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 5234: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 5260: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 5310: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 5324: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 5393: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 5396: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 5418: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 5434: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 5477: Mr. POLIS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 5497: Mr. CRITZ, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. KOSMAS.
H.R. 5509: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5510: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 5513: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5523: Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 5525: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5540: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 5541: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 5542: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 5552: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BERRY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 5555: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 5561: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FARR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PETERS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 5562: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 5566: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 5580: Mr. MCCARTHY of California.
H.R. 5585: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 5596: Mr. FILNER and Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD.
H.R. 5608: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 5612: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 5617: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 5619: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H. Con. Res. 200: Mr. HINCHEY.
H. Con. Res. 259: Mr. MANZULLO.
H. Con. Res. 266: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. CARNEY.
H. Con. Res. 281: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. WAMP.
H. Con. Res. 284: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H. Con. Res. 290: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. HALL of Texas.
H. Res. 762: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. STARK.
H. Res. 771: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 913: Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H. Res. 982: Mr. LAMBORN.
H. Res. 1226: Mr. BONNER and Mr. DINGELL.
H. Res. 1244: Ms. KILROY.
H. Res. 1245: Mr. COLE.
H. Res. 1321: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. GALLEGLY.
H. Res. 1342: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Res. 1370: Mr. STARK.
H. Res. 1401: Mr. DENT, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. WITTMAN, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H. Res. 1420: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H. Res. 1462: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FARR, Mr. SIREN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. INGLIS, and Mr. BERMAN.
H. Res. 1473: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H. Res. 1483: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LINDER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. AKIN, Mr. COLE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BOREN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. OLSON, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DJOU, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

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. LEVIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 5618, to continue Federal unemployment programs, 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. 5618, to continue Federal unemployment programs, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

NOTICE

The text of the Conference Report will be found in Book II of this issue.