United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 20, 2010 No. 107

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC.
July 20, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

CONGRATULATING ANA SOTORRIO ON RETIRING AS ASSOCIATE AVIATION DIRECTOR FOR MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize an outstanding constituent and a dedicated public servant, Ana Sotorrio, who will be retiring after 30 years of public service.

As the associate aviation director for Miami-Dade County, Ana has worked tirelessly to ensure that Miami International Airport remains one of the finest airports in the world.

As a recipient of the International Women in Business award, Ana must be commended for receiving this distinguished and prestigious award last year. Her exceptional leadership in promoting and enhancing trade and international business between Miami International Airport and the Americas is truly inspiring.

In addition, Ana's advocacy on Capitol Hill helped Miami International Airport become the Nation's number one international cargo airport and the number two international passenger airport.

Ana, enjoy your well-deserved retirement and your extra time with family and friends.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of wonderful people who deserve our congratulations, I would like to recognize all of the caring teachers in my South Florida community and commend them for their wonderful contributions to the development of our children.

As a woman who has been on all sides of our education system, as a student, as a former Florida certified teacher, as a recipient of a doctorate from the University of Miami in education, and as a proud parent and grandmother, I truly know how instrumental and exceptional a teacher can be.

Teachers have the power to intrigue and open whole new horizons and vistas for our youth, setting them on a positive path with high hopes and expectations for the future. A teacher can inspire a child in a specific subject matter such as math, science, art, or history, and fundamentally alter, often focusing, their enthusiasm. And there are few greater rewards than the satisfaction gained from instilling a lifelong love of learning in a child.

Fulfilling this great responsibility takes a tremendous degree of perseverance and commitment from our teachers. Our educators' unwavering dedication gives our students the ambition to achieve one of the most important aspects of life's endeavors: love of learning. These teachers are driven to present each and every child with the opportunities that they so rightfully deserve.

Certainly South Florida and the Keys, areas that I represent, are fortunate to have many outstanding educators such as the ones that I have described. Educators who are willing to do everything possible to ensure that our students are the best in our great Nation. Their commitment to our community and to our students is exemplary, and we are forever grateful for their services.

It was our teachers many years ago who gave us, the legislators, the foundations and the directions that we needed to get ahead. Each person in this great elected body is testimony to the talent and commitment of their hardworking teachers along the way. I am certainly grateful for the support I received while in school, and I'm sure that I would not be the same person without it. And I will forever be a product of the Florida public education system.

I graduated from West Miami Middle School, Southwest Miami Senior High School. I have an associate of arts degree from Miami-Dade College, a master's and a bachelor's degree from Florida International University in education—all public institutions.

As an older adult, as I mentioned, I completed a doctorate in education from the University of Miami. But even if I had finished my education at the high school level, other than family, there has been no greater influence on who all of us are than our teachers.

Through the mentoring of our teachers, students are provided with near limitless potential and possibilities. Teachers make sure that children can be creative with their minds. They get their minds on a task. And this education will allow them to accomplish the many great things that they want

Printed on recycled paper.

to achieve throughout their lifetimes. This continues to be my guiding principle, inspired in me by my many great teachers, allowing me to work tirelessly for my community. Today's students will undoubtedly be inspired to even greater heights with unwavering commitment to bettering our community and our country.

For the professionalism and care that our teachers have shown in the pursuit of this most noble of professions, I thank each of them from the bottom of my heart. They have shaped the lives of countless students, and we are truly privileged to have such wonderful individuals taking on this great challenge.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I will submit in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of the teachers who have received awards for excellence in education throughout South Florida and the Florida Keys in this past school year.

From Centennial Middle School: Frederic Gabriel, Teacher of the Year.

From Citrus Grove Elementary School: Edward Slater, Teacher of the Year; Jonny Junes, Rookie Teacher of the Year.

From Coconut Grove Elementary School: Emely Yanes, Teacher of the Year.

From Coral Shores High: Nancy Ellsworth, District Teacher of the Year.

From Excelsior Language Academy: Ms. Reagan Weissenberg, Teacher of the Year.

From Fairlawn Elementary Community School: Ileana Estrella, Teacher of the Year.

From Gerald Adams Elementary: Gloria Pascual, Teacher of the Year; Michael Sommer, Inclusion Teacher of the Year.

From Glynn Archer Elementary: Terri Sims, Inclusion Teacher of the Year; Lottie Edwards, Teacher of the Year; Jalynn Frazier, Beginning Teacher of the Year.

From Horace O'Bryant Middle School: Christina Beza, Beginning Teacher of the Year; Kristen Condella, Inclusion Teacher of the Year; Stephanie Manaher, Teacher of the Year.

From Henry M. Flagler Elementary School: Marielena Lago, Teacher of the Year.

From Kensington Park Elementary School: Maria D. Reinoso, Teacher of the Year; Kendra Ceasar, Rookie Teacher of the Year.

From Key Largo School: Laura Lietaert, Teacher of the Year; Eva Brown, Elementary School Inclusion Teacher of the Year; Nicole Elliot, Middle School Inclusion Teacher of the Year.

From Key West High School: Dina Kinnune, Inclusion Teacher of the Year; Rebecca Provost, Teacher of the Year.

From Kinloch Park Elementary School: Felicia Fina, Teacher of the Year.

From Marathon Middle/High School: Andrea Rapach, Beginning Teacher of the Year; Mike Lettau, Teacher of the Year.

From Merrick Educational Center: Maude Weiss, Teacher of the Year; Krista Caballero, Beginning Teacher of the Year; Lydia Chico, Paraprofessional of the Year.

From Miami Lakes K–8 Center: Ada Romeu, Teacher of the Year; Amy Castillo, Rookie Teacher of the Year; Rosy Calvo, Miami-Dade Public Schools District Principal of the Year.

From Plantation Key School: Barbara Berry, Teacher of the Year; Amy Bence, Inclusion Teacher of the Year.

From Poinciana Elementary: Jessica Eden Lockwood, Inclusion Teacher of the Year; Martha Wyker, Teacher of the Year.

From Ruth Owens Kruse' Educational Center: Dr. Ana Menedez-Londono, Teacher of the Year; Mr. Luis Farach, Paraprofessional of the Year.

From Sigsbee Elementary: Ellie Riley, Inclusion Teacher of the Year; Lynly Hill, Teacher of the Year; Callie Hubble, Beginning Teacher of the Year.

From South Dade Middle School: Ronald Dennis, Teacher of the Year; Susana Skinner, Rookie Teacher of the Year.

From Somerset Academy Silver Palms: Adreia Da Costa, Young Student Teacher of the Year; Alejandra Guzman, Middle and High School Teacher of the Year.

From South Florida Autisim Charter School: German Garcia, Teacher of the Year; Roxana Rojas, Teacher Assistant of the Year.

From Stanley Switlike Elementary: Suzanne Terpos, Teacher of the Year; Erin Voelliger, Inclusion Teacher of the Year.

From Sunny Isles Beach Community School: Ms. Christine Peck, Teacher of the Year; Rose Belizaire, Rookie Teacher of the Year.

From Sylvania Heights Elementary School: Anna-Maria Losada, Teacher of the Year.

From Vineland K–8 Center: Ms. Laurie Sharron, Teacher of the Year.

SUPPORTING OUR SENIORS—RECOGNIZING THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT

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

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last week we celebrated the 45th anniversary of the adoption of the Older Americans Act. Later this month we will celebrate the 45th anniversary of Medicare and next month the 75th anniversary of Social Security.

Seniors are vital to our communities, having spent a lifetime building and shaping this Nation. Increasingly, our seniors have been able to continue to make important contributions throughout all of their lives, volunteering their time, mentoring our youth, and often remaining active in the workforce.

As a former Chairman of Fairfax County, Virginia, I was proud of the work I helped lead in the creation of a 50+Plus Action Plan outlining more than 60 initiatives to support our senior population. We expanded transportation opportunities, ensured communities were planned to provide housing options for all ages, pursued respite options for caregivers. And it was necessary to bring that focus to Washington.

This Congress has made strategic investments to assist these efforts through actions such as the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act that expanded opportunities for seniors to remain active. But it wasn't always this way, which is why we needed the Older Americans Act.

The Older Americans Act facilitates the provisions of necessary social services and nutritional support to seniors through a partnership with various State agencies. In addition to establishing the Administration on Aging, the act established the National Family Caregiver Support Program, recognizing the critical role that family caregivers provide and the need to make sure they have the necessary resources. That act also provides for home-based services, disease prevention and wellness programs to promote better health.

The Older Americans Act was a continuation of the improvements in the quality of life begun in 1935 when Congress enacted the Social Security Act. The poverty rate among seniors in 1935 exceeded 45 percent. Today it is 10 percent. Few acts of Congress have made such a dramatic difference on a single demographic group.

In addition to the Older Americans Act, in 1965 Medicare was established to protect seniors' health. Before its enactment almost half of all senior citizens lacked health insurance. Given the traditionally higher costs of senior health care without Medicare, for many Americans there was no prospect of health insurance. Our efforts to further enhance the quality of life for our Nation's senior citizens continue to this day. The Health Care Reform Act enhances Medicare benefits.

What's interesting to me is I was a young high school debater when Medicare was adopted, and the national high school debate topic that year was, Would the adoption of Medicare constitute socialized medicine in America? Would it, in fact, discourage the private sector? Would it, in fact, make us look a lot more like the health care system in the United Kingdom or Canada?

Much of the rhetoric we hear today about health care reform was echoed 45 years ago against Social Security, and much of it came from the same sources who oppose health care reform today. They consistently opposed Medicare. Yet when you go to a retirement community, when you meet with seniors across this country, certainly in my district, I can't find one who thinks that we ought to repeal Medicare. They know that Medicare has made a huge difference in the quality of their lives, and going from being maybe the most vulnerable demographic group in America in terms of health care coverage, today they have the most protected. That's the efficacy of an effective government program that has made a difference in the quality of lives.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the anniversaries of the Older Americans Act, the Social Security Act, and Medicare, we also celebrate the adoption of the Health Care Reform Act that will make the same kind of difference in years to come in millions of lives now and in the future.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to not traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

UNCERTAINTY—THE ENEMY OF JOB CREATION

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

Mr. STEARNS. Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

With the United States unemployment rate steadily hovering around 10 percent, Americans are continuing to ask, ''Where are the jobs?'' The response to this jobless crisis from congressional Democrats and the Obama administration seems to be focused on higher taxes, increased government spending, and more government mandates and regulation. All of this has led to great uncertainty in the business community, especially among small businesses which employ over half of all private sector employees.

In a recently released letter, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce explains how the current policies of the administration and congressional Democrats are not working. The high spending and high tax agenda has created an atmosphere of uncertainty. As the Chamber's letter correctly states, ''Uncertainty is the enemy of growth, investment, and job creation. Through their legislative and regulatory proposals—some passed, some pending, and others simply talked about—the congressional majority and the administration have injected tremendous uncertainty into the economic decision-making process and business planning. This is why banks are reluctant to lend and why American corporations are sitting on well over a trillion dollars. It is why America's small businesses and entrepreneurs, the engines of innovation and job creation, are starving for capital and are either struggling to survive or simply unable to expand. In the process, we are also eroding our competitive position globally, as other nations take steps to cut taxes, reduce regulations, and restrain the appetites of big government. For all of these reasons, the known and unknown costs that come with expanding operations and adding to payrolls in the United States are simply perceived to be too high.''

As the Chamber's letter highlights, the continued expansion of the Federal Government into all areas of our economy is stunting economic growth and prohibiting private sector job creation. The Democrats' congressional agenda includes one piece of job-killing legislation after another. The new health care law includes thousands of expensive and burdensome mandates and hundreds of billions of dollars in business taxes and penalties. It contains thousands of pages of new regulations to be followed by individuals, employers, health care providers and States.

The House passed climate change bill, the cap and trade bill, would create nearly 1,500 new regulations and mandates and carry a price tag of well over a trillion dollars, according to the Chamber. Furthermore, the Environmental Protection Agency is engaging in an unprecedented level of regulatory action by moving forward with 29 major economic rules and 173 major policy rules.

The list keeps going. The recently passed financial regulatory reform legislation creates 243 new formal rulemakings by 11 different Federal agencies, 47 studies and 74 reports. It is really no wonder American businesses are hesitant to expand and hire.

In addition to the regulatory uncertainty, the Federal Government's appetite for spending needs to be controlled. American families and small businesses are simply making tough choices in this economic climate but Federal spending continues to soar. The Federal Government is spending $31,000 per household, the highest ever, and running up a $1.5 trillion deficit in 2010, the largest deficit since the end of World War II.

Recent yearly budget deficits have reached unprecedented levels, accounting for 11 percent of the GDP. By comparison, the historical average budget deficit is only 2.9 percent of the GDP. In 2008, publicly held debt as a percentage of the GDP was about 21 percent, nearly five points below the post-war average. Under President Obama's budget, this figure would more than double to 90 percent of the GDP by the year 2020. This continued structural debt poses serious economic risks to this country. As the Chamber's letter notes, ''By crowding out available capital for business expansion and eventually triggering increases in interest rates and inflation, rising deficits and debt add to uncertainty, inhibit growth, and smother job creation.''

The way out of this recession and toward job creation is to get Federal spending under control and enact policies that free up capital and encourage businesses to grow. We need to reduce uncertainty and restore confidence in our economy. We cannot do this if the administration and congressional Democrats continue to impose more and more burdensome mandates and increase taxes on job creators. It's time to reduce the unnecessary meddling of the Federal Government and let the American entrepreneurial spirit flourish.

THE 9/11 HEALTH AND COMPENSATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, for too long the heroes and survivors of the 9/11 attacks have struggled to receive the health care and compensation that they need and deserve. They came to Ground Zero to aid in America's recovery. Now we must aid in their recovery.

After 8½ years of hard work, we are closer than ever to passing H.R. 847, the 9/11 Health and Compensation Act. The bill, which would provide health care and compensation, is nearing consideration on the House floor next week.

But another tragedy threatens the health of cleanup workers. The warnings from 9/11 must be heeded as crews restore the gulf after the BP oil spill.

I urge my colleagues to remember and support those who aid our country in time of need. They were there for us; we must be there for them, with their health care and with support.

STOP THE DROP HOUSES ACT

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of bipartisan legislation I introduced yesterday with my colleague Congressman Brian Bilbray: the Stop the Drop Houses Act.

The Federal Government's failure to secure the border and fix our broken immigration system has allowed smugglers and Mexican cartels to set up vast networks of drop houses, which operate as way stations for criminal enterprises. In Phoenix we have as many as 1,000 drop houses. They are dangerous magnets for violent crime.

Even more alarming is the fact that a loophole in Federal law prevents authorities from using civil forfeitures to seize these houses. Authorities can seize vehicles or even airplanes, but they can't use civil forfeiture against the actual drop house itself. The Stop Drop Houses Act would close the loophole and allow authorities to use civil forfeitures to seize these drop houses.

Obviously it will take much more to fix our broken system, but this is one obvious and important step that Congress can take right now to make our communities safer.

I urge my colleagues to pass the Stop the Drop Houses Act.

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is critical to our economic recovery to extend unemployment benefits for several more months and assist struggling States and local governments so that they can avoid layoffs of teachers, police officers, firefighters, and others.

Right now there are 15 million out-of-work Americans who are waiting on the Senate to extend unemployment benefits, which contribute to paying mortgages, health care, utility bills, and the cost of food. The Democratic unemployment bill would provide unemployment checks averaging about $300 to people whose 26 weeks of State-paid benefits have run out. The benefits would be extended through the end of November.

We know these benefits not only are a much-needed lifeline for jobless Americans and their families. They also provide a proven boost to our struggling economy.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats are fighting to help middle class Americans while the majority of the Republicans are blocking a commonsense bill at a time of great economic challenge.

I urge the Senate to pass the unemployment extension to those Americans who are seeking employment every day as they go and look at the Web sites and visit companies and are told there is no work. How could the Republicans then say that extending unemployment is going to keep people from looking for work? They want work. We know that the jobs have gone. We need to recreate jobs.

So let's save middle America so that they will be able to provide for the needs of their families.

REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS UNDER ATTACK

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because women's reproductive rights are under attack.

Four months ago we passed a health care bill to ensure that every man, woman and child in this country has access to the medical care they need. But yesterday, a rule was announced that restricts choice coverage in the new high-risk insurance pools—even if the woman pays for that coverage with her own money.

This rule means women with preexisting conditions such as cancer, AIDS, diabetes, who have been denied coverage and are counting on the high-risk pools, won't be able to get reproductive health coverage; not even if they pay for it with their own money.

This incomplete and conditional care is not what our mothers, daughters, sisters and wives need. This is not the status quo.

We must remember the health care bill we passed, protect a woman's right to choose, and stop this harmful provision before it takes effect.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 53 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Lord God faithful through the ages, You take delight in Your people, even when we are distracted from lasting purpose or impatient because there is no immediate results from our determined actions.

Give us the wisdom to accomplish great deeds because we are drawn closer to Your designs for this Nation and our place in the globalized world.

Strengthen us lest we become tired. Further us in our search to deepen the commitment of serious study and hard work until we find security and justice for Your people, especially those in most need.

May Your kingdom come, Your will be done through our humble efforts, both now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER 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.

HONORING THE LIFE OF PATRICIA DECIO

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

Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the life of Patricia Decio of Elkhart, Indiana. Mrs. Decio made everyone she touched a better person through her caring, loving ways.

She was born in 1930, graduated from Mundelein College, and married Art, the love of her life, in 1951. Art always said how lucky he felt to be married to Pat, and their devotion to one another is an example for everybody.

Pat was the proud mom of five children, 14 grandchildren, and three great grandchildren. She devoted her life to her family, her church and her community. Her work with the Women's Care Center was summed up by the plaque that stated "we would not be serving so many women and babies today if it were not for the vision and faith of this wonderful woman." Her dedication to our community, St. Mary's, Notre Dame, Elkhart, the NAACP, is legendary.

We know she is surrounded by God's grace, a loving family, and we know we will see her again.

Pat, thank you for all the kindness you showed and the lives you touched. May God hold you in the palm of His hand.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are asking, "Where are the jobs?"

And just this morning we found out that housing starts fell in the month of June to the lowest level in 8 months. Consumer confidence has fallen to its lowest level in the last 11 months.

We need to get Americans back to work, and we need to get American businesses back open again. But we're not going to get there if the President continues to take money and freedom away from American employers, whether it's through the stimulus bill, ObamaCare, the national energy tax, or this financial regulatory bill.

With 3 million jobs lost, unemployment at 9½ percent, and with trillion-dollar deficits, it's clear to everyone except the President that his big government agenda is not working.

We need to cut spending now in order to help create jobs in America. But we have no budget to clean up the mess. We have no plan to move free trade agreements that could create millions of American jobs. And we have no plan to stop the largest tax increase in history for American families and small businesses.

Republicans are listening, through America Speaking Out, and offering better solutions that will limit the size of this government and empower small businesses across our country.

COMMEMORATING THE 36TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemoration of the 36th anniversary of the Turkish invasion of Cypress. Turkey's invasion and continued occupation of this tiny island republic is a symptom of Turkey's indifference to human rights, religious tolerance, and democratic values.

Today, Turkey continues to illegally resettle some 180,000 Anatolian Turks into the homes and possessions of the 200,000 Greek Cypriots evicted from the occupied territories. The Turkish military is also systematically eradicating Hellenic and Christian heritage, with all but five of the 500 Greek Orthodox Churches located there having been looted, desecrated or destroyed.

On this, the 36th anniversary of the invasion and occupation of Cypress, the United States should demand an immediate withdrawal of the 45,000 Turkish soldiers now occupying northern Cypress, and should continue to press this issue in every interaction with Turkish officials. This will promote a values-based alliance with Turkey that will serve to bring justice to the people of

Cypress, strengthen NATO, and reinforce collective western security.

THE BITTER FEUD BETWEEN THE WHITE HOUSE AND AMERICAN BUSINESSES

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, last week a bitter feud erupted in Washington, and it wasn't your typical partisan spat between liberals and conservatives, or even Democrats and Republicans. The fight was between the White House and American businesses.

Since when, Mr. Speaker, has it been acceptable for American employers and the White House to be on opposing teams? How can we expect American businesses of all sizes to get the economy back on track when they have become so frustrated by the ideological and anti-competitive agenda coming out of Washington?

To fend off criticism from business groups, including the NFIB, the White House has embarked on a summer PR campaign in an attempt to show that they are not, in fact, anti-business. But even the best PR operations aren't outfitted with time machines.

Over the past 18 months, stimulus, cap-and-trade, health care and FinReg have contributed to a perfect storm of uncertainty and debt, forcing American businesses to hunker down and hoard capital, rather than hire more workers.

Mr. Speaker, American businessmen and women aren't just a part of our economy or some constituency to be dealt with. They are our economy.

TRICKLE DOWN ECONOMICS IS BACK

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, trickle down economics is back. It worked so well before.

We just heard the minority leader: Tax cuts will solve everything. Tax cuts targeted toward the wealthiest among us, the super rich, will have a trickle down effect that will put people back to work and lower the deficit.

That's kind of magic, isn't it?

The Republicans forget that one-half of the so-called stimulus, nearly one-half, was tax cuts. Didn't put anybody back to work. Most people don't know they got them. Eight bucks a week out of your lower withholding.

And guess what?

We borrowed all that money. It will be paid back for 30 years. Now they want to borrow more.

There's two sides to solving the deficit problem in this country. Cut unnecessary spending and, yes, the wealthiest among us are going to have to pay a little bit of their fair share by repealing the Bush tax cuts on those folks.

They want to deny that. They want to say, oh, we can have the cake and eat it too. We'll lower revenues and we'll balance the budget.

Now, if you eliminated the entire Federal Government, except for about 60 percent of the Pentagon, no justice, no prisons, no border patrol, nothing, you still wouldn't get to balance. You have to deal with revenue.

□ 1210

DON'T LET THE TAX CUTS EXPIRE

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

Mr. PENCE. This is a difficult time in the life of our Nation. The American people are focused on jobs. But given the recent political rhetoric from the White House and what we just heard about letting tax cuts expire, one thing is clear: Democrats in Washington still don't get it. It's amazing.

In the midst of the worst economy in 25 years, Democrats are actually talking about embracing the largest tax increase in American history. You know, I don't know anybody back in Indiana who thinks they pay too little in taxes. The American people deserve to know that should Democrats get their way, every income tax bracket will increase on January 1, 2011. Every single one.

You know, you don't raise taxes on every American taxpayer during the worst recession in 25 years. Here's our commitment: As we did on their government takeover of health care, their national energy tax, and their failed stimulus policy, Republicans are going to stand in the gap against their job-killing agenda. We will protect taxpayers from the largest tax increase in American history with everything we've got. The American people know Washington doesn't tax too little; Washington spends too much. And Republicans are on the side of the American people.

PASS THE DREAM ACT

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of thousands of children in our country, cheerleaders on a high school cheerleading squad, members of the high school football team, students who work hard and play by the rules, get ready for college, and yet they are unable to ever enter the workforce legally or go to college. Why? Because their parents violated the law and brought them here when they were 1 or 2 or 3 years old.

The DREAM Act will address and help these hundreds of thousands of de facto Americans who in most cases don't even have a memory of another country, and frequently don't even speak any other language other than English fluently.

Regardless of where one is on the larger issue of immigration reform, surely we should not visit the sins of the parents upon the children. In no other area of law do we do this, nor should we with regard to immigration.

The bipartisan DREAM Act would recognize the hundreds of thousands of de facto Americans as actual Americans. It catches up with where people already are and helps our Nation be able to benefit from the hard work and study of these wonderful Americans. I call upon my colleagues to pass the DREAM Act.

VOTE ON CONTRIBUTING TO THE IMF

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

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, Margaret Thatcher once said, ''The problem with socialism is that eventually you run out of other people's money.'' It's true. And we see it in Europe today. Greece and others in the European Union have spent their way into bankruptcy, and unfortunately we are following in the same path. They're requesting $300 billion from the IMF.

What most people in America don't realize is America is the largest contributor to the IMF, so we are really underwriting a European bailout. I have introduced a resolution in Congress calling for an up-or-down vote by Congress on this proposal. And I posted my idea on America Speaking Out.

Right now any citizen can go to America Speaking Out to discuss and vote on this idea. I encourage them to vote ''yes'' and to spread the word to others. Let's keep the momentum going.

SOCIAL SECURITY'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. One in every four American households relies on Social Security, including 33.5 million retirees, 7.8 million disabled workers, and 4.2 million children. Its benefits are modest. The average retiree benefit is about $14,000 a year, less than $12,000 for women retirees, but essential. One in four retirees depends on Social Security for almost all of their income.

On August 14, Social Security turns 75 years old. It has never missed a check, and is cherished by Americans of all ages. We are able to celebrate its anniversary because in 2005 Democrats beat back President Bush's and congressional Republicans' privatization efforts.

Today there are new Republicans calling for privatization. Once again, Democrats will step forward to protect and strengthen Social Security so we can celebrate this national treasure for generations to come.

THE NUMBERS THAT ARE DRIVING OUR ECONOMY RIGHT NOW

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are hurting. We all know that. There are some specific numbers to which we can point that underscore that pain: First, 9.5, the current percentage of unemployment; 14, the number of consecutive months that the unemployment rate has been in excess of 9.4 percent; 125,000, the number of jobs that were lost last month; $13 trillion, the level of our national debt; $1 trillion, the annual deficit as we head towards the end of the fiscal year; 0, the number of times before this year that the House has ever failed to debate and pass a budget; 0, the number of proposals by the Democratic majority to cut wasteful spending and provide accountability for their out of control spending practices; 0, the number of pro-growth proposals that the Democratic majority has offered.

The American people want nothing more, Mr. Speaker, than to create jobs and get our economy back on track. Unfortunately, the refusal to pass a budget, the refusal to rein in wasteful spending, the refusal to allow proven pro-growth economic policies to be put into place is impinging our opportunity to do that.

Republicans stand ready to put into place the kinds of policies that will ensure that the pain the American people are feeling will be diminished.

SOCIAL SECURITY'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 75th anniversary of the founding of Social Security, it's a time to reflect on the generations and the hundreds of millions of Americans who through good times and bad counted on Social Security to be there to have dignity in retirement, to provide quality of life.

There is millions of stories out there very similar to the one in my family. As a young man watching my father die of a lengthy illness, and a 9-year old brother at home, and a stay-at-home mother, watching Social Security survivor benefits be there to allow my little brother to go on and go to college and my mother to retrain as a nurse and go back into the workforce. Many people will say, and they're absolutely right, pull yourself up by your bootstraps. They are right about that. We just didn't have any boots. They were loaned to us by Social Security. And for that we have paid that back 10 times over.

A family is stronger, a community is stronger, our country is stronger. In August we should celebrate the 75th anniversary and many more to come.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I love these debates about Social Security and this conversation about Social Security. But if you don't have a job, who's going to pay the Social Security? So it's really about jobs.

I had an interview today with some radio folks back in my district, and they asked a question, Have we created any jobs but government jobs? And how come we are creating government jobs that get paid more than the private-sector jobs? When did we get confused about that? They wanted me to answer the question, Where are the jobs for the folks in Texas? Where are the jobs for the folks in the other States? Why are all the jobs just in Washington, DC, growing the government?

This administration has destroyed thousands of private-sector jobs by taking over and Federalizing the student loan program and making loans harder to get and taking longer to be processed. Now President Obama and this administration have unilaterally killed tens of thousands of jobs in the gulf, in direct violation of a Federal court order.

Now, is this a way we create jobs for America? The question they want to know, Where are the jobs, so, with a job, we can pay our share of Social Security?

SOCIAL SECURITY'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the upcoming 75th anniversary of Social Security and express my support for the financial security of millions of retired Americans.

Representing Maryland's Fourth Congressional District, I serve many who oversee and administer the Social Security Administration. One of my constituents I had the honor of meeting out at Collington retirement community in Mitchellville, Maryland.

Robert M. Ball was one of the chief architects of Social Security, the program we know today. Mr. Ball was Social Security's chief administrator from 1962 to 1973. He was described once as ''the undisputed spiritual leader, and its chief advocate and defender.'' He served three presidents, Republicans and Democrats, to make sure it remained strong for all of us. He passed away in January 2008, but he left a legacy barely known outside Washington, but a program that's the backbone of America's social safety net.

At a time when Republicans are threatening the privatization of Social Security, Mr. Ball would say not now. Can you imagine what would have happened just a year ago when our Nation suffered its worst financial crisis since the Great Depression? Our seniors would have lost everything, and our young people would be starting from scratch. The American people deserve better. Democrats are going to give them better. And we need to get our economy back on track, put people back to work, contribute to Social Security, and strengthen our most successful program of the 21st century.

□ 1220

PAT BOONE: AMERICAN ICON

(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. Mr. Speaker, in addition to being a legendary actor, writer, and singer, American actor Pat Boone serves as spokesman for 60 Plus, an advocacy group led by Jim Martin for senior citizens. Pat is an advocate for liberty and a defender of the Constitution. His contributions for our military servicemembers are inspiring. Pat developed the documentary ''For My Country'' to promote the significance of the National Guard.

Pat Boone is ahead of his times. Back in 2004, at a commencement speech at Pepperdine University, Boone stressed the need for citizen involvement and called for a new Boston Tea Party movement. Today, as the Tea Party is a household term, we should note Boston was not the only city with the tea rebellion during the Revolutionary War. Before the famous Boston Tea Party, patriots in Charleston, South Carolina, impounded tea in 1773 to protest taxes and in 1776 sold the tea to finance the Revolution.

Concerned citizens still feel T-E-A, Taxed Enough Already. It's time to give Americans tax relief and create jobs.

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

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE EXTENSION

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the millions of Americans caught in the crosshairs of Republican political calculations. Today, a partisan minority blocks relief to those laid off during this recession.

This obstruction doesn't just keep food off American tables; it keeps Americans out of work. People like Annette Tornberg. Last month, she lost her benefits. Now she can't afford the gas she needs to drive to job interviews. Like the vast majority of those

on unemployment, Annette uses the funds as a bridge to her next job—not to replace it.

The notion that relief discourages people from seeking jobs is not only wrong but outrageous. So today, I call on Republicans to stop hurting American workers. Stop playing politics with their lives and start letting the Senate and millions of Americans get back to work.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, last week the State of Ohio announced that its unemployment rate for June was 10.5 percent. Every county in my district saw an increase, and in some areas it's higher than 14 percent. And that's before taking into account those people that have given up looking for work and the underemployed. No wonder my constituents continually ask, ''Where are the jobs?''

Business leaders in my district and around the country continue to say the same thing. We need to stop this reckless spending in Washington and stop pursuing job-killing policies. When businesses are faced with new taxes to cover the government takeover of health care, the uncertainty of cap-and-trade tax legislation, and the litany of other taxes, how are they expected to hire new workers and reinvest in their business?

I am gravely concerned about the direction this Congress is taking with our economy. The reckless spending has to stop, and the massive debt which we are saddling our children and grandchildren with is unconscionable. It is time to put sound fiscal policies in place. Let's spend less, keep taxes low, and help create an environment in which small businesses can thrive. Only then in Ohio can we finally say, ''Here come the jobs.''

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SCHAUER. Mr. Speaker, over the last 75 years, Social Security has been secure and reliable for Americans approaching retirement. For some Americans, it's the backbone of their retirement; for others, it's all they have. Six out of 10 senior citizens in our country receive the majority of their income from Social Security and four out of 10 widows do. As a matter of fact, after our country's most recent economic disaster, even more seniors were left with only Social Security to rely on because they saw their retirement accounts dwindle at the hands of Wall Street.

We've already seen what can happen when we let Wall Street CEOs gamble with our life savings—we lose. We cannot afford to gamble with our Nation's golden years, and privatization is just that—gambling.

We must work together to strengthen the promise of Social Security for our children and for our grandchildren and still meet the needs of those who depend on it now for income.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

(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. Mr. Speaker, everyone is asking, ''Where are the jobs?'' When will the liberal leadership in the House take action to get us out of this perpetual economic slump and have a plan to provide the jobs that American families need?

Unemployment nationally remains high at 9.5 percent for June, with the U.S. economy losing 125,000 jobs in that month alone. South Florida's unemployment rate has steadily increased to 12.8 percent. To add insult to injury, in my congressional district, we're still reeling from the perception of the gulf oil spill in our area. BP might have temporarily sealed the leak, but the damage has been done to south Florida's tourism economy. Commercial fishermen, charter boat captains, mom-and-pop restaurants, they're all feeling the economic pinch.

It is time to take a proven approach of providing tax relief, regulatory relief for families and small businesses, while reducing the debt, which is delaying future economic growth.

NATIONAL OCEANS POLICY

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, the United States Congress enacted legislation to create an Oceans Commission to look at how we can prevent the oceans from dying. Yesterday, the President of the United States enacted, by Executive order, the first national oceans policy and governance for the oceans and Great Lakes of the United States—our greatest national heritage and our greatest national trust.

We, the people, are going to be taking care of the oceans like they've never been taken care of before. We're not going to allow the conflicts of the sea of overfishing, of overmining, of overdrilling, of overeverything and dumping all of our waste and garbage and sewage into the oceans. We're now going to have a policy that's like the clean air policy, where we cleaned up the air in America, cleaned up the water in America with the Clean Water Act.

Thank you, Mr. President, for being the best steward our oceans have ever had and implementing the recommendations of the National Oceans Commission, which Congress enacted but could not enact legislation. Hopefully, we'll move out from here and the world will see and the children will appreciate the actions that the President took yesterday.

IN SUPPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS

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

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, over the Fourth of July district work period, I met with small business leaders in central New Jersey. We discussed the state of the economy and how New Jersey's job creators are in dire need of free market solutions that will help them create jobs. Instead, Congress has put forth job-killing policies that include higher taxes, unchecked spending, and new health care mandates that continue to put a drag on small businesses across the Nation.

That's why I have joined a number of my colleagues from the Northeast in authoring a small business assistance plan that provides important tax relief, reduces paperwork requirements, and boosts small business lending. Our proposed measure focuses on letting small business owners keep more of what they earn to hire workers, buy new equipment, expand their companies, and spend less time filling out paperwork created by Federal mandates.

I urge my colleagues to help small businesses across the Nation and cosponsor H.R. 5554.

□ 1230

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, next month we will be celebrating the 75th anniversary of Social Security. Before 1935, half of America's seniors lived in poverty. Since FDR signed Social Security into law, we have upheld a sacred trust to our parents and grandparents that after decades of hard work, raising their children, and defending the U.S. against foreign enemies, that they would be able to retire with dignity and respect.

Three weeks ago, my colleague from Ohio, the House Republican leader, implied that we should raise the retirement age to 70 for everyone, office workers and construction workers alike, and cut Social Security benefits to help reduce the deficit and pay for the war in Afghanistan. Raiding Social Security in this way is both irresponsible, and it is a breach of trust.

We should not be gutting Social Security and breaching our sacred trust to America's seniors. It's amazing that Republicans are willing to gut Social Security and refuse unemployment compensation during these challenging times while at the same time arguing that we must preserve the tax cuts for the superwealthy.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, hardworking individuals and entrepreneurs have always been the life blood of our economy. They create jobs. They spur innovation. They have made the American free enterprise system the envy of the world.

As Americans, we all understand that if you work hard you can be successful. Unfortunately, that spirit appears to be undergoing a fundamental transformation in which government comes before the spirit of free enterprise.

The trend began early in 2009 when the government passed the so-called ''stimulus package'' that was supposed to boost the economy and keep unemployment under 8 percent. More than a year after stimulus, unemployment remains well above 9 percent.

Around this country there is an atmosphere of uncertainty caused by Washington's anti-worker agenda. New taxes, mandates, and regulations in countless new laws and proposed laws are threatening to strangle our Nation's entrepreneurs and workers. As I travel around my district, a prevailing feeling of uncertainty about what lies ahead has made employers hesitant to create new jobs; and until this fear and uncertainty about the future is allayed, the American people will continue to wonder and ask the question: Where are the jobs?

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFIT EXTENSION

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

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, unemployment benefits and Social Security benefits are a safety net. They are not a lottery handout; and as we struggle to try to get the Senate to pass an extension of unemployment benefits, with 15 million out-of-work Americans who are depending on us to pay their bills, it's important to remember that the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has said that passage of unemployment benefit extensions is one of the most cost-effective and fast-acting ways to stimulate the economy.

But lost in all of this debate and all of this delay is the human side. So I want to share the story fresh from the headline of today's Dubuque Telegraph Herald with the headline: ''Desperation sets in for jobless parents.'' A family with a 32-year-old dad and 30-year-old mom could provide for their children a year ago, but times have changed because Mom suffered an injury at work and hasn't been able to work since March. Dad lost his job a couple of months later, and their unemployment benefits expired in July. The family includes girls, 14 and 10, and boys, 11 and 7.

These are the Americans who need us to act now.

IT'S POLITICS AS USUAL

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last week, President Obama was in Holland, Michigan, announcing the award of an economic stimulus grant to a Korean Company: 300 jobs, $150 million, all at a cost of $500,000 per job, all financed by the American taxpayer.

Every Republican in this Chamber voted against the stimulus because we don't think that having the Federal Government pick winners and losers is a way back economically. We don't think borrowing over 40 cents for every dollar that we spend is the way to create jobs. We don't think that this out-of-control spending and piling mountains and mountains of debt on future generations is the kind of America that our Founding Fathers envisioned.

But then the President, while accepting our State's gracious hospitality and respect for his office, chose to take a cheap, partisan, political shot at Congressman PETE HOEKSTRA, whose district he was in. President Obama is proving himself to be the most partisan President in our Nation's history, and instability will not create jobs. Instead, it's politics as usual. It is certainly not change that we can believe in.

REJECT PROPOSALS TO PRIVATIZE SOCIAL SECURITY OR MEDICARE

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

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as we debate ways to tackle our growing deficit and create jobs, I call today on this Congress to reject proposals that would privatize Social Security or Medicare.

Colorado seniors rely on Social Security and Medicare; and as we struggle to climb out of a deep recession, the security provided by these programs is more critical than ever.

Dismantling Medicare and adding trillions of dollars to the deficit with a risky privatization scheme that gambles seniors' financial security in the stock market is just the wrong way to go. Rolling the dice on the financial security our seniors depend on, in a financial system that recently almost collapsed, is reckless in the extreme and has been roundly rejected by the American people.

We can cut waste, fraud, and abuse from Social Security and Medicare without cutting a penny in benefits, and I will fight to protect the promise that we made to America's seniors.

COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, as the American people ask where are the jobs, the President's economic advisers reply with weak statistics about the wasteful government stimulus program. All the while, we're losing billions of dollars to tariffs that could have been eliminated years ago.

It has been 1,337 days since the U.S. and Colombia negotiated a free trade agreement. For over 3 years, the Democrat leadership in Congress has refused to consider the legislation to ratify that treaty. In that time, American businesses have paid an estimated $2.8 billion in tariffs. This is $2.8 billion that could have gone to good American jobs, and this number grows higher every day. You can see it on the Republican Ways and Means Committee Web site.

We need to stop wasting our time, hoping that more government spending and borrowing will revive the economy. Instead, we need to unleash American businesses and entrepreneurs to expand into new markets. Passing the Colombia, South Korea, and Panama Free Trade Agreements would give real, tangible benefits to American workers and create jobs.

MAINTAINING CURRENT RETIREMENT AGE FOR SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, during the first decade of this century, the Bush economy destroyed the middle class. Today, we are at a point where 72 percent of Social Security retirees have elected early retirement at age 62 because they had no other financial choice.

But despite the fact that they have voted with their feet in unprecedented numbers, what is Mr. BOEHNER's proposal for Social Security, which he told the Pittsburgh Gazette a couple of weeks ago? He wants to raise the retirement age to age 70. If there is a more out-of-touch statement about what the middle class of this country is going through and what an out-of-touch proposal, to basically totally knock the stuffing out of the retirement security, Mr. BOEHNER's proposal to raise the Social Security retirement age to 70, to means test benefits would decimate what's left of the American middle class.

We cannot let that happen. Democrats will protect this program, which is celebrating its 75th anniversary this August, by maintaining the retirement age which exists today, a program which is solvent until 2037 and with moderate, balanced changes can protect its solvency for future years and generations.

MAJORITY REJECTS SPENDING FREEZE

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

Mr. REHBERG. In the last month alone, I've hosted 11 listening sessions around Montana, promising to bring their message back to Washington with me. The message is Montanans are fed up with the reckless spending that every man, woman, and child is on the hook for more than $40,000 in Federal debt.

I heard them, which is why I joined the House Republicans in their earmark moratorium, but not everyone is listening. In three appropriations subcommittee meetings, I have offered amendments to freeze spending at fiscal year 2010 levels. My amendments would have saved the taxpayers more than $18 billion.

But each time, they were rejected on a party-line vote. See, the President has even promised a spending freeze next year. So this year they're increasing spending to compensate. It's a sneaky shell game that only ensures that the taxpayers lose.

But Montanans told me loud and clear they want spending reform, and that's what I'm going to do, and I'm going to keep fighting for it every day I'm here.

□ 1240

SUPPORTING OUR NATION'S SENIORS

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly support our Nation's seniors. The government programs upon which they most depend, Medicare and Social Security, are being threatened by congressional Republicans.

Recently those on the other side of the aisle have been championing drastic changes to both programs. They want to cut Social Security benefits, raise the retirement age to 70, and turn Social Security benefits over to the stock market. They want to convert Medicare to a voucher program so that seniors would get a coupon to go out of their own way to buy a regular, individual insurance policy.

And what do congressional Republicans propose to do with these savings? Certainly, they want to pay for the war. I will not stand for stripping senior benefits down. I will not stand for balancing the budget on the backs of hardworking retirees.

Social Security and Medicare benefits belong to our Nation's seniors, and congressional Democrats will not stand for whittling them down or stealing them away. Social Security represents a promise, and that is if you work hard and pay into the system, you will have financial security in your retirement years.

It's been that way for 75 years. Now is not the time to change it.

JOBS MORATORIUM

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, while the unemployment rate is 9.5 percent and while the gulf coast continues to recover from a devastating oil spill, the people of Louisiana are wondering what they did to deserve President Obama's moratorium on jobs.

According to a recent report by LSU Professor Jim Richardson, the Obama administration's 6-month moratorium on offshore drilling will result in the loss of over 17,400 good-paying jobs in Louisiana alone, just another piece of the Democrat job-killing machine.

Hundreds of millions of dollars in State and local revenue will also be lost as well, all in the name of a moratorium that Federal courts and the administration's own expert advisers have rejected completely. The people of Louisiana would much prefer to have jobs than unemployment benefits.

It's truly unbelievable that when Washington should be focused on helping the gulf coast recover from a catastrophic tragedy, the White House is putting forth policies that do more economic damage than the spill itself.

HONORING SOCIAL SECURITY'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, next month we celebrate the 75th anniversary of Social Security. As we mark this important anniversary, I believe it's important to reflect on the millions of seniors that have been helped by Social Security over the years.

I have met with hundreds of Ohioans recently, and they are concerned about Social Security's future. The message to me has always been clear. They don't want to undermine any part of Social Security, and certainly not with privatization. They oppose any measure that would jeopardize the safety net that Social Security provides them in retirement, and I agree.

It's true that Social Security is facing some real challenges. However, I strongly believe that Congress can focus on keeping these promises to our seniors instead of putting the entire Social Security at risk, leaving it to the whims of Wall Street.

TIME TO ACT ON TRADE IS NOW

(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. Mr. Speaker, for far too long, the approval of pending trade agreements with countries such as Colombia, South Korea, and Panama have languished, awaiting approval by Congress.

According to research conducted by our colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, the inaction of these trade agreements is costing America jobs and market access. In fact, implementing the Colombia trade agreement alone could create an estimated 8 million U.S. jobs. Every day we delay, the more ground our Nation and our economy lose to our international competitors.

Earlier this month, the Canadian Parliament ratified a trade agreement with Colombia, improving their access to this market and putting our producers at even more of a disadvantage. Trade is an indispensable part of American prosperity, and Congress needs to take immediate, decisive action on these trade agreements.

NEVER FORGET HOW WE GOT INTO THIS ECONOMIC MESS

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

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, let us never forget, never forget how we got into this economic mess. It was the losing Republican ideas that brought forward an economic policy that drove our economy into the ditch, and now they want the keys to the car back. But after driving our economy into the ditch, we cannot allow that to happen.

What did they deliver? Two wars at the same time without paying a dime, a $400 billion handout to big drug companies, helping to ship our jobs overseas, an $8 trillion loss of wealth in our housing bubble as we crashed into a deep recession.

We cannot allow them to have the keys to this car again. We are beginning to turn this economy around. We are rebuilding America, job by job, block by block and city by city.

We need to work together in this, but we can't go back to those failed and losing policies of the past.

DISCOURAGING PRIVATE-SECTOR JOB GROWTH AND DRIVING JOBS OUT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, just last week the Haldex brake plant in Iola, Kansas, announced it was shutting down and taking 160 good jobs from American workers and sending those jobs to Mexico, where they won't have to deal with a government intent on hitting them with stifling tax increases and job-killing regulations. This administration is discouraging private-sector job growth and driving jobs out of my district and out of the United States.

But as for the 160 workers losing their jobs, they won't give up. In fact,

Iola's mayor, Bill Mannes, is an employee at Haldex. Even though he is losing his job, he and the Iola City Commission and the Iola Chamber are initiating a plan to recruit a new manufacturer to town.

So if any business is out there looking to grow who needs a strong and ready workforce in a great Midwest community, Iola, Kansas, could be the place for you.

PROTECT THE PROMISE OF SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protect the promise made to more than 50 million Americans who depend on Social Security to keep a roof over their heads and food on the table.

Seventy-five years ago, in the wake of our country's worst economic crisis, we introduced Social Security as a pledge to stand by hardworking Americans, despite old age, disability, or the death of a loved one. And, as we emerge from hard financial times, we are still keeping this promise to our mothers and our fathers, to our grandparents and to our children.

Unfortunately, there are those who would like to break this promise. By privatizing Social Security, we would be gambling with this important safety net that many of our seniors rely on, subjecting people's entire life savings to the whim of the stock market and threatening our own financial stability.

We cannot allow America's retirement to be gambled away. I stand by this commitment I made to southern New Mexico, and I urge my colleagues to join me in protecting Social Security.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today to urge Democrats to hear the voice of the American people as they ask, where are the jobs? There is no budget, there is still no plan to create jobs to get this economy rolling again.

The Democrats have got to stop their crazy out-of-control spending and get serious about job creation. This will happen through the expansion of the private sector and not through the expansion of government.

We have got to encourage small businesses, not penalize them with more taxes and regulations. House Republicans have offered commonsense solutions to get our economy back on track. Rolling back taxes, cutting spending, cutting the deficit and the debt, removing regulations and balancing the budget, these crucial actions must happen to get this House in order and get Americans back to work.

So, Mr. Speaker, the American people want to know, where are the jobs? I want to know where are your solutions? We have offered ours.

□ 1250

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. ELLISON. Where are the jobs? Well, my friends in the party opposite should know; they're the ones who lost them. The fact is that, in Bush's last month in August, he lost 741,000 jobs, an amazing feat.

My friends in the party opposite talk about debt. Is this the same party that had two unpaid-for wars, $700 billion in cuts for the wealthy unpaid for, a $400 billion handout to big PhRMA? Do they speak of debt? My friends of the party opposite sat by and did nothing while foreclosures, predatory lending, and explosions in executive pay brought us the largest number of foreclosures since the Great Depression, refused to regulate in any particular way, and now they say, ''Where are the jobs?'' and they talk of debt. This is an amazing amount of audacity.

I wonder, where are the jobs? They should know; they're the ones who lost them. We're trying to find them, and we're being successful.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a new USA Today poll reported that three-fourths of those 18 to 34 don't expect to get a Social Security check when they retire. They deserve much better. In '35—1935, that is—workers were told that the payroll tax would never exceed 2 percent of the first $3,000 of earnings. Sadly, since then, Congress has raised the payroll tax 14 times, now at 12.4 percent, and the taxable wage base 10 times.

Time and history prove Congress cannot resist the temptation to raise taxes on Social Security. We've got to find a better way forward without raising taxes, without any changes to those in or near retirement.

Americans want action, not scare tactics. Let's start working together on fair, commonsense solutions so we can ensure Social Security will be there for those who need it most without raising taxes.

CELEBRATING THE 75TH BIRTHDAY OF SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, this year we celebrate the 75th birthday of Social Security.

Since Democratic President Franklin Roosevelt signed the Social Security Act in 1935, Americans have known that they can rely on Social Security benefits when they retire.

Today, over 160,000 Hawaii seniors and millions of seniors in every other State receive monthly Social Security benefits, but Republican leaders in Congress have a new plan to privatize Social Security, balancing the budget on the backs of our seniors. Does this sound familiar?

George Bush and congressional Republicans fought to privatize Social Security in 2005. Seniors all across the country rose up in angry protest. If Republicans had succeeded then, seniors would have lost trillions in the stock market meltdown of the Bush recession.

Unbelievably, the Republicans still have not given up on their idea to privatize Social Security. You have to ask, what is it that makes them so deaf to what seniors in our country tell me loud and clear—preserve Social Security.

WE MUST PASS A CLEAN SUPPLEMENTAL BILL

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing welcome news that House leaders may accept a clean supplemental appropriations bill if it is sent back from the Senate. I introduced a House version of that bill last week. If we had voted it out then, it would be on the President's desk right now.

The Army and Marine Corps operating accounts are about to run into the red. Without these supplemental funds, the Pentagon will begin cutbacks—reduced training, delayed equipment purchases, possibly even delayed pay for our soldiers and marines.

By passing this clean supplemental, we can avert that dangerous situation. We can provide disaster relief funds to the areas that need it. We can avoid adding tens of billions of dollars to the Federal deficit that would have come from add-ons passed by this House 2 weeks ago.

I urge my colleagues, please pass a clean supplemental bill now.

KEEP SOCIAL SECURITY THE WAY IT IS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the supplemental that this leadership passed was to create jobs, and I hope that the bill that comes from the Senate will embrace the need for American jobs.

In Ohio, the home of our minority leader, there is a 10.5 percent unemployment. Can anyone explain to me why the Republicans continue to obstruct the extension of unemployment

benefits, benefits that will benefit those who work and who have worked and who need to pay their mortgages and provide food on the table? We need to extend unemployment benefits for unemployed Americans now.

Again, we have another story. Here is a story of privatizing Social Security or extending the age before receiving Social Security. I remember the fight. I was here on the floor of the House when seniors were calling our phone lines and saying don't privatize Social Security. Thank goodness for the wisdom of our seniors. If we had privatized Social Security, it would have collapsed in the abysmal disgrace of Wall Street—no money. But Social Security has been paying on a faithful basis now for decades.

We know that 72 percent of the American public don't want us to raise the age to be eligible for Social Security, but yet the minority leader wants to raise it so he can pay for the Iraq and Afghan war. Bring the soldiers home. Recognize that 36 million families are in need of Social Security. Seniors are in need of Social Security. Keep our Social Security the way it is—strong and solvent.

POLITICAL PRISONERS IN CUBA

(Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today is Dr. Oscar Elias Biscet's 49th birthday. This physician and peaceful advocate of freedom has dedicated his life to defending human rights and advancing democracy in Cuba, and for that he was sentenced to 25 years in prison.

So while Dr. Biscet and thousands of political prisons sit in Castro's gulags, the Castro regime is using political prisoners as a bargaining chip in a calculated attempt to gain concessions from the United States and the European Union.

Even more troubling, however, is the evident collaboration between the Cuban Catholic Church and the Castro regime. The church is cooperating with the regime and reaching out to only those families of political prisoners that the regime asks them to talk to, while Dr. Biscet and others don't even get a call from the church.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to stand tall, to stand with the Cuban people, and to demand the release of every single political prisoner in the Cuban gulags. Until every single one is released, we cannot shut up, we cannot stop speaking.

The United States should not be fooled. We will continue to stand with the political prisoners.

SOCIAL SECURITY UNDER ATTACK

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, for 75 years, older Americans have relied on the guaranteed benefit that Social Security provides. This monthly check provides a safety net from poverty and is a key component to a dignified retirement after a lifetime of work. Seniors contributed to Social Security. They earned it. They deserve it. They depend on it.

As we celebrate 75 years of this outstanding program, it is once again under attack by Republicans who want to dismantle the system and spend trillions of dollars in a risky privatization scheme that gambles senior citizens' savings in the stock market while lining the pockets of Wall Street. Does that sound familiar? Well, it should. Republicans tried to do the same thing under the Bush administration. This represents yet another attempt to return to the failed policies that created the worst economic situation since the Great Depression.

Well, I stand here committed to fighting back against such programs and protecting Social Security so that 30,000 seniors in southern Nevada who depend on it won't be abandoned in their golden years.

IN MEMORY OF SENATOR PAUL COVERDELL

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Senator Paul Coverdell, one of the most kind and thoughtful and deliberate Members of Congress, passed away 10 years ago this past Sunday. Senator Coverdell was a strong leader in Georgia for decades, serving as a State senator for 19 years and as a United States Senator for 7 years before his untimely death of a cerebral hemorrhage on July 18, 2000.

His dedication extended far beyond the political arena. He was a veteran of the United States Army and served as the Director for the Peace Corps from 1989 to 1991.

In honor of Senator Coverdell, the Centers for Disease Control established the Paul Coverdell National Acute Stroke Registry that helps implement State-based registries able to track care for acute stroke and help expand the knowledge and improve the quality of care. His legacy lives on.

Senator Coverdell was an inspiration to so many of us to dream big dreams and to answer the call to preserve this great Nation. He knew that the wonder and the awe of America rests in the principles of our founding documents and our people. We will always remember his patriotism and his wisdom.

PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to Social Security, Americans have two choices: On the one hand, there is the Democratic Party that created Social Security, strengthened it, and will continue to defend it from attacks. On the other, there are the Republicans on a never-ending crusade to dismantle this sacred program.

The ranking member of the Budget Committee plans to slash benefits, hike taxes on middle class families, and turn Social Security over to Wall Street. If former President Bush and Republicans had their way, trillions would have been lost during the financial crisis. Instead, the American people said ''no'' to privatization, and when the markets crashed, the trust fund did not lose a penny.

The American people have consistently rejected these failed Republican ideas that threaten the financial security of seniors. Don't be misled. We can protect Social Security's solvency for the ages, and we can do it without slashing benefits, privatizing the program, or making people work into their golden years.

I stand to defend America's seniors, and they deserve nothing less.

□ 1300

THE COLLAPSE OF THE AMERICAN DREAM

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the ongoing destruction of the American Dream.

As the dense fog of increasing debt suffocates our economy, joblessness creates the uncertainty in which small businesses cannot survive. Credit is not available. Increasing taxes are creeping in at every level. We now know that we cannot keep our doctors or our insurance. We, the people, see no leadership.

As the President treads water, as America looks for leadership, as small business is paralyzed with uncertainty, as our elderly watch their health care rationed and as they are fearful for their future, as our families lose their confidence in leadership, all of this poses the virtual collapse of the American Dream.

The denial on the part of the administration is pathologic. The refusal to acknowledge reality is causing undue human suffering, prolonging the agony of massive unemployment, creating confusion and doubt in our military, and sending international messages of U.S. indecision and weakness.

It is time for action. It is time for us, the American people, to restore the American Dream.

CELEBRATING 75 YEARS OF SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support of Social

Security. This year, we celebrate 75 years of this critical program, and we must reaffirm our commitment not only to protect it but to ensure its continuing viability.

America's senior citizens have lived through wars and recessions as well as periods of unprecedented prosperity. They have pioneered technologies in medicine, communications, transportation, and industry. These remarkable achievements demonstrate the strength and character of our older Americans, underscoring the debt of gratitude that we owe to generations that have given so much—one generation which includes my own parents, who are celebrating birthdays this week and next.

Unfortunately, the recent recession has reminded us that economic prosperity is never a guarantee; and in times of such uncertainty, our Nation's seniors need the steadiness of Social Security now more than ever.

Some have suggested that privatizing certain aspects of Social Security will somehow strengthen it. Well, I say not. I urge my colleagues to fiercely resist any such effort to privatize Social Security and to risk our seniors' well-being with the volatile, unpredictable nature of the market. I ask my colleagues to come together and to continue the promise that was made 75 years ago for those who have given so much to our society.

DEMOCRATS' IRRESPONSIBLE DEFICIT SPENDING

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, nearly a year and a half after the President told our country that an $800 billion-plus stimulus package was needed to keep unemployment below 8 percent, we are in the midst of our 14th straight month with unemployment above 9 percent. Many economists predict that nearly every major policy passed since that time, such as cap-and-trade, health care and so on, will result in a net loss of jobs. Now the Democrats are telling our country we need to double down on their economic policies and increase our debt and deficits to finance more spending.

How does that make any sense whatsoever?

If you don't have a job, we want you to find one. However, we know that, if Congress continues irresponsible spending, it will make economic growth and job creation less likely. That is why Republicans are insisting on finding spending cuts. It is time to tell the administration that they have maxed out America's credit card and to ask them to start working with the American people to get our fiscal house in order.

PASS THE EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, 2.5 million Americans have lost their unemployment benefits—more than 33,000 of them in my home State of Massachusetts. I have heard from many of these struggling families.

From Chelmsford: ''My UI benefits have just run out. A UI check is food and other necessities while I draw down savings to keep my house.''

From Lowell: ''I have always had a very good job. I work hard, pay taxes, and I certainly have not been living in excess. Last July, my company had to cut staff, and my entire team was let go. I have never had a problem finding a job, but this search has been extremely difficult. Unemployment benefits helped me to stay on track with life's basic necessities, such as food, gas and insurance. Losing them has caused desperate action on my part.''

From Westford: ''Please extend unemployment benefits for all Americans. I know many solid citizens who are actively and vigorously job hunting to no avail, including my wife. Help.''

I urge my Senate colleagues to pass this desperately needed extension.

REPEATING THE LESSON OF THE GREAT DEPRESSION

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, when the stimulus bill became law, unemployment stood at 8.2 percent. Today, a year and a half and hundreds of billions of dollars later, unemployment is 9.5 percent.

This spending binge hasn't made things better. It has made things demonstrably worse because, before government can put money into the economy, it first takes that money out of the economy. We see the jobs created when government puts the money back, but we don't see the jobs that are lost, because government first took that money out of the economy.

When we borrow trillions of dollars, we crowd out the very same capital pool that would otherwise have been available for businesses to create jobs; so those jobs don't get created, and the ranks of the unemployed grow.

These are the same policies that turned the recession of 1929 into the Depression of the 1930s. Do we really want to repeat that lesson?

STRENGTHEN THE SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, Social Security is a pledge to hardworking Americans that they will be able to retire with the dignity they deserve. As this treasured program reaches its 75th anniversary, we have a responsibility to guarantee that it remains strong for future generations; but as we work toward improving the long-term solvency of this program, we must avoid making ill advised changes, like creating volatile private accounts that could throw millions of seniors into poverty.

These are tough economic times, particularly for seniors on fixed incomes. Rising health care, energy and housing costs mean too many seniors do not have the resources they need to live comfortably. Now, more than ever, Social Security is a critical safety net for millions of Americans.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work together to strengthen the Social Security program for current and future generations. Hardworking Americans deserve to look forward to financially secure retirements.

EDIBLE ROAD SIGNS

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

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to point out the obvious: You cannot feed road signs to your kids. They are made of aluminum, degreasing agents, and reflective film. They don't taste good. In fact, you can't even pay the rent with road signs because landlords prefer checks.

That's why Americans are so confused about the Obama administration and why they are spending tens of millions of dollars of taxpayer money on road signs, touting the success of the stimulus. I should have said the so-called ''success'' of the stimulus.

President Obama assured the American people that he would not waste the stimulus money. In fact, he even said that he would not waste one single nickel and that he would make famous anyone who wasted the money. Well, I guess I'm making the President famous then because these signs are the most obscenely wasteful and gratuitous things that we have seen out of him yet.

There is a reason why the majority has lost all credibility with the American people, and there is a reason you haven't created any jobs. That reason is posted on the sides of our roads.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strongest possible support for Social Security—an essential lifeline that some 130,000 seniors in my congressional district depend on every day.

Social Security is an earned benefit that American workers have paid into

over a lifetime of their careers. That is why it is outrageous, at least from my perspective, to hear some of my colleagues propose to cut Social Security as a mechanism to reduce the national deficit or to pay for the war in Afghanistan.

This is irresponsible, shortsighted, and overwhelmingly reckless; and I personally won't stand for it. Social Security is one of the only Federal programs that has a dedicated source of revenue, what we pay into that has paid for itself in full for over 75 years now without contributing to the national deficit. In south Florida and around the country, seniors rely on Social Security as a stable, guaranteed source of income in their retirement years, particularly in these tough economic times.

I adamantly oppose and will work to defeat any attempts to weaken America's retirement security and pay down national debt unrelated to the Social Security program—all on the backs of our Nation's seniors.

□ 1310

UNCERTAINTY—THE ENEMY OF JOB CREATION

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, with the U.S. unemployment rate steadily hovering around 10 percent, Americans continue to ask, ''Where are the jobs?'' The answer to this crisis from congressional Democrats and the Obama administration is, higher taxes, increased government spending, and more government regulation.

The passage of ObamaCare, cap-and-trade in the House, and financial regulation has created an atmosphere of tremendous uncertainty, especially among small businesses, which employ over half of all the private sector employees. Uncertainty, as we all know, is the enemy of growth, investment and job creation.

The way out of this recession and towards job creation is enact policies that free up capital, reduce uncertainty, and restore confidence in our economy. We cannot do this if the administration and Congressional Democrats continue to impose costly regulations, higher taxes on job creators, and create uncertainty in the marketplace.

SOCIAL SECURITY IS A SACRED TRUST

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for 75 years, Social Security has lifted millions of seniors and disabled Americans out of poverty. That is why I can't believe that Republicans would cut Social Security benefits and make it harder for people who worked all their lives to get benefits.

Social Security is a sacred trust. It is a trust between the American government and the American people. It is a trust between parents and children, between those working and those in retirement. It is the greatest example of the beloved community in America.

We will not allow anyone to cut Social Security. We will hold this sacred trust for generations yet to come.

NO END IN SIGHT

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk to you about jobs. I come into this Chamber often and hear my Democrat colleagues talk about how bad things were under the past administration, how much better off we are under this President.

Well, I'll tell you one thing President Bush gave us that this President can't give us, and that's jobs. In 2003 we passed the second largest tax cuts in American history, and we had 55 consecutive months of job growth in this country, the longest period of job growth in American history.

This President came into office, said, if you'll give me nearly $1 trillion in a stimulus bill, I'll make sure unemployment doesn't go over 8 percent. Well, we're at 10, we've been here for most of his Presidency, and we see no end in sight.

Well, now we're talking about the unemployed. We've got 10 percent of the people hurting. They're in pain. They need our help. They need unemployment benefits, and we want to give them to them.

The President says, and Speaker PELOSI says, well, the Republicans are standing in the way. They're cold-hearted.

No, the problem is, they can't get the Democrats to vote for it because they want to borrow the money.

We've said we want to vote for unemployment benefits, we just want to pay for them. We've told the President, just reach into your stimulus bill, unfunded stimulus funds, and pay for them there. He doesn't want to do that because that's a political trust fund.

He's using the unemployed as a political football, and if that doesn't make you mad, it ought to.

NO PRIVATIZATION OR CUTTING OF SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. It's always good to go back to the district. I was there over the weekend. Among the many things was a family wedding.

My 89-year old mother came up to me and said, John, does that Republican leader really mean to cut Social Security to pay for the war?

And I said, well, apparently that's what he means. But I'll tell you this, Mom, and to every other mother and father out there that's on Social Security, no way, no how will the Republicans get their way, either privatizing Social Security, or cutting it to pay for the war. That's not going to happen.

The Democrats have been for Social Security since 75 years ago when it was first established, and we remain strong to that commitment. It is there. It is the fundamental opportunity for retirees to have a foundation. No privatization and no cutting of Social Security, despite what the Republican leader might say.

QUIT BANKRUPTING AMERICA AND PAY FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, under this administration and this Congress, we have now seen the largest deficits in history, the largest national debt in history, the failed stimulus plan, the health care takeover, cap and energy tax, a permanent Wall Street bailout, all of which has led to the loss of millions of jobs, near double-digit unemployment, the highest in a generation. So, unfortunately, under their policy, yes, we do need another extension of unemployment.

But here's the difference. The Democrats want to borrow 43 cents on the dollar, mainly from the Chinese, and send the bill to our children and grandchildren. That's unacceptable.

Republicans say pay for it. And almost every week we come to the floor under the YouCut program and offer spending reductions to do just that.

The second difference is, Democrats actually believe more unemployment leads to more employment. The Speaker of the House has said, unemployment checks create jobs faster than almost any other initiative you can name.

Mr. Speaker, give me a break. Republicans know that Americans want paychecks, not more unemployment checks. Quit bankrupting America and pay for this unemployment insurance.

GOING FORWARD

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, one thing good about our country, we always go forward, not backwards. And we are not going to go backwards to allow the privatization of Social Security. We are not going to go backwards to allow the removal of important protections against Wall Street, abuses of the U.S. economy. We're going to go forward.

And we're not going to go backward on environmental protection. I'll say

why this is important. This morning we were doing our investigation of the BP oil spill. We had President Bush's Secretary of the Interior, Gail Norton, testify. And you know what we discovered?

During the Bush administration's rapid ramp-up of offshore drilling, they learned that 50 percent of the blow-out preventers that were supposed to be the fail-safe system to prevent these massive oil spills, 50 percent of them didn't work. But they refused to do anything about it.

They learned that they had a problem with their own investigators, that the wells weren't being cemented appropriately, but they refused to do anything about it.

We are not going to let folks go backwards on Social Security, go backwards on Wall Street reform, or go backwards on environmental protection. This is a country that goes forward.

NO BUDGET THIS YEAR

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, it's official. In late June the majority leader confirmed what we've known all along and suspected: There will be no budget this year.

Yes, for the first time since 1974, the House will not even consider a budget resolution that's necessary to begin the appropriations process beginning October 1.

Now, this may sound like inside baseball or congressional housekeeping, but it's much more than that.

Over this past month, I've met with hundreds of constituents who have the same question, ''Where are the jobs?''

My colleagues, we should be spending this summer working to improve our financial outlook, positioning our Nation to create an environment for private sector job growth and opportunity.

Instead, the majority has chosen to increase domestic spending by 84 percent since the President took office on inefficient programs that have succeeded only in adding to the public debt. To finance this spending binge, we're borrowing more and more money from nations like China, Japan, and Saudi Arabia.

The people of New Jersey and people across the Nation know that we spend too much, tax too much, and we borrow too much. It's got to stop.

□ 1320

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I went door to door in Waterbury, Connecticut, where unemployment today is 14.1 percent. Guess what everybody wanted to talk about? They wanted to talk jobs. People in Waterbury never shied away from hard work. This is the Brass City. It's due to its rich history of manufacturing, making things from Boulder Dam in Colorado to munitions for World War II and Korea.

And today the unemployed in Waterbury aren't just sitting on their hands waiting for a job to drop in their lap. And unlike some on the right try to suggest, they're not looking for a handout either. They just need some help getting through this recession.

Outside the city limits of D.C., patience is running thin with the Republicans who are playing politics with people's ability to buy groceries and simply make ends meet during tough times.

We can come out of this recession stronger than ever, but Congress needs to do the right thing and extend unemployment benefits for people in Waterbury and all across this country.

THE UNARMED NATIONAL GUARD WILL GUARD COMPUTERS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the administration says they will be sending 1,200 National Guard troops to the southern border region on August 1. But they're not going to the actual border. They'll be far behind the lines, guarding computers. And the National Guard will be unarmed while they are guarding the computers.

The Border Patrol welcomes the National Guard at the border. They appreciate the help. But the Border Patrol agents made it real clear they need armed National Guard to help them stop the criminal cartels at the border. Further, the Border Patrol will need to guard the National Guard. Now, how does that make sense?

Mr. Speaker, we have 15 million unemployed Americans already. We should hire some of those 15 million unemployed to do the technical work behind the lines, and the National Guard should be armed and on the front lines of the border doing what they're trained to do: Protect the country. We need the National Guard with boots on the ground on the border, not rebooting computers somewhere behind the border.

And that's just the way it is.

SOCIAL SECURITY'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, Republicans in Congress are talking about dismantling our Social Security system. They want to privatize this important program, raise the retirement age, and make our seniors pay for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. This is simply unacceptable.

Seventy-five years ago our Nation made a promise to our seniors. We promised to help them through their golden years. This promise has served our Nation well, allowing those who built this great country an opportunity to enjoy the fruits of their hard work. Social Security is one of the most important, successful programs in the United States' history, an invaluable program that helps more than 50 million seniors and disabled Americans.

Our seniors depend on their monthly checks to put food on the table and a roof over their heads. Without this critical help, many of them would fall into poverty. Social Security should not be privatized, and must remain intact for America's future generations.

ECONOMY AND JOBS—MORATORIUM

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, as Americans ask, Where are the jobs, we see the job creation of one family at risk thanks to the President's ill-conceived offshore drilling moratorium.

Sunbelt Machine Works Corporation was founded 32 years ago by Frank and Mary Scantlin. While Frank ran the shop, Mary served as secretary and a truckdriver to help out. Their children grew up sweeping the floors and learning the business, working their way up in a company that today employs 70 people in the district that I represent.

The President's moratorium will cause Sunbelt to lay off people soon if production doesn't restart quickly. Jobs have already headed overseas, as two rigs have left the gulf. The CEO of one of those rigs' owners apologized for the ''loss of U.S. jobs'' because of the moratorium.

Mr. Speaker, we must lift this job-killing moratorium now. Americans are tired of asking, Where are the jobs?

PRESIDENTIAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

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

Mr. BACA. The American people know that we cannot go back to the failed policies of the Bush administration and the Republicans in Congress. Their lack of accountability and oversight caused 8 million Americans to lose their jobs and led to the worst economic conditions since the Great Depression.

Thankfully, President Obama has led our efforts to rebuild a strong economy for the middle class and expand new job creation for Americans. With his leadership, we have enacted laws, created millions of jobs, given 98 percent of the working families a tax break, increased

Pell programs, made student loans more affordable, jump-started the auto industry with the Cash for Clunkers program, and provided health coverage to 32 million previously uninsured.

The truth of the matter: President Obama and the Congressional Democrats continue to move in the right direction. I ask my colleagues, where would we be right now if we were still stuck with the same Republican policies of the past?

AMERICA SPEAKS OUT

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, across this country and certainly throughout Florida, people have been asking and speaking out, but leaders in Washington have not been listening. From the new health care law to a national energy tax, Americans have repeatedly said ''no'' to what this Congress has had to offer.

I have been listening, and I've heard loud and clear that my constituents, like most Americans, are tired of new taxes, new spending, and record-breaking deficits. That's why the House Republicans have launched AmericaSpeakingOut.com, a new forum where people across the country can share and discuss their ideas on a wide range of critical issues.

We plan to offer a new set of policy solutions grounded in the principles of smaller, more accountable government, and we want to engage the American people directly in building those solutions together from the start. Changing course in Washington will require Americans to speak out and Congress to start listening.

Please visit AmericaSpeakingOut.com and start speaking out.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT OF 1935

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Social Security benefits make a significant contribution to the well-being of many Americans. Today, 83,545 persons in the Seventh District of Illinois rely upon these payments to sustain their monthly living expenses. Fifty-nine percent of them are elderly, and 11 percent are children. These persons receive an average monthly benefit of $996 a month, with the cost of living for rent and utilities in Illinois being $957 per month, equating to 96 percent of their Social Security income.

While we celebrate Social Security for the last 75 years for the American aged, disabled, and survivor populations and their children, I encourage my colleagues to make sure that these funds are sustained without further impact on the economic well-being of our most challenged populations. Thank you, Social Security.

HONORING ATF SPECIAL AGENT WILLIAM G. CLARK

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

Mr. LEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I introduced a resolution honoring ATF Special Agent William G. Clark of Rochester, New York.

One morning in 2008, while stationed in the United States Virgin Islands, Special Agent Clark witnessed a domestic dispute between his neighbor and her boyfriend, who was drunk and on drugs. His neighbor was being threatened and pleaded for his assistance. And Special Agent Clark did what his training taught him to do: he helped someone in need.

While attempting to protect his female neighbor from being beaten, Special Agent Clark was charged by her boyfriend, who was swinging a large metal flashlight after threatening to retrieve a gun. Special Agent Clark fired in self-defense. The man subsequently died from his injuries, and Special Agent Clark is now being charged with second-degree murder.

A Justice Department incident review panel has cleared Special Agent Clark, who remains on active duty. The panel unanimously found that Special Agent Clark was acting within the scope of employment and authority, and that there was no evidence of misconduct or inappropriate action on the part of Special Agent Clark.

ATF Special Agent William G. Clark is a hero who was protecting a battered woman, and Congress should recognize his heroic acts.

□ 1330

CELEBRATING SOCIAL SECURITY'S 75TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join all of you in wishing Social Security a happy 75th birthday.

Social Security and Medicare are two of the most successful legislative accomplishments in the history of the world. But not everyone in this body is celebrating Social Security's overwhelming success.

There are many in this body on the other side who would like to privatize Social Security. Remember the Bush plan—to tie Social Security to the fluctuation of the stock market. This is a gamble we should not take.

It is an extraordinary American success story. For those who are simultaneously trying to educate college-aged children and the thought of caring for elderly parents, let me give you the actuarial reality. It's impossible. Simply put, the reason that Mom and Dad are not living in your attic is because of Social Security and Medicare. It is the greatest achievement in legislative history domestically for all American families.

Happy birthday, Social Security.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOYLE). Members are reminded not to traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

CELEBRATING THE 2010 SPECIAL OLYMPICS NATIONAL GAMES

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on a happier note, this weekend I had the great honor of participating in the 2010 Special Olympics National Games opening ceremony in my hometown of Lincoln, Nebraska.

The pomp and pageantry of the official ceremony appropriately welcomed a very enthusiastic and excited audience of more than 3,000 athletes, 1,000 coaches, and 13,000 fans gathered at the University of Nebraska. As I marched in with Nebraska's delegation to the Games, I was struck by how inspiring the moment was as the community boisterously and loudly gathered to celebrate these very special athletes.

The Special Olympics have grown tremendously both in the number of participants but also in the heart of our Nation. The Special Olympics oath is, ''Let me win. But if I cannot win, let me be brave in the attempt.''

Mr. Speaker, to all of these brave and special athletes in Lincoln's 2010 Special Olympics National Games, I wish to extend a heartfelt congratulations.

PASS THE EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Currier and his family are my constituents, and they're suffering needlessly because Republicans are shamelessly blocking the extension of unemployment insurance. The Republicans argue that people like Thomas are lazy and would rather collect unemployment than work. Well, let me tell you about Thomas Currier.

He's 62. He's worked his entire life and at one time even owned his own business. After 25 years in the IT field, he was laid off in August of 2008, and last month he finally lost his unemployment insurance. His wife needs surgery they can't afford. His daughter dropped out of college because they can't pay her tuition. Not only has Mr. Currier lost his income, but as a result

of the GOP opposition, he's lost his dignity.

I urge my Republican colleagues in the Senate to drop their indefensible opposition to extending unemployment insurance immediately, and with it, provide needed relief to millions of people like Thomas Currier.

STOP EARLY FEDERAL RETIREMENT

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, last week there were headlines saying that leaders on both sides of the aisle agree that we need to raise the Social Security retirement age to 70. Before we do that, we need to stop spending hundreds of billions we do not have on very unnecessary foreign wars, but we also need to revise the entire Federal retirement system—both civilian and military.

We cannot change the retirement benefits for those already in the system. The political opposition would just be too strong. But we need to inform new Federal hires and new military recruits that we can no longer allow healthy, able-bodied people to retire in their late thirties or even in their forties or fifties.

Local police fight street crime. Almost no Federal law enforcement today is physical in nature. Early retirement in most Federal law enforcement can no longer be justified. Working as a waiter or waitress is more physically demanding than most Federal Government positions for which we now grant early retirement.

With a $13 trillion national debt, Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot afford to give relatively young people lavish retirement benefits.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues are singing the same old tune again. This past Sunday on ''Meet the Press,'' the Republicans top campaign leader let the truth be known. If the Republicans take power in Congress, he said, ''We need to go back to the exact same agenda.'' The exact same agenda. The one that lost 8 million manufacturing jobs in this country, the one that tried to privatize Social Security, the one that drove our country into a ditch. Yep, that same agenda.

What does privatization of Social Security really mean? It means taking your money and letting Wall Street play with it. We saw how well that worked over the past few years when the Republicans controlled this House. Private retirement accounts lost one-third of their value during the Republican recession. Heads they win, tails you lose.

But the Republicans don't learn from their mistakes; so they want to return to the exact same agenda of the Bush Republican years.

America, make sure Congress knows Social Security is your money. You earned it. You paid for it. It is your future.

SPEND, SPEND, SPEND

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

Mr. DJOU. Mr. Speaker, the American people expect Congress to act responsibly and be trustworthy, but how can this happen when this Congress has no plan? No plan for a budget, no plan to create jobs, no plan to turn around our economy other than to spend, spend, and spend some more of the people's money. We spent more than a trillion dollars to create jobs, but as of yet, our unemployment rate still languishes at 9.5 percent.

Our Nation is plagued with debt, and not creating a budget further amplifies the problem.

Mr. Speaker, we are spending too much money. Even worse, we are spending too much money on programs that do not work. And even worse than that, we have no plan to pay any of this money back. And this problem is further compounded by this House's refusal to pass a budget.

It's time to cut spending and enact real, meaningful tax relief and put more money in the hands of the American people.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

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

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Mr. Speaker, most people understand that we have a real tangible need for the safety nets of Social Security and Medicare. The hard lessons of history compelled us to create protections for our seniors who have given us a lifetime of hard work and deserve security in their golden years.

But Washington Republicans just don't get it. They want to privatize Social Security and put seniors' retirement at the mercy of the stock market. They want to repeal the benefits we provided through Medicare. If Republicans had their way, they'd reopen the doughnut hole. They'd take away free, preventative health care under Medicare, and they'd play roulette with our seniors' retirement, their access to doctors, and their prescription drugs.

Washington Republicans have turned their backs on our seniors. I'm proud to stand by our seniors and make sure they have quality, affordable health care, safety and security in retirement, and peace of mind that these benefits are here to stay.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it's a little over 18 months since President Obama signed the so-called economic ''stimulus'' bill into law. To say now, as many of my Democratic colleagues continue to do, that this stimulus was somehow a success, that's really an insult to the millions of Americans who are now unemployed and continue to look for work.

We've heard repeatedly from our business leaders and economists that one of the biggest impediments to job creation is what this Congress has been doing here every day. I mean, how can businesses be expected to invest and to create jobs when they read in the paper such things that our government is expected to run trillion dollar deficits as far as the eye can see, that banks will now have to conform to 243 new regulations because of that 2,300-page Dodd-Frank bill we just passed, and that next year we will experience in this country the largest tax increase in American history?

And, also, the energy prices. Energy prices may skyrocket because of the House-passed cap-and-trade bill. And health insurance premiums, they were promised to go down, but they are going to increase because of the recently passed health care bill.

Mr. Speaker, uncertainty is the enemy of economic growth. Thank goodness it's the August recess.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Social Security and to highlight its importance as we approach the 75th anniversary since its founding.

Social Security is a pillar of a society based on the premise that if you work hard and play by the rules, you will have the stability and security of a minimum level of guaranteed income as you get older. And the reality is Social Security provides nearly all of the retirement income for six out of 10 seniors in this country.

Mr. Speaker, for 75 years, Social Security has never been a day late or a dollar short. And as we approach this historic achievement, we must commit ourselves to strengthening Social Security, not privatizing it. We must continue to provide the foundation for Americans' retirement security for generations and generations to come.

□ 1340

UNCERTAINTY IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, one business organization after another has made it clear: The policies of this President and this Democrat-controlled Congress are creating uncertainty all throughout the private sector. Whether it's the Chamber of Commerce or the National Federation of Independent Businesses, the message is the same: Washington is giving them no reason for confidence in the economy.

All across this country, business owners are looking at higher costs for health care, the potential for higher energy costs, the threat of more taxes, and the reality of oppressive, costly government regulations. It's no wonder the private sector isn't hiring. The only sector of the economy that's really growing is government. The endless deficit spending in Washington is expanding government and sucking the life out of the private sector.

This has to stop. House Republicans have commonsense solutions. We need to rein in out-of-control spending, cut taxes and get a massive Federal Government off the back of free enterprise.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in history, the other body has to wait for a new Member to be sworn in today to take up unemployment insurance and break a filibuster. Even in the mildest of turndowns, there has always been bipartisan support for unemployment benefits. Ask the average American: Give us your definition of emergency spending: unemployment benefits paid for in part from employee paychecks or more tax cuts for the wealthy?

The question answers itself, for all except my Republican friends in this House. They've gone further and insulted the unemployed by offering as an excuse that benefits keep people from looking for and taking jobs. The Bush recession left one job for every five job-seekers. It's cruel to blame the unemployed for not finding work in the midst of the great recession. It is worst to deny them food to put on the table.

CONGRESS' RAMPANT ACTIVISM

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, after four stimulus packages over the past 2 years, Americans are asking: Where are the jobs? Why aren't businesses hiring? In a word, uncertainty.

We've seen a great deal of activist government over the past 2 years with enormous budget deficits, the government takeover of car companies, bank bailouts, mandatory national health care, misguided financial regulation and more. Still, President Obama and the congressional leadership have additional disruptive plans on tap, including big tax increases and cap-and-trade legislation. Not only are businesses being burdened with new taxes and other requirements, they also know that further afflictions are coming, but the form and extent of those afflictions are still a mystery.

Business people plan to succeed, but when the government is making major burdensome and, as yet largely unspecified, changes, it is very difficult to plan. Rather than hiring and investing, many are choosing to wait and see.

America's working people are the victims of this administration's and this Congress' rampant activism.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Social Security as it approaches its 75th anniversary. When FDR signed this historic legislation into law, he understood that the whims of Wall Street were sweeping many hardworking Americans into financial ruin. At the time, more than half of America's seniors lacked sufficient income to be self-supporting.

Social Security changed all of that. Indeed, today, in my home State of Florida, 53 percent of seniors would be below the poverty line without Social Security. That hasn't stopped Republicans from wanting to end the guarantee of Social Security. In 2005, President Bush proposed privatizing Social Security, which would have cut benefits for 70 percent of retired Americans. Well, it's deja vu all over again.

While President Bush may be gone, his plans live on. House Republicans are once again calling to privatize Social Security, and Medicare for good measure. We simply cannot risk tossing millions of seniors into poverty.

Let us rededicate ourselves to Roosevelt's vision and to the economic security of all of our citizens and not throw our seniors out in the cold.

DEEPWATER DRILLING JOBS MOVING TO OTHER NATIONS

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, the people of Louisiana have suffered a lot of catastrophes: the BP explosion, fishing industry's down, the tourism industry is down. Now, to add insult to injury, we have the moratorium which is costing thousands of jobs in Louisiana.

What's the result? ''Three deepwater drilling rigs to be moved from sites south of Cameron Parish.'' ''First rig sails away over drilling ban'' to Egypt. ''Brazil sees silver lining in BP spill: more rigs.''

Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? Well, in the deepwater drilling they're going to be moved to other nations.

SOCIAL SECURITY BRINGS A SENSE OF PRIDE

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

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Sometimes when I listen to the debate, you would think that President Obama inherited a large surplus and growing jobs. No, what my Republicans forget, that's not what President Obama inherited. That's what George Bush inherited and lost in 8 years.

Why are we in this problem? It is for 8 years of bad economic principles that George Bush put forward. Obama inherited deficits and loss of jobs, 750,000 of them a year; and now we hear again the same old policy, attacking and wanting to privatize Social Security.

Well, Democrats and the American people rejected that idea during the failed policies of the 8 years of George W. Bush, and we reject that policy again because we understand the significance and the importance that Social Security brings to our families, it brings to children and those who are retired who without Social Security would be in poverty.

Social Security brings a sense of pride to those who have worked hard all of their lives so that they can have something at the end.

TENNESSEANS FRUSTRATED WITH CONGRESS

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, my home State of Tennessee has an employment rate of over 10 percent. The Tennesseans that I know are very frustrated with Washington. They've lost faith that this Chamber can or will do anything meaningful about jobs this year. They look at Washington and see us living out that maxim: if at first you don't succeed, spend and spend again. They look at us and they said where are the jobs.

Now Tennessee's Governor and State legislature have made some very different choices. Instead of expanding the size of government, they scaled it back. Instead of increasing taxes, they've offered incentives for investment. Many in this Chamber say those are policies of the past. Well, in Tennessee, those choices have worked. They attracted over $4 billion of investment in the past 18 months. It is investment that creates sustainable growth and good, solid paying jobs.

By contrast, the stimulus program we hear so much about in this Chamber has sent just over $1 billion to the State of Tennessee. At 10 percent unemployment, what do Tennesseans

have to show for those stimulus jobs? No jobs and a lot of expensive road signs.

REPUBLICANS WANT TO PRIVATIZE SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. WEINER. If you're one of those folks who has one of those new, modern TVs with the ''what the heck are they talking about button'' on the TV, you're going to need it for this side of the aisle because, frankly, it is insane for them to wrap their arms around the idea that deficits are growing, they're booming, and then get this, they want to offer tax breaks to billionaires this year. Millionaires and billionaires. And you know how they're going to pay for it? They don't say. They want to add to the deficit.

But there is one moment of clarity we saw recently that I have got to tell you that in my 12 years in Washington is refreshing. The Republican head of the Budget Committee, their ranking member, came out with a proposal to privatize Social Security. And you know what, that's not some obscure Member. I actually like the guy. I commend him for being honest. Finally, the Republicans have come out and said what, frankly, they've said for 75 years. They want to eliminate Social Security. Not actually eliminate it. They want to invest it in the stock market. Boy, talk about lessons unlearned.

The Democrats, who created Social Security, are here to celebrate 75 years of keeping it strong and another, God willing, 75 years. The Republicans want to privatize it, invest it in the stock market. You decide for yourself what the right policy is.

□ 1350

IMMIGRATION LAW

(Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, last week the Department of Justice filed a lawsuit challenging the State of Arizona's recently enacted immigration law.

DOJ bases its groundless lawsuit on the supremacy clause, preemption, and the commerce clause. However, DOJ's officials should take note—and maybe even read the bill, for that matter—that the new Arizona law mirrors Federal law, which already requires aliens to register and carry their documents with them. Arizona's law simply states that violating Federal immigration law is now a State crime as well.

Because illegal immigrants are, by definition, in violation of Federal immigration law, under the new provisions they can now be arrested by local law enforcement in Arizona. This week DOJ officials have stepped up their attack on the Arizona immigration law by stating that they may file another lawsuit if the law leads to racial profiling.

Once again, read the bill. Arizona's law expressly prohibits racial profiling four separate times. All in all, DOJ's lawsuit reveals the Obama administration's contempt for immigration law, the people of Arizona, and for the majority of the American people who support Arizona's efforts to reduce human smuggling, drug trafficking, and illegal immigration.

Arizona takes a responsible and constitutional approach to defending the immigration laws.

RESPECT VIRGIN ISLANDS' LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor originally to reassure our seniors about Democrats' determination to save Social Security as it approaches its 75th birthday, but I must respond to my colleague who raised the issue of the ATF Agent William Clark.

Neither he nor I know exactly what happened the day that Agent Clark shot and killed Mr. Sukow. Yes, he did come to the aid of a lady who was at least being verbally assaulted by the victim, and the victim had a flashlight in his hand.

But the investigation raised serious questions about the level of the threat and whether the reaction of Agent Clark was excessive. Given the information received by witnesses, an attorney, and a security guard, as well as the medical examiner and the police investigation, our attorney general acted responsibly by charging the agent.

Agent Clark has and will continue to have a fair hearing in our courts, and Congress should not do anything to interfere with the judicial process. We wish the incident did not happen.

In the meantime we are working with Federal law enforcement to make sure that the authority under which they carry out their duties will be clear. We respect their work, and we ask that they respect the Virgin Islands' law enforcement in return.

BROKEN GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I was home again this weekend and, guess what, the American people are still sick and tired of this broken government and business as usual, and so am I.

They said that new government leaders promised them change, and that's what they got. And that's what they still get when they stick their hand in their pocket, a handful of change.

The new government said we will pay for everything we do. They call it ''pay as you go.'' The people I talk to say what we got instead was tax to the max, borrow like there's no tomorrow, and spend to the end. Spend to the end of American ingenuity, spend to the end of American innovation, spend to the end of our children's future, the end of a great American experiment, the end of our freedom.

Instead of building our country on the word ''change,'' let's get America back on track, build it on words like responsibility, accountability, God, family, country. Mr. Speaker, how about faith, a little faith in the American people?

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, for 75 years Social Security has been a promise, an investment in the future of our Nation's workforce. An estimated 159 million Americans are eligible for Social Security benefits, and they have earned them.

It is their money, but many worry that these benefits won't be around when they need them. These workers can rest assured that my Democratic colleagues and I intend to preserve and strengthen Social Security for generations to come.

Social Security is a major income source for retired Americans, and workers should receive back what they have paid into Social Security over the years. Our children and grandchildren also deserve to have Social Security available to them upon their retirement.

We can and we will protect the core values of the Social Security system.

DO SOMETHING BESIDES BLAME PEOPLE WHO ARE NOT IN OFFICE

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, well, I keep hearing our friends across the aisle end up talking about George W. Bush. They keep forgetting that got them the majority in November of 2006. My friends across the aisle have been in charge ever since 2006.

It's time to do something besides blame people who are not in office. Take responsibility, that's a good thing.

And then we just hear this weekend, our administration, our friends, want to give $500 million more to Pakistan because we are not worried enough about folks here. We already gave them maybe a billion bucks. I have the new results from last year. They voted against us in the U.N. 87.5 percent of the time.

You don't have to pay people to hate you; they'll do it for free. Let's get the

money where it will do us some good instead of helping our enemies cause us problems.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the most successful program the United States Government has ever created, Social Security.

Since its inception in 1935, Social Security has become the great promise that each generation will take care of those who came before it. In our district in Texas, nearly 65,000 recipients receive over $61 million monthly from the Social Security administration. It's a blue-collar district, home to thousands of hardworking families who have overcome wars and natural disasters in becoming the backbone of the American economy.

The national average benefit for the retiree is $14,000 a year, a majority of income for 6 out of 10 seniors. This modest amount guarantees that tens of millions of parents, grandparents, friends and neighbors can retire with dignity.

I believe it's important to consider what would have happened if Congress had followed along the lines of then-President George W. Bush in 2005 to partially privatize Social Security and make Social Security subject to the stock market.

Or consider what could happen if Congress follows along the plans of some of my colleagues across the aisle in cutting Social Security to reduce the national debt. I believe that cutting Social Security is irresponsible and wrong as we approach the 75th anniversary of Social Security.

SOCIAL SECURITY

(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. Mr. Speaker, I guess the polls show that the Democrats are in trouble, because every time that happens, Social Security is pulled out of their back pocket. Republicans are going to destroy Social Security. This party is the only party to save Social Security.

Democrats must be behind in the polls because they are pulling out George W. Bush. I have looked all over this campus. I can't find him. I went down to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. He left. Maybe you folks didn't notice.

President Obama is there. And what a real shame it is that current Democrats are running away from the Democratic Party of John F. Kennedy. He told us, forget about class warfare; a rising tide lifts all boats.

Maybe you ought to listen to some of those on your side who didn't talk about fear but talked about hope.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, next month marks the 75th anniversary of Social Security, which has been there for generations of Americans and will be for generations to come.

Social Security is a bedrock promise to all Americans. You have paid into the system, the money is yours, and it is our responsibility to do everything we can to guarantee that it will be there for you when you retire.

That's why we are so fortunate that our friends on the other side of the aisle were unsuccessful in their attempt to privatize Social Security at exactly the time the American financial markets were nearing collapse. 401(k)s and IRAs lost one-third of their value during the stock market plunge of 2008 and 2009. Imagine what would have happened to those retirees' income if their Social Security earnings had also been gambled away in the stock market.

Mr. Speaker, rather than risk a lifetime of savings, Social Security will continue to be the stable, reliable, safety net that it was created to be 75 years ago.

□ 1400

GETTING THE ECONOMY MOVING AGAIN

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, just Friday I was in my district in Barren County, Kentucky—voted the number one rural county in America to live in—and I was at the Chamber of Commerce. I sat and talked at a roundtable with business leaders, people who own franchises and other types of small businesses, and their concerns about getting the economy moving again didn't have to do with George W. Bush or even when the majority took over in 2006. Their concern was this Congress, the debt from the stimulus bill that didn't keep unemployment from going above 8 percent. They were concerned about the energy cost that is going to greatly affect the great Commonwealth of Kentucky, the cap-and-trade. And also, they were talking about how they're going to implement the health care bill that was passed by this majority. Those were their concerns.

I left with them saying, if we got back to our belief in limited government and unlimited faith in the American people, that we will get this economy moving again and bring back the jobs they need.

SOCIAL SECURITY MUST BE PRESERVED

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

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, 75 years ago Frances Perkins, a wonderful woman who came from a long line of Maine farmers and craftsmen, addressed the Nation as the Secretary of Labor. In addition to being the first woman Cabinet member in our Nation's history, she was also the person President Roosevelt put in charge of creating the Social Security system. In her address, she talked about creating a system to ''provide safeguards against the misfortunes which cannot be wholly eliminated in this man-made world of ours.''

Nearly 300,000 people in my State now receiving benefits are living proof that for 75 years Social Security has done just what Frances Perkins hoped for—assuring a decent standard of living in good times and in bad for seniors and for countless others.

From disability insurance and survivors' benefits to providing a cushion during retirement, Social Security has allowed Americans to retain their independence and their dignity. It must be preserved.

GOVERNMENT-RUN STIMULUS HAS FAILED

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, we must end this culture of uncertainty. It is delaying our economic recovery. Businesses are unwilling to hire new workers because they do not know what new taxes and regulations Washington will enact on them. ObamaCare's chilling effect on hiring and new jobs was just the beginning. The cap-and-trade bill will further hurt our economic recovery if it is enacted.

As a result of policies adopted by this administration, businesses are sitting on huge stockpiles of cash to brace themselves for further interference from the government. Economist Larry Kudlow noted that corporations are sitting on $2 trillion worth of cash. If allowed to be injected into our economy, this could unleash a tremendous private sector stimulus of our economy.

The government-run stimulus has failed. We now need to get government out of the way of the private sector to let it save our economy.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on Congress to defend Social Security.

For many years, I've had the privilege of working to bring commonsense policies that benefit middle class families in North Carolina and across America. I was proud to help lead the fight against President Bush's misguided effort to privatize Social Security and to cut benefits. We won that

fight, but now some Washington politicians are threatening Social Security again with risky Wall Street schemes.

During this current economic crisis, more than 50 million Americans depend on Social Security to make ends meet. Without Social Security, one out of every two American seniors would fall into poverty. Dismantling Social Security would eliminate the safety net for millions of disabled Americans and survivors and many of their children.

No politician in Washington, D.C., has the right to threaten the American institution of Social Security. As we approach the 75th anniversary of the Social Security Act, I call on this Congress to defeat the proposals to cut Social Security benefits.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, over the last several weeks, I've done numerous America Speaking Out town halls all across the 10th Congressional District in Georgia. And what I hear from my constituents, from the most liberal communities all the way to the most conservative ones, is people in my district are asking, ''Where are the jobs?'' They understand that our economy is suffering and they understand that the stimulus bill has been an abject failure. They want to say, ''Where are the jobs?'' and that's what they're saying through americaspeaking out.com.

We need to get the ball rolling and leave dollars in the hands of small business, as well as the consumers, so that we can create jobs in the private sector. But that's not what our colleagues on the other side are doing. They're creating bigger government and creating more jobs in Washington, D.C., not in Georgia or any other State around this country. Only a few jobs are being created other than here.

I encourage people to go on americaspeakingout.com and speak about what we should be doing right here in Congress today, what we should be focusing on. What I'm hearing the American people saying is, ''Where are the jobs?'' We're trying to answer that question.

DEMOCRATS STAND BEHIND SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about Social Security. I rise because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle in this past weekend alone have said they want to return—they want to return to the Bush years. They want to return to privatizing Social Security. They want to do so so that they can help balance the deficit by cutting Social Security.

Can you imagine, had the Bush tax cuts gone through, had the Bush proposal for Social Security gone through, what would happen to so many of our citizens during this great recession? People who rely solely on Social Security would not have anywhere to turn to.

The concept and the idea we often criticize our colleagues saying they have no plan, but in fact they do. They want to privatize Social Security. Yes, they want to privatize Social Security. They want to voucher Medicare. They want to block grant Medicaid, and then they want to turn around and take your health benefits and treat them as ordinary income and tax them.

Ladies and gentlemen, members of the Democratic Caucus stand firmly behind Social Security and its benefits to all the American people.

THE HEROES OF CUBA

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. The world, and especially the press and the media in the United States, continue to treat the political prisoners in the gulags of the Cuban dictatorship as nonpersons.

The most well-known and respected political prisoner in Cuba is Dr. Oscar Elias Biscet. He has been in the gulags of the Castros for a decade due to his peaceful, pro-democracy work inside that enslaved island. Dr. Biscet is the Mandela of Cuba. Today is his 49th birthday. I wish him Godspeed and freedom, and freedom for Cuba.

To the press I ask, how long do the heroes of Cuba have to suffer before you acknowledge their existence?

THANK GOD BUSH IS GONE

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, it's been interesting listening to the discussions this morning and this afternoon. Social Security is 75 years old. It came about because of Franklin Roosevelt, a great Democratic President, and a Democratic Congress, evolving out of a Depression caused by Republican Herbert Hoover. And now 75 years later, we look at the situation where another Republican President, a Hoover George Bush, caused us the next worst financial crisis.

Republicans talk about privatizing Social Security. Social Security is money that needs to be there to preserve people's standards of living when Republicans who let the economy get out of hand because they don't have any regulations let it happen. This is the most foolish thought I've ever seen, if we didn't learn from September of 2008 that the market is a gamble and comes up and down. It's not social security; it's social insecurity.

People have gotten up here and said, You haven't noticed that Bush is gone? That's all they can say is Bush is gone. Nobody can defend him, rated the second worst President in the history of the United States. A man who earned record deficits by giving tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires and fighting a war based on lies to raise great deficits, and now all they can say is he's gone. Thank God he's gone.

SOCIAL SECURITY

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in memory of a great Floridian, Claude Pepper, who served this body and the other body for over 32 years. He was one of the greatest advocates for senior citizens in the history of this body, and I rise today in his memory to talk about the importance of Social Security to maintain the safety net for all Americans as we celebrate 75 years of Social Security being that safety net for seniors.

And I have some breaking news for everyone. Social Security is not the cause of the deficit. Let me repeat, Social Security is not the cause of the deficit. And the Republican plan to privatize Social Security is going to be dead on arrival.

□ 1410

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas). 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.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON CHILDREN AND DISASTERS REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2010

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5266) to extend the final report deadline and otherwise reauthorize the National Commission on Children and Disasters.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5266

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Commission on Children and Disasters Reauthorization Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON CHILDREN AND DISASTERS REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) DEADLINE FOR FILLING VACANCIES.—Paragraph (2) of section 605(g) of the Kids in Disasters Well-being, Safety, and Health Act

of 2007 (title VI of division G of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–161; 121 Stat. 1844, 2213)) is amended by inserting ''not later than 90 days after the date of vacancy'' after ''shall be filled''.

(b) FREQUENCY OF INTERIM REPORTS.—Subsection (a) of section 611 of the Kids in Disasters Well-being, Safety, and Health Act of 2007 is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''INTERIM REPORT'' and inserting ''INTERIM REPORTS''; and

(2) by inserting ''and annually thereafter'' after ''first meeting''.

(c) DEADLINE FOR FINAL REPORT.—Subsection (c) of section 611 of the Kids in Disasters Well-being, Safety, and Health Act of 2007 is amended by striking ''not later than 2 years after the date of its first meeting'' and inserting ''not later than December 31, 2012''.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 612 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 612. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $1,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012, and $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2013.

''(b) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts made available pursuant to subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5266.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 5266 and ask for the support of the House. It is a bill to reauthorize the National Commission on Children and Disasters, sponsored by my colleague from Florida, Representative CORRINE BROWN.

The National Commission on Children and Disasters was created as a result of the indelible lessons of Hurricane Katrina and as a result of the effects that disaster had on children. The commission was authorized by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the Kids in Disasters Well Being Act of 2007, which was also sponsored by Chairwoman BROWN.

The commission's work has been well received, and many of its recommendations have been implemented, especially those related to the Federal Emergency Management Agency. I was pleased to chair a hearing of the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management that received testimony from Mark Shriver, the chair of the commission, on its interim report when it was issued last October.

The commission just issued a progress report on May 11, and I recently had a talk with Chairman Shriver about that report. While FEMA has made good progress on many of the recommendations, other agencies have not; and, therefore, the commission's work remains incomplete. The subcommittee will continue to work with the commission on the implementation of its recommendations.

H.R. 5266, the National Commission on Children and Disasters Act of 2010, reauthorizes the commission by extending the deadline for its final report until December 31, 2012, and requires annual interim reports from the commission. The commission will sunset 180 days after the date of its final report.

H.R. 5266 authorizes appropriations of $1.5 million in fiscal years 2011 and 2012 and $1 million in fiscal year 2013, the final year of the commission. The bill also rectifies a problem the commission experienced at the outset when it took nearly 5 months for all of the members of the commission to be appointed. The bill requires vacancies to be filled in 90 days, which should help minimize any delays in the commission's work in the event of a vacancy.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5266, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I stand to support H.R. 5266.

In 2007, Congress created the National Commission on Children and Disasters to examine the needs of children in preparing for, responding to, and recovering from disasters. One lesson we learned from Hurricane Katrina is that we must ensure that our preparation for and response to disasters incorporate the unique needs of children. During Hurricane Katrina, many children were separated from their families, and schools and child care facilities were destroyed.

I had a personal experience of that as it took me about 2 weeks after Hurricane Katrina to find a child care facility for my daughters. At that time, one was 3 years old, and the other was around 9 months. It became clear that focused attention to children would be critical to helping families through a major disaster and through the recovery process.

The National Commission on Children and Disasters was created to ensure there is focused attention on the needs of children in disasters. The commission submitted an interim report last year, and under current law, a final report is due in October 2010. However, additional time is needed to allow for the proper review of the issues and to ensure full implementation of the commission's interim recommendations.

This legislation will provide the commission with the additional time to complete this important work. H.R. 5266 will ensure that the needs of children are properly incorporated in our preparation for and response to disasters.

I support the passage of this legislation, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the sponsor of the bill, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5266, the National Commission on Children and Disasters Reauthorization Act.

I would like to thank Chairman OBERSTAR and subcommittee Chairwoman NORTON for their hard work and assistance in bringing this bill forward.

I would also like to thank Mark Shriver, the commission chair, for his work and dedication to children.

You all have provided crucial support in the creation of the National Commission on Children and Disasters and continue to do so in advancing this important bill to allow the commission to continue its important work.

The passage of H.R. 5266, the National Commission on Children and Disasters Reauthorization Act of 2010, is of extreme importance to our Nation's efforts in protecting our Nation's children before, during, and following a disaster.

In the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, I authored the KIDS WiSH Act to improve Federal, State, tribal, and local disaster preparedness, response and recovery efforts for children who make up nearly 25 percent of our population but whose needs are often overlooked in disasters. Children are not little adults, and their needs are unique and cannot be easily inferred from disaster plans prepared only for adults.

The commission delivered its interim report in October 2009, which identified numerous gaps and made recommendations related to disaster management and recovery, child physical and mental health, education, child care, child welfare, juvenile justice, emergency sheltering, housing, evacuation, and family reunification.

As President Obama's administration has taken shape, the commission has played a vital role in fostering communication and coordination among Federal agencies and their partners in implementing the recommendations. While there are encouraging signs that the unique needs of children are receiving greater attention, there is still a great deal of important work ahead for the commission beyond the current fiscal year.

Just recently, in fact, in its interim report issued 8 months ago, the commission released a report which tracks the progress toward the implementation of the recommendations. Although the commission found that Federal agencies have taken some initial positive steps, many crucial recommendations remain substantially unad-

dressed, leaving children needlessly vulnerable in disasters. Therefore, I wholeheartedly believe that more work is needed to be done to bring about sweeping and permanent changes in the Nation's disaster planning and management, which still heavily favor able-bodied adults.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support our Nation's children and to vote ''yes'' on this bill.

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

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I want to join the chairwoman, Ms. CORRINE BROWN, not only in asking the House to pass this bill, but to commend her.

□ 1420

The chairwoman discovered this issue and acted on it. She discovered it in Florida, when there were refugees, as it were, from Katrina. She was moved by it. She decided to do, in fact, work on the ground in Florida for these children and others who were caught in Katrina, and she followed up with legislation, and never let up until this very day. And I know she won't let up until the other body sees fit also to pass the bill.

So I want to commend her for her discovery of a vital issue that my own committee, which has jurisdiction over FEMA, had not noted with nearly as much attention as the gentlelady from Florida.

I want also to note the work of Mark Schreiber, whose work on the commission went far beyond his chairmanship. He took this cause unto his own, pressed it with all that he had, and deserves great credit for making sure that we got to the day when we would pass the bill.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5266, the ''National Commission on Children and Disasters Reauthorization Act of 2010'', which extends the authorization for the Commission on Children and Disasters for an additional two years. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) for introducing this bill and the attention she has brought to the issue of the needs of children in disasters.

In 2007, Congress enacted the Kids in Disasters Well-being, Safety, and Health Act of 2007 as part of the Consolidated Appropriations Act (P.L. 110–161). This legislation established a 10-member Commission to examine the needs of children in response to and recovery from disasters and emergencies. The bill required the Commission to submit a final report to Congress with its findings two years after the date of the first meeting of the Commission, and sunset the authorization for the Commission 180 days after the submission of the final report.

Under current law, the report of the Commission is due in October 2010. H.R. 5266 extends the date for the final report to December 31, 2012, and requires annual interim reports from the Commission in the intervening years.

The Commission was created as a result of lessons learned from Hurricane Katrina, a disaster that affected thousands of children. As the Commission's May 2010 Progress Report reminds us, more recent disasters—such as last year's tsunami in American Samoa, this year's devastating earthquake in Haiti, and the recent H1N1 outbreak—disproportionately affected children compared to adults. However, serious impacts on children can occur in a disaster of any magnitude. Last month, tornadoes spread across my home state of Minnesota. The hardest hit area was Wadena, in my district, where preliminary damage assessments indicated that the community bore 90 percent of the damage to infrastructure and emergency response costs.

Shortly after the storm, I was in Wadena and saw the damage first-hand. One of the worst hit facilities was the Wadena Deer Creek High School, which was damaged beyond repair. Following a disaster, it is essential to reopen schools as quickly as possible in order to restore a sense of normalcy and stability for children and families. Children need to resume their education and reconnect with their friends, and with schools open, parents can get back to work. We are fortunate in Wadena that while the high school is being restored, the district will be able to use a recently closed parochial school and a local community and technical college campus.

We are also fortunate, as the Commission's May 2010 Progress Report points out, that Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has made good progress in implementing the recommendations of the Commission, including the appointment of a Children's Working Group that reports directly to the Administrator. Unfortunately, other Federal agencies have been slow to implement the Commission's recommendations and, as a result, the work of the Commission remains incomplete.

In October 2009, the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management held a hearing on the then-newly issued interim report of the Commission. Based on the testimony at this hearing and the Commission's findings, I included language in H.R. 3377, the ''Disaster Response, Recovery and Mitigation Act of 2009'', to require the Administrator of FEMA to take into account the recommendations of the Commission when drafting or updating agency plans, strategies, regulations, and policies. It is important for the Commission to be extended so it can advise Congress and the President on how FEMA is meeting this requirement.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5266.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 5266, the National Commission on Children and Disasters Reauthorization Act of 2010. I commend my colleague on the Transportation Committee, Representative BROWN, for her work on this legislation and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, the National Commission on Children and Disasters is conducting a comprehensive study that examines and assesses children's needs as they relate to preparation for, response to, and recovery from all hazards, including major disasters and emergencies. The Commission will review relevant laws, regulations, and policies and report its findings and recommendations to the President and Congress.

This legislation, which reauthorizes this important commission, will also extend the deadline for submission of the final report to December 31, 2012. Due to delays in the appointment of Commission members and receipt of funding, the Commission was unable to hold its first meeting until 10 months after it was created. As a result, the work of the Commission remains incomplete and, without reauthorization, the Commission will be required to issue its final report on October 14, 2010, and will sunset 180 days thereafter.

According to the committee report for this bill, children comprise nearly 25 percent of the U.S. population; however, disaster plans are written largely for able-bodied adults, meaning that before, during, and after disasters, the unique needs of children are overlooked, unmet, and misunderstood. This legislation is necessary to ensure that the commission can complete its important work which will have lasting effects on the safety of children before, during, and after a disaster.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. NORTON. Madam 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 District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5266.

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.

DEAUTHORIZING PORTION OF POTOMAC RIVER WATER PROJECT

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5545) to deauthorize a portion of the project for navigation, Potomac River, Washington Channel, District of Columbia, under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5545

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

SECTION 1. PROJECT FOR NAVIGATION, WASHINGTON CHANNEL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Upon the date of enactment of this Act, the following portion of the project for navigation, Potomac River, Washington Channel, District of Columbia, authorized by the Act of August 30, 1935 (chapter 831; 49 Stat. 1028) is deauthorized: Beginning at Washington Harbor Channel Geometry Centerline of the 400-foot-wide main navigational ship channel, Centerline Station No. 103+73.12, coordinates North 441948.20, East 1303969.30, as stated and depicted on the Condition Survey Anacostia, Virginia, Washington and Magazine Bar Shoal Channels, Washington, D.C., Sheet 6 of 6, prepared by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore district, July 2007; thence departing the aforementioned centerline traveling the following courses and distances: N. 40 degrees 10 minutes 45 seconds E., 200.00 feet to a point, on the outline of said 400-foot-wide channel thence binding on said outline the following three courses and distances: S. 49 degrees 49 minutes 15 seconds E., 1,507.86 feet to a point, thence; S. 29 degrees 44 minutes 42 seconds E., 2,083.17 feet to a point, thence; S. 11 degrees 27 minutes 04 seconds E., 363.00 feet to

a point, thence; S. 78 degrees 32 minutes 56 seconds W., 200.00 feet to a point binding on the centerline of the 400-foot-wide main navigational channel at computed Centerline Station No. 65+54.31, coordinates North 438923.9874, East 1306159.9738, thence; continuing with the aforementioned centerline the following courses and distances: N. 11 degrees 27 minutes 04 seconds W., 330.80 feet to a point, Centerline Station No. 68+85.10, thence; N. 29 degrees 44 minutes 42 seconds W., 2,015.56 feet to a point, Centerline Station No. 89+00.67, thence; N. 49 degrees 49 minutes 15 seconds W., 1,472.26 feet to the point of beginning, such area in total containing a computed area of 777,284 square feet or 17.84399 acres of riparian water way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5545.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise to support H.R. 5545.

This noncontroversial bill will allow development of the Southwest Waterfront in the District of Columbia. This bill will benefit not only residents here, but also regional residents and U.S. and international visitors by permitting the District to extend docks and increase maritime activity just a short eyeshot from the U.S. Capitol building.

In order for the District to make these improvements, the Federal Government must redesignate part of the water designated by the Federal Government as the Washington Channel so that more and larger docks can be built by the District to accommodate increased boating and waterside activity.

The original width of the Washington Channel was established in the early 1800s to accommodate industrial and maritime commerce at the Southwest Waterfront prior to the construction of East Potomac Park.

Today, however, the Southwest Waterfront is no longer a major port, and does not accommodate large vessels. In fact, the U.S. Coast Guard, the U.S. Navy, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have agreed that this redesignation will not affect navigation interests or adversely affect navigation safety.

I ask Members to support this noncontroversial change that will reinvigorate the Southwest Waterfront for the city, region, and visitors alike to enjoy.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Today we're considering the deauthorization of a portion of a navigation channel in Washington, DC. The Washington Channel was authorized in 1935. Ms. NORTON's bill would deauthorize a small portion of the project that is no longer necessary to ensure safe commercial navigation along the northern end of the Washington Channel. Neither the Army Corps of Engineers nor the U.S. Coast Guard has objections to this change in the Federal navigation channel.

The bill is noncontroversial. There are no costs associated with deauthorizing this portion of the Washington Channel. I fully support passage, and recommend my colleagues vote for and approve H.R. 5545.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Almost 10 years ago this House approved a bill to revitalize the Southeast Waterfront. The Southeast Federal Center is now being reinvigorated just down the street from the Southwest Waterfront. It is now called The Yards.

I very much appreciate that this House understood that it was far better for the Southeast Waterfront, owned by the Federal Government, to be revitalized than to lie fallow. And already, it is blossoming and blooming.

But the Southwest Waterfront has been awaiting concurrent action, not by this House, and not at the expense of the Federal Government, but by the District of Columbia.

This action, the action of the House today, should this bill be passed, will allow the District of Columbia to move forward on a multi-use development of the Southwest Waterfront, to which tourists and international visitors are always welcome, and will be even more welcome because it will be fit. It will be a fit place to come and see.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5545, a bill to deauthorize a portion of the project for navigation, Potomac River, Washington Channel, District of Columbia, under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

This bill deauthorizes one-half of the Federal navigation project width of the Washington Channel, District of Columbia. The channel deauthorization runs from the northern limit of the Federal navigation project to just south of the Maine Police pier which includes the Spirit Ship Dock.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure consulted with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Coast Guard, and the U.S. Navy regarding this proposed deauthorization and we have not been made aware of any opposition to the proposed deauthorization of this segment of the Washington Channel, District of Columbia. This non-controversial bill was reported favorably out of our Committee by voice vote, without amendment.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5545.

Ms. NORTON. Madam 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 District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5545.

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.

DELAYING EPA FISHING BOAT DISCHARGE RULES

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5301) to extend the period during which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and States are prohibited from requiring a permit under section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for certain discharges that are incidental to normal operation of vessels, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5301

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

TITLE I—NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM

SEC. 101. DISCHARGES INCIDENTAL TO NORMAL OPERATION OF VESSELS.

Public Law 110–299 (122 Stat. 2995, 33 U.S.C. 1342 note) is amended in section 2(a) by striking ''during the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending December 18, 2013''.

TITLE II—CLEAN ESTUARIES

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Clean Estuaries Act of 2010''.

SEC. 202. NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM AMENDMENTS.

(a) PURPOSES OF CONFERENCE.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLANS.—Section 320(b)(4) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(b)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) develop and submit to the Administrator a comprehensive conservation and management plan that—

''(A) identifies the estuary and its associated upstream waters to be addressed by the plan, with consideration given to hydrological boundaries;

''(B) recommends priority corrective actions and compliance schedules addressing point and nonpoint sources of pollution to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the estuary, including restoration and maintenance of water quality, a resilient and diverse indigenous population of shellfish, fish, and wildlife, and recreational activities in the estuary, and assure that the designated uses of the estuary are protected;

''(C) considers current and future sustainable commercial activities in the estuary;

''(D) addresses the impacts of climate change on the estuary, including—

''(i) the identification and assessment of vulnerabilities in the estuary;

''(ii) the development and implementation of adaptation strategies; and

''(iii) the impacts of changes in sea level on estuarine water quality, estuarine habitat, and infrastructure located in the estuary;

''(E) increases public education and awareness with respect to—

''(i) the ecological health of the estuary;

''(ii) the water quality conditions of the estuary; and

''(iii) ocean, estuarine, land, and atmospheric connections and interactions;

''(F) identifies and assesses impairments, including upstream impairments, coming from outside of the area addressed by the plan, and the sources of those impairments;

''(G) includes performance measures and goals to track implementation of the plan; and

''(H) includes a coordinated monitoring strategy for Federal, State, and local governments and other entities.''.

(2) MONITORING AND MAKING RESULTS AVAILABLE.—Section 320(b)(6) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(b)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

''(6) monitor (and make results available to the public regarding)—

''(A) water quality conditions in the estuary and its associated upstream waters, as identified under paragraph (4)(A);

''(B) habitat conditions that relate to the ecological health and water quality conditions of the estuary; and

''(C) the effectiveness of actions taken pursuant to the comprehensive conservation and management plan developed for the estuary under this subsection;''.

(3) INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES.—Section 320(b) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(b)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

''(7) provide information and educational activities on the ecological health and water quality conditions of the estuary; and''.

(4) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The sentence following section 320(b)(8) of such Act (as so redesignated) is amended by striking ''paragraph (7)'' and inserting ''paragraph (8)''.

(b) MEMBERS OF CONFERENCE; COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES.—

(1) MEMBERS OF CONFERENCE.—Section 320(c)(5) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(c)(5)) is amended by inserting after ''institutions,'' the following: ''not-for-profit organizations,''.

(2) COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES.—Section 320(d) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(d)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(d)'' and all that follows through ''In developing'' and inserting the following:

''(d) UTILIZATION OF EXISTING DATA AND COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES.—

''(1) UTILIZATION OF EXISTING DATA.—In developing''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) UTILIZATION OF COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES.—In updating a plan under subsection (f)(4) or developing a new plan under subsection (b), a management conference shall make use of collaborative processes to—

''(A) ensure equitable inclusion of affected interests;

''(B) engage with members of the management conference, including through—

''(i) the use of consensus-based decision rules; and

''(ii) assistance from impartial facilitators, as appropriate;

''(C) ensure relevant information, including scientific, technical, and cultural information, is accessible to members;

''(D) promote accountability and transparency by ensuring members are informed in a timely manner of—

''(i) the purposes and objectives of the management conference; and

''(ii) the results of an evaluation conducted under subsection (f)(3);

''(E) identify the roles and responsibilities of members—

''(i) in the management conference proceedings; and

''(ii) in the implementation of the plan; and

''(F) seek resolution of conflicts or disputes as necessary.''.

(c) ADMINISTRATION OF PLANS.—Section 320(f) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(f)) is amended to read as follows:

''(f) ADMINISTRATION OF PLANS.—

''(1) APPROVAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date on which a management conference submits to the Administrator a comprehensive conservation and management plan under this section, and after providing for public review and comment, the Administrator shall approve the plan if the Administrator determines that the plan meets the requirements of this section and the affected Governor or Governors concur.

''(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—Upon approval of a comprehensive conservation and management plan under this section, the plan shall be implemented. Funds authorized to be appropriated under titles II and VI and section 319 may be used in accordance with the applicable requirements of this Act to assist States with the implementation of the plan.

''(3) EVALUATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and every 4 years thereafter, the Administrator shall complete an evaluation of the implementation of each comprehensive conservation and management plan developed under this section to determine the degree to which the goals of the plan have been met.

''(B) REVIEW AND COMMENT BY MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE.—In completing an evaluation under subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall submit the results of the evaluation to the appropriate management conference for review and comment.

''(C) REPORT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In completing an evaluation under subparagraph (A), and after providing an opportunity for a management conference to submit comments under subparagraph (B), the Administrator shall issue a report on the results of the evaluation, including the findings and recommendations of the Administrator and any comments received from the management conference.

''(ii) AVAILABILITY TO PUBLIC.—The Administrator shall make a report issued under this subparagraph available to the public, including through publication in the Federal Register and on the Internet.

''(D) SPECIAL RULE FOR NEW PLANS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), if a management conference submits a new comprehensive conservation and management plan to the Administrator after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall complete the evaluation of the implementation of the plan required by subparagraph (A) not later than 4 years after the date of such submission and every 4 years thereafter.

''(4) UPDATES.—

''(A) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 18 months after the date on which the Administrator makes an evaluation of the implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan available to the public under paragraph (3)(C), a management conference convened under this section shall submit to the Administrator an update of the plan. The updated plan shall reflect, to the maximum extent practicable, the results of the program evaluation.

''(B) APPROVAL OF UPDATES.—Not later than 120 days after the date on which a management conference submits to the Administrator an updated comprehensive conservation and management plan under subparagraph (A), and after providing for public review and comment, the Administrator shall approve the updated plan if the Administrator determines that the updated plan meets the requirements of this section.

''(5) PROBATIONARY STATUS.—The Administrator may consider a management conference convened under this section to be in probationary status if the management conference has not received approval for an updated comprehensive conservation and management plan under paragraph (4)(B) on or before the last day of the 3-year period beginning on the date on which the Administrator makes an evaluation of the plan available to the public under paragraph (3)(C).''.

(d) FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Section 320 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1330) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (g), (h), (i), (j), and (k) as subsections (h), (i), (j), (k), and (m), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

''(g) FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

''(1) ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED WITHIN ESTUARIES WITH APPROVED PLANS.—After approval of a comprehensive conservation and management plan by the Administrator, any Federal action or activity affecting the estuary shall be conducted, to the maximum extent practicable, in a manner consistent with the plan.

''(2) COORDINATION AND COOPERATION.—The Secretary of the Army (acting through the Chief of Engineers), the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service, and the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, as determined by the Administrator, shall, to the maximum extent practicable, cooperate and coordinate activities, including monitoring activities, related to the implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan approved by the Administrator. The Environmental Protection Agency shall serve as the lead coordinating agency under this paragraph.

''(3) CONSIDERATION OF PLANS IN AGENCY BUDGET REQUESTS.—In making an annual budget request for a Federal agency referred to in paragraph (2), the head of such agency shall consider the responsibilities of the agency under this section, including under comprehensive conservation and management plans approved by the Administrator.

''(4) MONITORING.—The heads of the Federal agencies referred to in paragraph (2) shall collaborate on the development of tools and methodologies for monitoring the ecological health and water quality conditions of estuaries covered by a management conference convened under this section.''.

(e) GRANTS.—

(1) RECIPIENTS.—Section 320(h)(1) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (d) of this section) is amended by striking ''other public'' and all that follows before the period at the end and inserting ''and other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations''.

(2) EFFECTS OF PROBATIONARY STATUS.—Section 320(h) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (d) of this section) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) EFFECTS OF PROBATIONARY STATUS.—

''(A) REDUCTIONS IN GRANT AMOUNTS.—The Administrator shall reduce, by an amount to be determined by the Administrator, grants for the implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan developed by a management conference convened

under this section if the Administrator determines that the management conference is in probationary status under subsection (f)(5).

''(B) TERMINATION OF MANAGEMENT CONFERENCES.—The Administrator shall terminate a management conference convened under this section, and cease funding for the implementation of the comprehensive conservation and management plan developed by the management conference, if the Administrator determines that the management conference has been in probationary status for 2 consecutive years.''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 320(i) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (d) of this section) is amended by striking ''subsection (g)'' and inserting ''subsection (h)''.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 320(j) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (d) of this section) is amended to read as follows:

''(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2016 for—

''(A) expenses related to the administration of management conferences under this section, except that such expenses shall not exceed 10 percent of the amount appropriated under this subsection;

''(B) making grants under subsection (h); and

''(C) monitoring the implementation of a conservation and management plan by the management conference, or by the Administrator in any case in which the conference has been terminated.

''(2) ALLOCATIONS.—Of the sums authorized to be appropriated under this subsection, the Administrator shall provide—

''(A) at least $1,250,000 per fiscal year, subject to the availability of appropriations, for the development, implementation, and monitoring of each conservation and management plan eligible for grant assistance under subsection (h); and

''(B) up to $5,000,000 per fiscal year to carry out subsection (k).''.

(g) RESEARCH.—Section 320(k)(1)(A) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (d) of this section) is amended—

(1) by striking ''paramenters'' and inserting ''parameters''; and

(2) by inserting ''(including monitoring of both pathways and ecosystems to track the introduction and establishment of nonnative species)'' before '', to provide the Administrator''.

(h) NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM EVALUATION.—Section 320 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1330) is amended by inserting after subsection (k) (as redesignated by subsection (d) of this section) the following:

''(l) NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM EVALUATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and every 4 years thereafter, the Administrator shall complete an evaluation of the national estuary program established under this section.

''(2) SPECIFIC ASSESSMENTS.—In conducting an evaluation under this subsection, the Administrator shall—

''(A) assess the effectiveness of the national estuary program in improving water quality, natural resources, and sustainable uses of the estuaries covered by management conferences convened under this section;

''(B) identify best practices for improving water quality, natural resources, and sustainable uses of the estuaries covered by management conferences convened under this section, including those practices funded through the use of technical assistance from the Environmental Protection Agency and other Federal agencies, and assess the reasons why such practices result in the achievement of program goals; and

''(C) identify any redundant requirements for reporting by recipients of a grant under this section, and develop and recommend a plan for limiting reporting redundancies.

''(3) REPORT.—In completing an evaluation under this subsection, the Administrator shall issue a report on the results of the evaluation, including the findings and recommendations of the Administrator.

''(4) AVAILABILITY.—The Administrator shall make a report issued under this subsection available to management conferences convened under this section and the public, including through publication in the Federal Register and on the Internet.''.

(i) CONVENING OF CONFERENCE.—Section 320(a)(2) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(2) CONVENING OF CONFERENCE.—'' and all that follows through ''In any case'' and inserting the following:

''(2) CONVENING OF CONFERENCE.—In any case''; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (B).

(j) GREAT LAKES ESTUARIES.—Section 320(m) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (d) of this section) is amended by striking the subsection designation and all that follows through ''and those portions of tributaries'' and inserting the following:

''(m) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'estuary' and 'estuarine zone' have the meanings such terms have in section 104(n)(4), except that—

''(1) the term 'estuary' also includes near coastal waters and other bodies of water within the Great Lakes that are similar in form and function to the waters described in the definition of 'estuary' contained in section 104(n)(4); and

''(2) the term 'estuarine zone' also includes—

''(A) waters within the Great Lakes described in paragraph (1) and transitional areas from such waters that are similar in form and function to the transitional areas described in the definition of 'estuarine zone' contained in section 104(n)(4);

''(B) associated aquatic ecosystems; and

''(C) those portions of tributaries''.

□ 1430

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, both of these bills have passed the House, have been duly fully considered by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, reported to the House and passed substantially. We combined them in this measure to send them to the other body, where we expect prompt action to be taken to send the bills on to the President.

I rise in support of H.R. 5301. This bill extends a provision prohibiting the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and States from requiring permits under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act for certain discharges that are incidental to the normal operation of vessels less than 79 feet in length. H.R. 5301 also reauthorizes EPA's National Estuary Program.

I'd like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) for their work on this legislation.

Title I of H.R. 5301 extends a narrowly-tailored provision enacted by Congress in 2008 to establish a moratorium permit requirements under the Clean Water Act for certain discharges from commercial fishing vessels and other commercial vessels. This title ensures that EPA has sufficient time to consider the implications of discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel, while preserving the goals of the Clean Water Act to restore and maintain the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the nation's waters.

When Congress established the moratorium two years ago, EPA was directed to conduct a study on discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel. This study was intended to provide EPA and Congress with additional information on the nature, types, volumes, and composition of vessel discharges, and the potential impact of these discharges on human health, welfare, and the environment.

EPA completed this study earlier this year and determined that discharges from these smaller vessels are not benign. Appropriately, EPA plans on bringing these vessels within the scope of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, NPDES, program. Currently, however, EPA does not have the framework in place or the resources to expand NPDES coverage to these smaller vessels.

Without an extension, the permit prohibition expires on July 31, 2010. H.R. 5301 extends the current moratorium to December 18, 2013. This will allow EPA time to implement the appropriate Clean Water Act mechanisms for controlling, minimizing, and properly addressing these types of vessel discharges. It will also allow the agency to plan for the inclusion of these smaller vessels when the agency renews its Vessel General Permits program.

Title I of H.R. 5301 was previously included in H.R. 3619, the "Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2010", which passed the House on November 2, 2009.

Title II of H.R. 5301 reauthorizes the National Estuary Program. Title II consists of the text of H.R. 4715, the "Clean Estuaries Act of 2010", as passed by the House on April 15, 2010. Estuaries and associated coastal areas are major economic forces for the nation. Commercial and recreational fishing annually accounts for $185 billion in revenues, and more than two million direct jobs. Estuaries are habitat for approximately 75 percent of the U.S. commercial fish catch and 80 to 90 percent of the recreational fish catch. Beyond fishing, estuaries produce significant economic value through tourism, energy production, and navigation. Estuaries also provide recreational opportunities such as boating, fishing, swimming, surfing, and bird watching. The University of California and the Ocean Foundation have determined that, on an annual basis, "beach-going" generates up to $30 billion of economic value, and that "coastal wildlife viewing" generates up to $49 billion.

Title II includes four important modifications to the existing National Estuary Program.

First, Title II calls for increased transparency and accountability through regular evaluation and management plan updates with a public disclosure requirement.

Second, the title requires Federal agencies to be active partners in the restoration and protection of the estuaries where they are situated. This includes taking part in the development of the management plans, cooperating

and coordinating their activities to implement the plans, and considering their financial responsibilities under any estuary management plan when submitting their annual budget requests.

Third, Title II requires programmatic changes to the National Estuary Program such as identifying vulnerabilities to climate change and developing responsive adaptation actions; engaging in educational activities to better inform the public about their local estuaries; requiring that estuary programs consider sustainable commercial activities in the watershed; and ensuring that commercial entities along estuary waterfronts will be active participants in estuary programs.

Fourth, this title increases the authorization for the program from $35 million to $50 million per year and establishes a minimum funding level for each of the 28 approved estuaries in the program of $1.25 million per year. If the program were fully funded at $50 million, 12 new estuaries could enter the National Estuary Program and each be funded at a level of $1.25 million. EPA reports that entities representing 38 additional estuaries have expressed interest in joining the National Estuary Program.

H.R. 4715, the "Clean Estuaries Act of 2010," was considered by the House earlier this year and passed by a roll call vote of 278–128. I am pleased to say that we received solid support on both sides of the aisle.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5301.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5301.

Effective 11 days from now, commercial fishermen, charter boat operators, and owners of other commercial vessels less than 79 feet will have to apply for and receive individual permits from the EPA to discharge from their vessels such things as deck wash, bilge water, and condensation from air conditioning units. Vessels that operate without these permits could be subject to citizen lawsuits and fines that exceed $32,000 a day.

My bill simply extends the current moratorium for a few more years to ensure that the EPA has time to analyze the results of the study they conducted and develop proper permitting regulations. As the chairman indicated in his statement, we have the Clean Estuaries Act which is combined with this bill. We are happy to do this with Mr. BISHOP.

Having said that, I am hopeful that we can move this bill today. I appreciate Chairman OBERSTAR's effort, but I just have a cautionary note, as the chairman has sort of indicated on a number of times, that the other body does not always act in a manner that we consider something they should do.

Mr. OBERSTAR, I think you understand that. And I hope we have a continued commitment to be able to make sure that this fishing boat problem can get solved before we leave one way or the other.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Yes, indeed I will say, first of all to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey on his leadership on the issue of vessel discharge. He has been a champion on this subject. We have heard his strong appeal, his reasoned approach to the issue. That's why we moved the bill earlier. We now joined it with this estuaries bill.

We expect always with hope that the other body acts promptly, but if not, there are backup plans to deal with the vessel discharge issue in advance of the deadline that the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey cited. We are together on this. We are going to assure that the issue is resolved. And hopefully, both of these bills, combined in this fashion, will bring enough interest in the other body to have a concentration of effort to pass both measures together.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 5301, legislation to extend the period during which the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and States are prohibited from requiring a permit under section 402 of the federal water pollution control act for certain discharges that are incidental to normal operations of vessels, to reauthorize the national estuary program and for other purposes. I commend my colleague, Representative LOBIONDO for his word on this bill and urge the House to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, in light of the disaster caused by the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, it is important that this Congress pay particularly close attention to the well being of our Nation's aquatic ecosystems.

H.R. 5301 accomplishes two things. First, this bill extends an existing moratorium for vessels less than 79 feet in length to obtain a permit under the Clean Water Act for discharges incidental to their normal operation. The Environmental Protection Agency has been studying the impacts of incidental discharges from these vessels and made the determination that these discharges are not universally benign. The agency has acknowledged however, that it will be unable to develop and issue appropriate permits for these vessels before the current moratorium expires on July 31, 2010. Extending the moratorium will allow for the additional time necessary to develop and issue appropriate guidelines to address such discharges consistent with the goals of the Clean Water Act.

Second, H.R. 5301 includes H.R. 4715, the "Clean Estuaries Act of 2010", as passed by the House of Representatives on April 15, 2010, which reauthorizes the National Estuary Program. Established in 1987, the National Estuary Program is charged with attaining or maintaining water quality in an estuary, places where rivers meet the sea. Reauthorizing this program is essential to protection of public water supplies and the protection or indigenous population of shellfish, fish, and wildlife.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OBERSTAR. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the subject of these two bills.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5301, as amended.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend the period during which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and States are prohibited from requiring a permit under section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for certain discharges that are incidental to normal operation of vessels, to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes.".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING RAILROAD RETIREMENT DAY

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1463) supporting the goals and ideals of Railroad Retirement Day.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1463

Whereas the rail industry established the first formal industrial pension plan in North America on the Grand Trunk Railway in 1874;

Whereas by the late 1920s more than 80 percent of all railroad workers in the United States were employed by companies with existing pension plans, but the benefits provided by these plans were generally inadequate, liable to capricious termination, and of little assistance to disabled employees;

Whereas when the Great Depression drove the already unstable railroad pension system into a state of crisis, the railroad industry was beset by retirees who needed immediate assistance but the planned Social Security system would not cover work performed prior to 1937 and was not scheduled to begin paying benefits until 1940;

Whereas railroad workers sought a separate railroad retirement system which would continue and broaden the existing railroad programs under a uniform national plan;

Whereas, on August 29, 1935, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed into law the Railroad Retirement Act, establishing the beginnings of a new social insurance system for the Nation's rail industry that today protects working families against loss of income due to the retirement, disability, or death of a wage earner and assists in meeting the medical expenses of the elderly and long-term disabled;

Whereas the Railroad Retirement Act was amended numerous times between 1937 and 2002, including a major restructuring in 1974 and most recently by enactment of the Railroad Retirement and Survivors' Improvement Act of 2001, the most significant railroad retirement legislation in almost 20 years;

Whereas the benefit and financing provisions of the legislation, like those provisions of most previous railroad retirement legislation, were based on joint recommendations negotiated by a coalition of rail freight carriers and rail labor organizations;

Whereas the Act liberalized early retirement benefits for 30-year employees and their spouses, eliminated a cap on monthly retirement and disability benefits, lowered the minimum service requirement from 10 years to 5 years of service if performed after 1995, and provided increased benefits for some widows and widowers;

Whereas the Act reduced tier II tax rates on rail employers in calendar years 2002 and 2003 and beginning with 2004 provided automatic adjustments in the tier II tax rates for both employers and employees, and also repealed the supplemental annuity work-hour tax rate;

Whereas as a result of this provision, the tier II tax rate on employers has decreased from 16.1 percent in 2001 to 12.1 percent in 2010 and the tax rate on employees has decreased from 4.9 percent in 2001 to 3.9 percent in 2010;

Whereas the law also created the National Railroad Retirement Investment Trust, which manages and invests railroad retirement funds in nongovernmental assets, as well as in governmental securities;

Whereas since creation of the Trust, its assets have grown from $20,700,000,000 in 2002 to $25,200,000,000 as of March 31, 2010, and that amount does not include an additional $8,900,000,000 transferred by the Trust to the Treasury to pay railroad retirement benefits during this period;

Whereas, during the past 75 years, railroad retirement benefits have been paid by the Railroad Retirement Board to more than 2,000,000 retired workers, 1,100,000 spouses, and 2,400,000 survivors;

Whereas the first retirement annuities awarded under the 1935 Railroad Retirement Act averaged $60 a month with no monthly benefits for spouses or survivors;

Whereas today employee annuity awards average about $2,700 a month, annuities for spouses average over $900 a month, and annuities to aged and disabled widows and widowers just over $1,700 a month;

Whereas in 2010, nearly 600,000 beneficiaries will receive retirement and survivor benefits and about 42,000 persons will receive unemployment and sickness benefits;

Whereas today more than 200,000 people work in railroad employment and pay railroad retirement taxes;

Whereas the rail industry and its workers continue to be an integral part of our Nation's transportation system and vital to our economy; and

Whereas the Railroad Retirement Board has designated August 29, 2010, as ''Railroad Retirement Day'' to celebrate the success and importance of the railroad retirement system to America's working families: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Railroad Retirement Day as designated by the Railroad Retirement Board;

(2) recognizes the important contributions that the rail industry, rail workers, and retirees make to the national transportation system; and

(3) urges the people of the United States to recognize such a day as an opportunity to celebrate the importance of the railroad retirement system to America's working families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on House Resolution 1463.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support House Resolution 1463, supporting the goals and ideas of Railroad Retirement Day, and encourage all of my colleagues to support this important legislation. This resolution recognizes Railroad Retirement Day and the 75-year anniversary of the Railroad Retirement Act.

The railroad industry established the first formal industrial pension plan in North America in the year 1874. The Railroad Retirement Act came because the Great Depression wiped out the private system before the Social Security program could meet the needs of railroad retirees. Additionally, the State-based unemployment insurance system had failed to serve those whose work took them across the country.

Under the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts, railroad workers and employees fund retirement, survivors, unemployment, and sickness benefits programs for the Nation's railroad workers and their families. During the past 75 years, more than 2 million retired workers, 1.1 million spouses, and 2.4 million survivors have received benefits through the Railroad Retirement Board.

Finally, the program fosters a close relationship between railroad employees and employers. The change in the system over the years has been the result of cooperation between management and labor, and stands as an example of how government, labor, and businesses can work together to serve the Nation's needs. Clearly, the railroad retirement programs serve a valid need in a very efficient manner, and is worthy of our recognition.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of H. Res. 1463, which designates Railroad Retirement Day on August 29, 2010. Railroad Retirement Day is established in this resolution to celebrate the success and importance of the Railroad Retirement System, which has benefited generations of hardworking railroad workers and their families.

I am proud to support the railroad retirement system, which predates Social Security and provides comprehensive retirement, survivor, and disability benefits. More than 600,000 beneficiaries receive approximately $10 billion in benefits each year from the railroad retirement system.

For the last 7 years, a portion of retiree assets has been managed in the National Railroad Retirement Investment Trust. The NRRIT invests in U.S. and global equity markets, fixed income, and real estate and commodities, much like many private-sector retirement funds. This innovative fund has already returned $7.9 billion to retirees, and has grown 16 percent in the last 7 years, despite payouts and the volatility in the markets and the global economy.

I believe we should take a close look at the success of this system as one of the potential solutions to the looming crisis in Social Security. So I congratulate and applaud the majority for bringing this up today, as I have heard so many of my other colleagues talk about Social Security and how those on my side want to privatize Social Security. That just is not true. Nobody on our side of the aisle wants to privatize Social Security. But we have to look at innovative ways to be able to keep Social Security viable.

Just today there was a poll in USA Today that says that the overwhelming majority of Americans under 34 years old do not believe they will get anything from Social Security. So once again, looking at the railroad retirement system is a potential solution to Social Security. And again, it's not privatizing. It's taking a small portion of it and investing it in different ways. And as I said, the success of this over the last 7 years, even in these volatile times, has proven to be successful.

□ 1440

It has grown 16 percent over the last 7 years.

I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to stop the rhetoric, stop the scare tactics in talking about the way we want to privatize Social Security. This is a viable solution that we need to consider. This is something that we need to take a look at as we move forward in this country.

So, again, I applaud the majority for bringing this up today when, as I've said, I've heard so much talk about privatizing Social Security. And we all need to look at Social Security and figure out how to reform it, because I have two children—22 years old and soon-to-be 19—and Social Security will not be there for them. And we're not talking about the folks who are retired today. We need to make sure we are going to keep that ironclad guarantee with today's retirees and those that are soon to retire, that we are not going to affect their Social Security.

But as we move forward, as I said, let's look at the railroad retirement system as a model for how we can improve Social Security for those in America that are just moving into the job market who won't be retiring for 20

and 30 and 40 years. The freight rail industry strongly supports the railroad retirement system because these good benefits attract and retain highly skilled workers. This is a system that has worked well for generations. And I would encourage the railroads and the unions to protect the system by ensuring that benefits are distributed fairly and to remain vigilant for fraud and abuse in this system.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. My dear friend, I am so happy that you support the railroad retirement system. And I can tell you that some people have not always been supportive of Social Security. I remember when Social Security passed, it passed without any Republican vote. And constantly, year after year, Bush and the Republicans tried to privatize it, and the American people said ''no'' and the Democrats said ''no'' and I say ''no, no.''

Now, I support the railroad retirement, and I'm glad that we stand together for the railroad workers. I hope we can get that same kind of support for the Social Security benefits.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PERRIELLO).

Mr. PERRIELLO. I thank the chairwoman for yielding time and for all of her leadership on all of the issues related to the railroad, such an important asset in our country and part of our competitive advantage and part of our need to make sure that we continue to build and make things here in America.

I rise today in support of H. Res. 1463, Supporting the Goals and Ideals of Railroad Retirement Day.

The railroad system is an integral part of our Nation's transportation system and provides us with the capacity to move both passengers and freight around the country. For over 200 years, this system has proven to be one of the best methods of transport available. Today, railroads are responsible for moving over 40 percent of the freight transported in the United States, and we depend upon rail for daily supply and demand.

It is important to honor both the commitment and labor of the railroad industry workers. Without them, our country would not have experienced such success in westward expansion and in the growth of industry.

Today, the railroad industry remains an important piece of our Nation's transportation infrastructure, and it would not be able to run without the ongoing efforts of railroad workers. Thus, I feel that we must honor the hard work of railroad workers, both past and present, by recognizing Railroad Retirement Day on August 29, 2010.

The railroad industry has created one of the most successful models for retirement plans of any sector of the economy. On August 29, 1935, the railroad industry created a unified retirement plan. For over 70 years, the retirement plan has been successful, even with the changes to the industry and fluctuations in the economy, including the $9 billion hit that it took in the recent economic meltdown and the challenges that presented to the system.

The pension plan now provides benefits to over 600,000 beneficiaries and is supported by an industry of over 20,000 workers. Even within my own district, there are nearly 3,000 railroad retirees. In 2010 alone, the plan will provide more than $11 billion in retirement and survivor benefits. Supporting this resolution shows our commitment to the railroad industry and our recognition of the hard work of retirees and the success of their retirement program.

I request your support for this resolution.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 16½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Florida has 16 minutes remaining.

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

Again, I want to make sure we set the record straight here. There is a lot of rhetoric, a lot of talk going on on the floor today about Social Security, and I just want to make sure that the record stands clear that in 1935, the Social Security Act, on April 19, 1935, was passed with 79 percent of the Republicans in the House voting for it in the House. There weren't many Republicans in 1935, I might add. Seventy-seven Republicans voted for it, and there were 18 that voted against; 288 Democrats voted for it and 13 voted against.

So let the record show that Republicans have supported Social Security, and we continue to support Social Security. Nobody that I know of on my side has talked about privatizing Social Security. We look to something like the railroad retirement system, how they've taken a portion of it, 7 years ago—under the Bush administration, I might add—under a Republican Congress, moved a portion of that to be able to be invested into different investment vehicles that has given a much greater return. As I've said, 17 percent growth in the last 7 years, even in these tough economic times. So it can be done.

And as I mentioned earlier, there was a poll out today that 18- to 34-year-olds in today's USA Today poll, 75 percent of them do not believe they will receive Social Security benefits. So standing up talking about railroad retirees, I'm here. I applaud the system. I want to applaud the railroad retirees and the freight system in this country, the railroads in this country.

But we've got to talk about all retirees, future retirees. That's who we owe it to, to the future generations to look at ways that we can strengthen and reform Social Security. And as I will go back to, as I've continued to state, I want to make sure that we hear this loud and clear, this is a system that we can look at as potentially a model. We have to consider this to make sure that we save Social Security for future generations.

With that, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I wasn't here in 1935 but I certainly was here in 1995, and I do know where the Republicans stood as far as not only privatizing Social Security but gambling with Social Security and where would they be with the crash in Wall Street.

I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), who's the guru and has all of the figures and the statistics on the history of Social Security and those who support it and those who have never supported it.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and her strong, stout defense of the Railroad Retirement program; Mr. PERRIELLO for his leadership and advocacy for the bill supporting the goals and ideals of Railroad Retirement Day; and for the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, a strong supporter of our railroad system, both passenger and freight in this country, and for the Railroad Retirement fund.

Now, the gentleman cited a figure about the vote in the House in 1935 on Social Security, and that figure is accurate. But that was on the conference report. And when the rule providing for consideration of Social Security came to the floor, only one Republican supported it in 1935.

Now, I understand that a vote on the rule is a party-line vote and that, as a matter of party discipline, only one Member on the other side broke ranks to vote for the rule, but we must acknowledge that the Social Security program has saved the Nation, has been a bulwark for blue collar working Americans and upper middle class and upper class.

□ 1450

In all of its 76 years, Social Security has never missed a payment. It has never bounced a check. You don't have to get up in the morning and look on the financial pages of the newspaper to see whether your retirement fund is intact or whether it's bottomed out or has dropped out of sight, as you have to do if your retirement fund is in the hands of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, corporation that you worked for went into bankruptcy or retirement fund was put in the hands of the PBGC and those assets were invested by the company for which you worked in the marketplace, and suddenly those assets lost value, enormous value.

Some people have seen their retirement funds lose 50 percent to 60 percent of their value because the investments they had made proved unsound

or vulnerable—sound to begin with, but vulnerable to this worldwide recession that we've experienced. Indeed, the Railroad Retirement Fund itself has lost $9 billion because of the recession.

So let's not have this haphazard, careless, thoughtless rhetoric that we heard in this Chamber in 1995–96 from the other side—not the gentleman from Pennsylvania, not his father who served with great distinction in this body then and still a great friend of mine—saying we're going to rip the system out by its roots, are going to replace it, we're going to privatize it, and a host of other schemes that eventually Members on the other side voted against. There's a very wise core of Members in the Republican side who understand the value of the Social Security program and who want to sustain and support it; and this is the most significant Social Security, most significant important social contract in America, in our history, the most successful; and Medicare's right behind it in its success, and right alongside it is the railroad retirement system.

People who have worked hard, they've saved, they've contributed into the system; the employers, the railroads have contributed into the system. Our purpose ought to not to be pointing fingers or using scare rhetoric, but rather to say let's work together to keep our economy going, to keep investment expanding in this country, to expand employment so that there are more people working, contributing into the Railroad Retirement Fund and into the Social Security fund. That ought to be the purpose of our efforts.

And that is why Mr. PERRIELLO was so thoughtful to bring out the goals and ideals of Railroad Retirement Day and our champion advocate for passenger rail, freight rails, Ms. BROWN, and an equally passionate advocate for rail service, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Let's put the rhetoric aside. Let's join the visionaries of seven decades ago so that seven decades from now there will be retirement programs that will be the safety—they will be the safety net for those who worked hard all their lives and expect dignity in their retirement years.

Thank you again, Madam Chairman, for yielding your time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support H. Res. 1463, which celebrates 75 years of the success and importance of the railroad retirement system to America's working families, commemorates the day (August 29, 1935) when President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed into law the Railroad Retirement Act, and recognizes August 29, 2010 as "Railroad Retirement Day", as designated by the Railroad Retirement Board.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PERRIELLO) for his leadership in introducing this resolution.

In 1874, the first modern railroad pension system was established in North America by the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada. Its stated purpose was "to help workers worn out from long service to retire." The American Express Company, then a railroad freight agency, established the first railroad pension system in the United States shortly thereafter in 1875.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad created a pension system in 1880, followed by the Pennsylvania Railroad in 1886; other railroads soon followed suit. By the late 1920s, more than 80 percent of all railroad workers in the United States were covered by a pension plan. However, these plans were generally inadequate, liable to capricious termination, and of little assistance to disabled employees.

The Great Depression drove the already unstable and inadequate railroad pension systems into a state of crisis. By 1928, over 250,000 railroad workers had lost their jobs and by 1931, 16 percent of all railroad employees nationally were laid off.

Older railroad workers eligible for retirement exercised their seniority rights and continued working, deciding that a steady paycheck was preferable to pension systems that could not meet their obligations. This decimated the ranks of younger workers, affecting the railroad industry for years to come as the labor pool of younger workers disappeared.

Congress passed the Railroad Retirement Act of 1934 "to promote economy, improve employee morale and promote the efficiency and safety of interstate transportation." This law created a fund into which all railroad employers and employees paid. The Railroad Retirement Act was the first major piece of Federal retirement legislation under President Roosevelt's "New Deal" and set the precedent for later, more general retirement legislation. It allowed older workers to retire with the promise of a reliable income from a stable pension system for the first time in history, and enabled younger workers to return to work.

However, after the Railroad Retirement Act became law, the United States Supreme Court held that the law was unconstitutional. Congress passed similar legislation the following year, which President Roosevelt signed into law on August 29, 1935. Railroad management and labor had to come to the table and resolve their differences and less than a year after the passage of the 1935 legislation, the first annuity payments to railroad retirees were made. In July 1937, the benefit payments of more than 50,000 pensioners were taken over by the Railroad Retirement Board.

In 2001, Congress enacted the most sweeping changes to railroad retirement law since the 1930s, with enactment of the Railroad Retirement and Survivors Improvement Act. The Act liberalized early retirement benefits for 30-year employees and their spouses, eliminated a cap on monthly retirement and disability benefits, and lowered the minimum service requirement to under 10 years if at least five years of service occurred after 1995.

By the beginning of 2010, railroad retirement benefits have been paid to two million retired employees, 1.1 million spouses, and 2.4 million survivors. This year, nearly 600,000 beneficiaries will receive retirement and survivor benefits and about 42,000 railroad workers will receive unemployment and sickness benefits.

H. Res. 1463 recognizes the vitally important contributions that the rail industry, rail workers, and retirees make to the Nation's transportation system. It recognizes the success of the legislation signed into law by President Roosevelt 75 years ago, and celebrates the importance of the railroad retirement system to America's working families.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 1463 and celebrating Railroad Retirement Day on Sunday, August 29, 2010.

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

In response to the chairman of the committee and his comments—and it is always dangerous challenging the chairman on his historical notes and happenings in the House, but as I recall in 1995, although I was not here, don't recall the debate, I do recall that it was a commission set up by President Clinton that made some of these recommendations.

So, to continue, for the majority to point to Republicans as not voting for it, as trying to rip it out by the roots, as trying to privatize, just simply is not accurate, and that's some of the rhetoric we hear from the other side.

Today, as we move this resolution forward, as I have said before, this is something we should be looking at as a model, as something we should try to understand how this works, the railroad retirement works, how it has grown 16 percent in the last 7 years despite these very volatile times in our economy. We did not privatize railroads' retirement. We took a portion of it, and we know that the retirees are receiving greater benefits because of what we've done here.

So I urge my colleagues on the other side as we debate this, as we talk about—a lot of folks talk about Social Security, as the chairman and the chairman of the subcommittee has mentioned Social Security, I'm not so sure, and I guess I have to ask the question: Do you support the National Railroad Retirement Investment Trust which does something very similar to many on both sides of the aisle, the commission that was set up by President Clinton and others on my side of the aisle talked about, as one of the ways to reform the Social Security system?

So we can stand up here today and talk about in glowing terms about the Railroad Retirement Investment Trust, when it's doing something that is very positive and it's a potential to help reform, to help make sure that those 18 to 34 years old in this country, that 75 percent of them do not believe they are going to get any money out of Social Security when they retire.

It just seems to me that the majority is using a lot of rhetoric, trying to hype up retirees in this country which we have to make sure that we keep that ironclad guarantee that those who are retired, those that are soon to retire are going to get the Social Security benefits that they've earned, that they have been promised by the Government of the United States.

But we have to look to the future generation, those that are going to retire in 20 and 30 years. Social Security, as the chairman pointed out, has not bounced a check. The check comes every month; but if we don't figure out

a way, a bipartisan way, how to reform Social Security, there's going to come a day when there's not going to be any money there, or we are just going to continue what we've been doing over the past 18 months, spending money, borrowing money that we don't have, which is going to be inflationary; and then that tax on our retirees, on our Social Security beneficiaries, is going to be an even more brutal tax when you lose value because of inflation. When inflation soars to four and five and seven, and those that have been on this Earth for more than 35, 40 years, remember the days of double-digit inflation and how brutal that was to the economy and how brutal that is to our retirees.

So this is an opportunity for us to look at a system that both sides of the aisle here talking, standing up today, as I said talking about in glowing terms the Railroad Retirement Fund, and we should look at this as a potential to help reform and strengthen Social Security for future generations.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Would the gentleman yield for a response to his very thoughtful question?

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. In House floor consideration of the railroad retirement program, it was made very clear time and again by both sides of the aisle that this plan for railroad retirement was not a formula for Social Security. Both sides were at pains to say that because of the difference in scale of the programs and the difference in purpose of the two retirements, Social Security and railroad retirement act. That's not to say that it couldn't be reconsidered at some future time, but it was made very clear then.

You have some 600,000-plus railroad retirees and 33 million Social Security retirees. We all realized at the time the scale is vastly different. The purpose and the revenue streams are very different. So it was a very clear purpose on both sides of the aisle, not to confuse, not to roll over from one to the other. And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

□ 1500

Mr. SHUSTER. I appreciate the gentleman's comments but, again, we can use this as an experiment, it's working.

I understand the scale is different, but the principles can be the same. Business principles, running an efficient operation, making sure of a return on investment. All those things that we use in a small business that I operated, they use those same fundamentals when they are operating large companies in this country.

My suggestion, my urging is that the majority, as we move down the road, look at this as something to consider on how we can reform Social Security and strengthen it for those future generations. As I want to continue to stress, for the folks that are retired today and those that are going to retire soon, we have got to keep that guarantee that it is going to be there. But if we don't do something, don't consider some other way to strengthen Social Security, those who are 18 to 35 that have stated in that poll, 75 percent of them do not believe there is going to be anything available for them in Social Security when they retire.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, let me just say that I welcome a debate on how we can reform Social Security any time, but I can truly say, having been here during the 1990s, one way that you shore it up is not to privatize it.

Coming from Florida, I mentioned earlier that I come from the State where Claude Pepper served in this body and the other body for over 32 years. He was one of the strongest advocates for Social Security. Clearly, we can see what happened on Wall Street and what has happened with other programs and pension funds.

Social Security is a safety net. Being in this body, let me say you stand for something or you fall for everything, and one of the things we are going to stand up for on this side is for Social Security.

We are very happy that we are having before us today the railroad retirement that we all can support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I will close by making the final note, again, the urging, the plea to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, to stop using the rhetoric that those of us on our side want to privatize.

We do not want to privatize Social Security. We want to find reforms to make sense. We want to find reforms that are going to strengthen Social Security and not just for those today, but, most importantly, those that are going to retire in 20, 30 years from now.

Because if we in this Congress do nothing, then we are going to continue to see Social Security going in the wrong direction and nobody in this country wants to see the Social Security system continue to go down, having less money, moving towards insolvency. So we have got to do something.

I say, let's look at the railroad retirement fund that has returned $7.9 billion to its retirees and has grown 16 percent in the last 7 years, despite payouts, volatility in the markets, in the global economy. This is a system that, again, 7 years ago, we have taken a small portion of it and invested it in U.S. and global equity markets, fixed income, real estate, commodities, not the entire amount, but a portion of it. Our railroad retirees are benefiting greatly by that.

I stand here today in support of this resolution. I hope it passes overwhelmingly, and I hope that we look to future generations to try to solve our problems, solve the reform of Social Security by looking at railroad retirement, which has been a tremendous success.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, let me just say that we, on our committee, always stand ready to work in a bipartisan manner, and we would certainly be interested in ideas that don't include privatizing Social Security. But for Members to come on this floor and act as if Social Security is the reason why we have the deficit—for several years, I know there is no institutional memory, we had what we call reverse Robin Hood, robbing from the poor and working people to give tax breaks to the rich. That's what got us in this hole.

Now I am glad we all can support the bill that is before us today, but as far as I am concerned it's the Ways and Means that handled this particular issue, and I am prepared to debate and discuss and work with my colleagues to come up with solutions as to how we can tweak the program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support H. Res. 1463, legislation supporting the goals and ideals of Railroad Retirement Day. I commend my colleague, Representative PERRIELLO, for his efforts on this bill and urge Congress to pass this important legislation.

Railroad Retirement Day, as designated by the U.S. Railroad Retirement Board, recognizes the important contributions that the rail industry, rail workers, and retirees make to the national transportation system. This legislation urges the American people to recognize Railroad Retirement Day, which is August 29, 2010, as an opportunity to celebrate the success and importance of the railroad retirement system to America's working families.

This year, nearly 600,000 beneficiaries will receive retirement and survivor benefits and about 42,000 railroad workers will receive unemployment and sickness benefits through the railroad retirement system. After the great depression, and years of decline, President Roosevelt and Congress worked with railroad management and labor to pass legislation that would allow for a secure and stable retirement system for railroad workers. The law has been updated and expanded over the years to increase benefits for dependents, liberalize early retirement benefits, and add survivor and spousal benefits. In the beginning of this year, its 75th year, railroad retirement benefits had been provided to 2 million retired employees, 1.1 million spouses, and 2.4 million survivors.

Madam Speaker, you may not have been aware that the City of Atlanta, Georgia, was named "Terminus" because it was the eastern terminus of the Western and Atlantic Railroad. The city became known as Atlanta after the Chief Engineer of the Georgia Railroad suggested that the area be renamed "Atlantica-Pacifica", a name that was soon shortened to Atlanta. Atlanta has served as an important railroad hub for many years, and today thousands of workers help ensure that Atlanta's passenger and freight rail keep people and goods moving throughout Georgia and the southeastern United States. These workers have and continue to make Atlanta the wonderful world-class city that it is and it is because of them that I am proud to support this bill and Railroad Retirement Day.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1463.

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.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SAVINGS ACT OF 2010

Mr. PERRIELLO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5604) to rescind amounts authorized for certain surface transportation programs.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5604

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 ''Surface Transportation Savings Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. SAFETY BELT PERFORMANCE GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), of the amounts authorized for fiscal year 2010 by section 2001(a)(4) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) to carry out section 406 of title 23, United States Code, $80,994,029 is rescinded.

(b) LIMITATION.—The amount rescinded pursuant to subsection (a) shall be decreased as necessary to ensure that not less than $28,505,971 is available for fiscal year 2010 to carry out section 406 of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 3. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

Of the amounts authorized for fiscal year 2010 by section 2001(a)(11) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520), $6,547,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER.

Of the amounts authorized for fiscal year 2010 by section 2001(a)(7) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) for the National Driver Register authorized under chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code, $78,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 5. NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH.

Of the amounts authorized for fiscal year 2010 by section 2001(a)(2) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) to carry out section 403 of title 23, United States Code, $1,829,000 is rescinded.

SEC. 6. TRANSIT FORMULA AND BUS GRANTS.

Of the amounts authorized for fiscal year 2010 by section 5338(b)(1) of title 49, United States Code, to carry out sections 5305, 5307, 5308, 5309, 5310, 5311, 5316, 5317, 5320, 5335, 5339, and 5340 of title 49, United States Code, and section 3038 of the Federal Transit Act of 1998 (112 Stat. 392), $17,394,000 is rescinded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PERRIELLO) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERRIELLO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5604.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Surface Transportation Savings Act of 2010 and appreciate the work of Congressman SCHAUER and the chairman and many others in working for this.

In the long journey towards reducing this Nation's deficit, we also need to look at small steps as well as large ones. As we look at pay-as-you-go legislation and bipartisan budget commissions, we also must find in every place that we can look opportunities to save some money.

One of those places we should be able to start, if nothing else, is looking at areas where the agencies themselves have said we cannot use this money or we do not want this money. We have compiled within Transportation and Infrastructure's jurisdiction over $107 million that is left sitting on the table. But we know too often in this town, money left on the table disappears very quickly.

This bill will lead to real savings. It reduces the contract authority that is currently available for certain highway safety and transit programs by $107 million. In fiscal year 2010, it takes this $107 million off the table so that it cannot be used to increase spending in the future.

There are two ways that this money could be used to increase spending in the future if not rescinded now. First, the future appropriations act could increase the obligations limitations that control spending for these highway safety and transit programs, thereby allowing this $107 million to be spent instead of reducing the deficit.

Second, the future appropriations act could rescind this authority and use it as a rescission to offset increased spending on other programs. In fact, and unfortunately, we have already seen attempts to do this. They become somewhat routine for appropriations bills to rescind contract authority to offset other spending. In fact, H.R. 4899, the FY 2010 emergency supplemental, used about $2.2 billion in rescissions of highway contract authority.

What we see here is a commonsense attempt with ideas from both sides of the aisle to look at opportunities where the agencies have said these are resources we will not spend or cannot spend. To me, this is one step where we should be able to agree at least in such areas that that money and that contracting authority should be taken off the table so that it is not spent and put towards deficit reduction.

I rise today to support this savings act, to appreciate all those and thank all of those who have worked on it. While these savings may seem small relative to the size of a budget deficit, it is a start. As they say, even the longest journey can begin with a single step. I urge my colleagues to consider H.R. 5604 in this light and support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1510

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

I rise in support of this bill, and I commend the gentleman from Virginia, who just finished making his remarks.

H.R. 5604 rescinds $106.8 million in contract authority from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and the Federal Transit Administration. This rescission of contract authority will come from the following programs: $81 million from NHTSA's safety belt performance grant program; $8.5 million from NHTSA's administrative expenses, the National Driver Registry, and research and development programs; and $17.4 million from FTA's formula and bus grant programs.

In total, H.R. 5604 rescinds approximately $107 million in contract authority, which is a type of budget authority. However, the Congressional Budget Office has determined that H.R. 5604, while certainly well intentioned and worthy of support, will not have any impact on outlays or direct spending.

According to the CBO, the budget deficit is defined as the amount by which the Federal Government's total outlays exceed its total revenues. Because CBO's official cost estimate for H.R. 5604 finds that this legislation will not reduce the Federal Government's outlays, this bill, unfortunately, will not reduce the budget deficit. This bill could ultimately lead to savings if the Congress does not simply spend this money someplace else.

For the first 9 months of fiscal year 2010, we are running a budget deficit of $1 trillion, and the deficit will reach at least $1.4 trillion by the end of the fiscal year on September 30. These are staggering, incomprehensible sums, and these deficits will only add to our growing Federal debt, which is already at over $13 trillion.

By the end of this year, the Federal debt will represent 62 percent of the Nation's economy, the highest percentage since World War II, according to CBO. This mounting debt will be passed on to our children and grandchildren. I believe, and most people believe, that Congress isn't doing enough to reduce the current budget deficit or our swelling national debt.

While this bill is certainly a step in the right direction, it will not reduce the current budget deficit or the national debt. And so while this is good legislation that I do support, we are going to have to go further if we're going to do what the American people expect and need us to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRIELLO. I appreciate the support of the gentleman from Tennessee and his concern about the deficit. We certainly need to continue to look at the big picture with pay-as-you-go legislation and budget commissions and other ways to get it to balance. In the meantime, there is nothing wrong with taking smaller steps in the right direction, whether that's looking at blocking congressional pay raises or anyplace that we can save. $107 million is nothing to sneeze at, even if it's not large by Washington standards.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SCHAUER).

Mr. SCHAUER. Thank you, Mr. PERRIELLO and Mr. DUNCAN.

We need common sense in Washington, and unfortunately there is too little of it at this time. That's why I decided to sign on and be a primary cosponsor of this bill, the Surface Transportation Savings Act of 2010. The bill will lead to real savings and real deficit reduction, and we need to fight for that at this very difficult time in our country.

As has been said, the Surface Transportation Savings Act of 2010 reduces the contract authority that is currently available for certain highway safety and transit programs by $107 million. Let me say that again, $107 million. That's real money. While this may not, in and of itself, directly reduce outlays this current fiscal year, it takes $107 million off the table so that it cannot be used to increase spending in the future.

Now, as my colleague, Mr. PERRIELLO, said, there are a couple of ways that this $107 million could be used to increase spending and increase the Federal budget deficit. We know that a future appropriations act could use these dollars and appropriate them and spend them on these current programs within the Department of Transportation. But let's be clear, there is a very real threat. The Congressional Budget Office may not see it, and I can understand why they may not trust the Congress to act responsibly, but twice already this Congress has tried to use these available dollars within other programs.

H.R. 4899, the FY 2010 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill that was passed by the House of Representatives earlier this month included $2.2 billion of rescinded highway contract authorities. So these are dollars that were budgeted but were not spent. And again, if we don't act, those kinds of available dollars will be spent.

Now, to make it even more directly relevant to this bill and to the Congressional Budget Office's analysis, H.R. 4899, this Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill, tried to spend $25 million that would be taken off the table by this Surface Transportation Savings Act. So I don't think we could be any more clear than the threat that is before us.

I couldn't agree more that we must address real deficit reduction one step at a time. This is a critical, critical step to do that. And I'll tell you, the people in Michigan's Seventh Congressional District believe $107 million is real money.

By not acting, the threat is real that these available dollars will be spent. By passing this bill today, the United States House of Representatives will remove $107 million that would likely be spent for some other program.

We must act to make sure that we restrain and constrain spending in a way that results in deficit reduction. That's why I'm proud to stand in support of this bill and hope that both my Democratic and Republican colleagues take decisive action to make sure that neither this Congress nor future Congresses spend money that we can't afford.

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

Mr. PERRIELLO. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the chairman.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

The gentleman from Virginia has been very diligent and vigilant on deficit reduction and on careful investment of the public resources, as has the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SCHAUER), and there is no one who can exceed those qualities other than the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), a gentleman whose entire career has been one of public probity and clarity.

As the gentleman from Michigan said, where he comes from and where I come from in northern Minnesota, where the gentleman from Virginia comes from, $107 million is real money. We could build 100 lane miles of new road at $1 million a mile in my part of the country. But being very clear, this is contract authority that is not going to be used. It's very clear it's not going to be used. The agencies have said they're not going to use it.

But in the curious construct of our budget processes in both the executive branch and the legislative branch, on this side of the Hill and the other side of the Hill, that money can be used in an obscure fashion that it takes a very long time to explain to ordinary citizens. Say, in a passing comment in a Fourth of July parade, you can't plumb the depths of this curious budget process. Sure, there are no outlay savings, but that's why the Appropriations Committee year in and year out, under both Republican and Democratic leadership, have used the rescission process to claim savings on the one hand and spend money on the other hand, real general revenue dollars on the other hand for projects that they consider to be important.

The supplemental appropriation bill earlier this month rescinded $25 million of highway safety contract authority that will be rescinded by the bill before us.

□ 1520

The supplemental appropriation bill rescinds $2.2 billion of Federal-aid highway contract authority so they can use it as something else.

This is real. What we are doing here is saying this is done. These authorities that exist in law that will not be used, for which obligations will not be made, and for which projects will not be advanced is terminated, and the Appropriations Committee then can't use that gimmick for something else they want to do.

So what we do is real in this legislation. It takes $107 million off the table. It makes it unavailable for rescission and unavailable for gimmickry through the appropriation process in either this body or the other body. We take a real positive step, one that is within the authority of this committee. We are not the Budget Committee. We are not Ways and Means. We have jurisdictional issues, and we are identifying other savings of this nature that will be considered on the House floor in the coming week before the August recess.

So I applaud the deficit hawks of our committee on both sides of the aisle for their vigilance and for pursuing this matter.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5604, the "Surface Transportation Savings Act of 2010". I commend the work of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PERRIELLO) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SCHAUER) for introducing this legislation.

This bill rescinds $107 million in excess contract authority that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) cannot use in fiscal year (FY) 2010. In doing so, H.R. 5604 will take these funds off the table so that they cannot be used to increase spending in the future.

The largest rescission contained in this legislation will occur in NHTSA's safety belt performance grants program. This program received $124.5 million in FY 2010 to carry out an incentive grant program to encourage States to enact and enforce laws requiring the use of safety belts. This funding level is equal to the amount authorized for this program in FY 2009 under the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: a Legacy for Users (SAFETEA–LU) (P.L. 109–59).

According to NHTSA, only three States are expected to qualify to receive an incentive grant under this program this year, requiring no more than $28.5 million in FY 2010 to carry out the authorized activities of the program.

NHTSA does not have the authority to redistribute the unused program funds this fiscal year, and they will remain unallocated in 2010. H.R. 5604 rescinds $81.0 million in unusable contract authority from this program.

The Surface Transportation Savings Act also rescinds $8.5 million in contract authority from NHTSA's administrative expenses, the National Driver Register, and research and development programs.

This excess contract authority was made available under the extension of current surface transportation programs passed as part

of the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act (HIRE Act).

Because the amounts of contract authority provided for these programs under the HIRE Act is greater than the funding levels provided by the FY 2010 Consolidated Appropriations Act, NHTSA cannot use these funds this year.

H.R. 5604 also rescinds $17.4 million of contract authority from FTA's formula and bus grant programs. The HIRE Act provides $8.361 billion in FY 2010 to carry out FTA's formula and bus grant programs, $17.4 million more than the funding level provided in the FY 2010 Consolidated Appropriations Act. FTA does not have the ability to utilize these funds this year.

Although the $107 million that would be rescinded by H.R. 5604 cannot be used at the present time, there are two ways this $107 million could be used to increase spending in the future if it is not rescinded now. First, a future appropriations act could increase the obligation limitations that control spending for these highway safety and transit programs, thereby allowing this $107 million to be spent. Second, a future appropriations act could rescind this $107 million and use that rescission to offset increased spending on other programs.

There are skeptics who claim that this bill will not reduce spending. They are closing their eyes to the budgetary shell game played out in this body over the past decade. It has become somewhat routine for appropriations bills to rescind surface transportation contract authority in order to offset other spending that no appropriations committee proposes. In fact, H.R. 4899, the "Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2010", that passed the House earlier this month, rescinds $25 million of the highway safety contract authority that would be rescinded by the bill before us today. The Supplemental Appropriations bill also rescinds $2.2 billion of Federal-aid highway contract authority.

The Committee on Appropriations includes such rescissions in appropriations bills because they offset other spending that the committee supports. Even if a contract authority rescission is "scored" as only reducing budget authority, not outlays, a budget authority offset is often all that is needed to facilitate additional spending in an appropriations bill.

To the extent that this bill takes $107 million off the table and makes that amount unavailable for rescission, or use, by some future appropriations bill, it will indeed result in "real" savings.

H.R. 5604 is one step in a continuing effort to find savings within programs under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. While these savings may seem small relative to the size of our budget deficit, it is a start. Even the longest journey begins with a single step.

I want to again thank Mr. PERRIELLO and Mr. SCHAUER for their hard work on behalf of the American taxpayers in introducing this legislation. This proposal is a common sense step toward improving the Nation's fiscal foundation and ensuring that the nation's Federal surface transportation funds are invested as efficiently as possible.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5604.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), our outstanding chairman of the full committee, for his very accurate explanation of the confusing, convoluted way we go about the budget and contract authority differences in this Congress.

I want to commend the gentlemen from Virginia and from Michigan for bringing this legislation to the floor. It is a good bill.

As I said, even though the CBO may not count it as reducing the deficit by $107 million, it is a step in the right direction, and we should be looking for savings in every Department and agency in this Federal Government, and we are going to have to if we are ever to get the Federal deficit and our national debt under any type of control.

What we first need to be doing, though, is to stop spending hundreds of billions of dollars on very unnecessary foreign wars and turning the Department of Defense into the Department of Foreign Aid with all the nation-building that they are doing. Then we need to go to every Department and agency, and instead of building other countries with money that we don't have, we need to start building our own country. I think no one has been more of a leader in that regard than our chairman, Chairman OBERSTAR, but we need to start taking care of our own country and start putting the American people first once again.

I do think that this bill is a step in the right direction; so I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Will the gentleman yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. DUNCAN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I would like to make the observation, Madam Speaker, that the gentleman took the lead in our Public Buildings Subcommittee many years ago, during his first term in Congress, on courthouses. The gentleman has saved the taxpayers of this country tens of millions of dollars, perhaps now in the hundreds of millions, by requiring, through his persistent campaign, courtroom sharing.

Madam Speaker, I'll say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I don't know how CBO scores that, but I know that, in our committee, I score it as a net savings to the public. We have built better courthouses, more courthouses and more efficient service to the public in requiring this very simple step of sharing courtrooms. To his great credit, the gentleman from Tennessee led the effort on it; and it has resulted in real savings, just as this legislation is resulting in real savings.

I tip my hat to the gentleman from Tennessee for his persistence in looking at those very specific ways in which we can achieve our goals.

Mr. DUNCAN. Well, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota, Chairman OBERSTAR, for those kind words. No one in this Congress admires the chairman more than I do. Certainly no one knows the work of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee better than Chairman OBERSTAR.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Madam Speaker, again, I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee and the others who have been a part of this.

If we can't at least agree to take the money that agencies say they don't even want or can't even use and put that to deficit reduction, how on Earth will we ever move forward in the simplest possible terms?

If this $107 million is left on the table, it will be spent on something. If we remove this contracting authority, it will not; and that will save the taxpayers money. That is the important thing. If we can't at least agree on these small steps, how are we going to take the big steps together?

So I appreciate the cooperation on this bill to find $107 million, to take that off the table and to make sure that it does not get spent wastefully.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5604, "The Surface Transportation Savings Act of 2010." By rescinding amounts authorized for certain surface transportation programs, our nation will save about $107 million and thus reduce our budget deficit.

This legislation would rescind millions of dollars in excess contract authority from programs including the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's safety belt performance grants program, which according to the NHTSA, only three states are expected to qualify to receive an incentive grant this year. The amount rescinded is reduced as necessary to ensure that 28.5 million is still available to carry out safety belt grants programs in Fiscal Year 2010.

In addition, H.R. 5604 rescinds funds that The Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act (HIRE Act) Act already provides funding for, including NHTSA's administrative expenses, transit formula and bus grant programs.

It is clear that the public is concerned about the current fiscal state of the federal government. An NBC/Wall Street Journal Survey conducted in May showed that the share of individuals rating "the deficit and government spending" as a top priority for the federal government to address has jumped since January from 13 to 20 percent—second only to job creation and economic growth. According to Gallup, "federal government debt" now ties with terrorism for the top spot in perceived threats to our future well-being.

The public's attitudes reflect our need to tackle our nation's serious budget challenge and exercise fiscal belt-tightening where it makes sense. H.R. 5604 is one step towards that goal. It contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments. This legislation is a small but necessary effort to help us gradually get our fiscal house in order.

With the Nation's budget deficit forecasted to swell 14 percent this year, largely due to the longest war in our history and unfunded tax cuts for the wealthy, we must explore common ground to achieve fiscal responsibility. If we don't, then by the time our grandchildren or great grandchildren are in college, our debt will exceed our GDP.

I will continue to support smart measures designed to return our Nation to fiscal health

and strength as steadily and as sustainably as possible. To this end, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5604 to help reduce our budget deficit.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PERRIELLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5604.

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. PERRIELLO. 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 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF END OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1516) recognizing the 65th anniversary of the end of World War II, honoring the servicemembers who fought in World War II and their families, and honoring the servicemembers who are currently serving in combat operations.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1516

Whereas World War II was the largest and most violent armed conflict in the history of mankind, with fatality estimates ranging between 22,000,000 and 70,000,000 military and civilian deaths;

Whereas America's finest men and women risked life and limb to protect the American way of life and to halt foreign tyranny and aggression;

Whereas over 16,000,000 Americans served in uniform and 405,000 members of the United States Armed Forces paid the ultimate sacrifice for the protection of the American people and for the formation of a more stable world;

Whereas World War II demonstrated how the American people unite in times of great peril;

Whereas the united efforts of Americans from all walks of life made the American homefront the Arsenal of Democracy for the worldwide triumph of the Allied powers;

Whereas Allied forces faced vicious combat, exhibited unmatched bravery, and suffered untold tragedy in places like Southeast Asia, the Philippines, the islands of the Southwest and Central Pacific, the deserts of North Africa, across great stretches of the Atlantic Ocean, and from the beaches of Western Europe to the icy Russian tundra;

Whereas World War II ended 65 years ago with the surrender of the Japanese upon the deck of the U.S.S. Missouri on September 2, 1945;

Whereas the trauma and the exultant triumph of the events of World War II still reside in the collective American psyche today through contemporary tales in novels, cinema, and oral telling; and

Whereas approximately 2,000,000 surviving World War II veterans are still alive today: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) on the 65th anniversary of the end of World War II, recognizes the service and sacrifices of all of the brave men and women who fought and contributed to American victory in that conflagration;

(2) honors the families and decedents of those men and women, and the men and women themselves, whose lives were taken in defense of liberty and freedom; and

(3) remembers and honors the service members today who are actively fighting for freedom and to protect the American way of life in ongoing combat operations, including Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today, and I request that the House support House Resolution 1516, which is a resolution recognizing the 65th anniversary of the end of World War II and honoring the service and sacrifice of the men and women in uniform who fought.

I am proud to note that I introduced this resolution alongside the committee's ranking member, the gentleman from California, BUCK MCKEON.

Madam Speaker, I grew up around veterans of the First World War; and during World War II, as a young teenager, I looked up to all my friends and neighbors in uniform as living, breathing American heroes. My father served in the Navy aboard the USS *Missouri* during World War I. It was on the next USS *Missouri*, the ''Mighty Mo,'' that Japan signed the official surrender papers to end World War II. It was 65 years ago this September. So the 65th anniversary of the end of World War II is a big thing for me. It is a big thing for this great Nation, and it is a big thing for the free nations of the entire globe.

It is difficult to explain to people who did not grow up during those tense years how it felt to be a young person in America the day Pearl Harbor was attacked. America had already participated in efforts to prevent the tyrannical expansion of Axis powers by providing material and industrial support to the Allied powers long before we were attacked; but all of a sudden, the front lines of war were on our shores. I am no longer that young teenager, but the memories of the extraordinary valor and selfless sacrifice of the over-16 million American men and women in uniform are still with me today. Their efforts echo across these lands in many complex ways, the simplest and most fundamental of those being the fact that we continue to be free.

Allied forces faced vicious combat, exhibited unmatched bravery, and suffered untold tragedy in places like southeast Asia, the Philippines, the islands of the Southwest and Central Pacific, the deserts of North Africa, across great stretches of the Atlantic Ocean, and from the beaches of Western Europe to the icy Russian tundra. Not only did Americans serve in uniform; Americans from all walks of life contributed to making the American home front the Arsenal of Democracy. It was the united efforts of everyone, of every last citizen, that resulted in triumph.

Ultimately, over 405,000 servicemembers lost their lives in World War II. To them, their spouses, their children, we as American citizens will be eternally indebted. We say thank you.

Before I reserve the balance of my time, I would also like to take a moment to acknowledge the service of our brave men and women in uniform who are serving in our ongoing conflicts today. In some ways, the war we find ourselves in today is like World War II: our American homeland was attacked—unprovoked—and our uniformed servicemembers are fighting to keep us free and safe from a war that has reached our shores.

□ 1530

This Nation has been blessed with generation after generation of patriotic Americans who have selflessly served our country. And you have carried on this tradition, and to them we say thank you.

Madam Speaker, there are only about 2 million World War II veterans with us today. On the 65th anniversary of the Allied victory and the end of World War II, I request that the House of Representatives pass this resolution, House Resolution 1516, to recognize the service and sacrifices of all of the brave men and women who fought and contributed to American victory in World War II; honor the families and descendants of those men and women and the men and women themselves whose lives were taken in defense of liberty and freedom; and remember and honor the servicemembers today who are actively fighting for freedom, and to protect the American way of life in ongoing combat operations today, including Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today, Madam Speaker, in strong support of House Resolution 1516 that recognizes the 65th anniversary of the end of the Second World War, and that honors our veterans' tradition of service and sacrifice that continues to this day.

I want to thank the chairman for making this opportunity possible, for his love of history, and his understanding of the sacrifices that our men and women have made since the founding of this great country.

I particularly remember, as a young boy, World War II, my dad served in the Philippines. And I remember the excitement of when he returned home after the war. There was a chain link fence that separated us from the plane. And as my dad got off the plane, he was carrying a little baby of a lady that was getting off the plane at the same time. And my mom, a very enthusiastic young lady, started to climb that chain link fence. She wanted to see her ''Cookie'' as she referred to my dad.

You know, that same scene was happening all across America, and it's happened many times since, as young men and young women have returned home.

They have shouldered a burden that subsequent generations have not been forced to share. Our entire Nation mobilized to fight a war of national survival. Men and women of all races and creeds put aside their differences and rallied around our national colors, turning our Depression woes into industrial and military might.

These were Americans of incredible courage and dedication. Even with the millions of stories about the heroes of the Second World War, you don't have to look past our own back yard to find Americans who did incredible things in the service of our country.

In California's 25th District, men like retired Air Force General Chuck Yeager, who, as an enlisted airman, was stationed at George Air Force base in Victorville. After General Yeager earned his commission and pilot's wings, he deployed to fight the Nazi war machine in Europe, where he was shot down, evaded capture, returned to friendly lines and returned to fight, earning the coveted title of ''Ace'' for shooting down Luftwaffe fighters.

After the war he returned to California and Palmdale, where he became the first man to break the sound barrier on October 14, 1947. Today, the rolling desert wind that Chuck Yeager soared over inspires the next generation of Air Force test pilots at Edwards Air Force Base.

Central California is home to an incredibly diverse environment, from soaring mountains to barren desert to dense urban sprawl. It was the open desert that in 1942 became the home of Marine Corps Logistic Base Barstow. Vital equipment and vehicles for the Marine Corps island hopping campaign was shipped to Barstow in preparation for deployment to the Pacific theater. Barstow later became the home to many of these veterans who made their homes and developed the economy of San Bernardino County.

Central California is also home to one of the more difficult passages of the Second World War, the Manzanar Internment Camp, where Japanese Americans were relocated and held captive. Many of these young Americans jumped at the chance to prove their devotion to America, and enlisted from Manzanar, deployed to the European theater, and distinguished themselves in combat service to their true native country, the United States of America.

In 1940, an aerial gunnery range was established in the Mojave Desert, which grew into what is now the National Warfare Training Center at Fort Irwin. Fort Irwin is the premiere military training facility in the Western Hemisphere, where servicemen and women from all our Armed Forces receive the finest training available to prepare them to face our enemies in combat and build damaged peoples into civil societies.

Then, as now, what has set our Armed Forces apart is their commitment to a moral war, a just war, an American way of war.

Today the legacy of these men and women lives on in our servicemembers who serve around the country, around the world in defense of freedom, fighting for those who cannot fight for themselves. The soldiers who liberated Dachau are no different from those soldiers who today ensure that young Afghan girls can go to school without being murdered by Taliban thugs.

The Marines who held the line on Wake Island today ensure that a shaky government in Marjah will be given a legitimate chance to succeed. Our Air Corps that decisively proved itself over the skies of Europe and the Pacific is now a unique branch of service and a force with truly global reach. The sacrifices our Navy made in the Second World War leave behind a tradition of absolute dedication to duty, and a role of unquestioned dominance on the high seas.

I urge the House to join me and pass this resolution to commemorate the end of the Second World War, and honor the servicemembers who are currently serving in combat operations abroad.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1540

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I am privileged to represent a district that's home to a large number of World War II veterans, veterans to whom I feel a tremendous gratitude for their heroic service, and so many other veterans of my district who served bravely in Korea, Vietnam, the gulf war, and the ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Our country has a sacred obligation to our troops, the brave servicemembers who risk their lives in defense of our country from the time they sign up to serve and well into their retirement.

I would like to thank Chairman SKELTON for his work on behalf of our servicemembers, and in honoring the courage and bravery of our veterans on the 65th anniversary of the end of World War II with this resolution.

I would like to particularly mention just a few of the many Americans who served our country during World War II, veterans in my district like Will Lapidus, who sacrificed so much of themselves to serve this country in a time of great need. Josephine Anton was among the first women to join the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. She left college in her last year to serve as a lieutenant in the WAACs. And like so many veterans, Josephine continues to seek out opportunities to serve her community.

I would also like to recognize Ed Safarty, who served with my late father Bernard Deutch. Their 84th Infantry Division fought valiantly at the Battle of the Bulge. My father volunteered to serve his country as a teenager, earned a Purple Heart, and like every veteran I know, shared his passionate patriotism with his children and with his community for the rest of his life.

The legacy of service and self-sacrifice from this generation of Americans, exemplified by these veterans and so many others, is humbling. Our country owes all servicemembers an enormous debt of gratitude. It's important to recognize the tremendous sacrifices as well that the families of our servicemembers make, whose invaluable support and encouragement is a gift to our Nation, and one that is too often overlooked.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to support House Resolution 1516 here on the House floor today. And to all the veterans and those servicemembers presently serving, as well as their families, I offer you my most profound thanks.

Mr. MCKEON. In closing, I would like to just again thank the chairman for bringing this resolution to the floor. Again, we have personal remembrances of people that fought in that great war and those of their families that have continued on and those who continue to serve in the armed services today.

We just had a memorial service a couple of months ago in my community where I live, and we had a couple of men there that were still able to wear their World War II uniforms. It was and continues to be an honor to see them each Memorial Day. I don't know how many more years we will have them with us. But they are a great reminder of the wonderful things that they stood for and continue to stand for, as they have been called the Greatest Generation.

I encourage all of our Members to support this resolution.

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

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

Madam Speaker, it was 1943. I was a young boy standing across the street from my home on Franklin Street in Lexington, Missouri. I heard an airplane overhead, and I looked up, and it

is what I learned later was a C–47 towing a glider. I also later learned that this airplane and the glider came from the Sedalia Army Airfield near Sedalia, Missouri, between Sedalia and Warrensburg, out of a small community known as Knob Noster.

It was June 6, 1944, when I stayed up late in the evening listening to the radio with my father. That was of course the occasion on the Normandy landing. It was the C–47s pulling gliders that were trained at the Sedalia Army Airfield over Normandy that helped in the landing and the successful assault there in France.

Today, the Sedalia Army Airfield is not called that anymore. It's called Whiteman Air Force Base, named after a lieutenant who in his P–40 at Hickam Field on December 7, 1941, got about 10 feet off the ground to go after the Japanese attackers and was shot and killed.

These are memories of a young boy. And seeing the soldiers and sailors and marines come home, they were my heroes. And Madam Speaker, today they are still my heroes.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1516, which recognizes the 65th anniversary of the end of World War II. The Allies' victory in Europe in 1945 ended an era of unspeakable atrocities and widespread human suffering.

World War II was the largest war in history as nations around the globe mobilized 100 million souls to fight in the name of either the Allied or Axis powers. The battle between the two resulted in the most deadly war in human history: 60 to 70 million deaths, 45 million of whom were civilians. The United States lost 345,000 brave soldiers in both the European and Pacific theaters, which was second only to the Civil War in the amount of American blood spilled in war.

America rallied over 16 million citizens into uniform and its factories and farms provided the largest mobilized support network in the world. The war helped bring the country out of the Great Depression, and vitalized my own Detroit as the manufacturing industry expanded greatly during this period.

It is also worth noting that during this time, the United States, in its fight against racist and genocidal opponents, was forced to confront its own racism. In one of our most shameful acts, Japanese-Americans were interned at camps throughout the war while segregation continued to separate whites and blacks back home. Despite these sad examples of discrimination, Japanese-American, African-American, and Hispanic-Americans all proudly took up arms to defend their nation and demonstrate their loyalty. I have no doubt that their courage laid the groundwork for the victories for equality and civil rights for all that would follow decades later.

Madam Speaker, as we honor our World War II veterans, we must also recognize the incredible sacrifices made by those currently serving overseas. We must also not forget the values for which World War II was fought. Our level of international cooperation at the end of that war was a clear example of our commitment to diplomacy and peaceful resolutions. We have and always will be a Nation that supports liberty and justice for all.

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1516 which recognizes the 65th anniversary of the end of World War II and honors the service and sacrifices made by the members of our Armed Forces and their families, as well as those serving in combat operations today.

Madam Speaker, September 2nd marks the conclusion of one of the most devastating confrontations in the world's history. On that day, 65 years ago, the Japanese offered their surrender on the deck of the U.S.S. *Missouri*, ending World War II and marking the defeat of foreign tyranny and aggression. It was a momentous day in America's history, not only were the Allies successful in defeating the Axis powers, but it defined America in a new light, launching a much larger role for our nation on the world stage.

Our nation's victory on September 2, 1945 came at a great cost. World War II was one of the most violent and deadly conflicts in our nation's history, claiming the lives of 405 thousand American men and women from all walks of life and every corner of the country. 16 million Americans came together to serve for a common good, joining our nation's fight to protect democracy and promote justice, changing the course of history forever. Their sacrifices for future generations are their everlasting legacy.

Our men and women in uniform also prevailed because of the valiant efforts of millions of Americans on the home front who steadfastly worked in war industries to produce and create the munitions, the ships, and the aircraft necessary for the war effort. There are few other times, if any, in our nation's history in which so many Americans bonded together and worked toward a common purpose with such strength and resolve.

Madam Speaker, each day over 1,000 veterans from this ''greatest generation'' pass from our midst and it is indeed appropriate that we honor their service and sacrifice today. Their labors have led to great wealth and prosperity for our country and allowed America to continue to be a beacon of justice and democracy for all people across the globe.

I thank my colleagues Mr. SKELTON and Mr. MCKEON for introducing this resolution, and I urge all my colleagues to support its passage.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1516, which recognizes the 65th anniversary of the end of World War II, honors the service members who fought in the war, and honors the brave men and women in uniform who are currently serving in combat operations. This important measure honors a generation of Americans who united in the fight against tyranny and fascism, sacrificing to protect America and help achieve a more stable, democratic world.

I thank Chairman SKELTON for his leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor and for his commitment to ensuring that America never fails to show gratitude for the sacrifices of the Greatest Generation.

Madam Speaker, World War II was the largest and most violent conflict in human history, with fatality estimates ranging from 22 million to 70 million military and civilian deaths. Over 16 million Americans served in the Armed Forces in World War II, 405,000 of them making the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of their country and the cause of democracy and freedom. I am forever grateful for the men and women who served, especially those who gave their lives so that we might live in a better world.

World War II demonstrated how the American people unite in times of peril. In addition to the bravery of our Armed Forces, Americans from all walks of life came together to make the American home front the Arsenal of Democracy. The men and women at home sacrificed, working long hours in our factories to help power the Allied efforts in Europe and the Pacific. The Allied Forces' victory over tyranny would not have been possible without the dedication of the Americans at home.

Sixty-five years ago, the Allied Forces, led by the United States, defeated a tyrannical force that threatened to eradicate human freedom. World War II still plays prominently in the American psyche, both as a trauma and a triumph. Looking back at World War II, we cannot help but feel an immense gratitude for the Greatest Generation and their willingness to sacrifice everything for our country. But we also look back and see the immense cost of war, the human, psychological, and financial toll that war takes on a nation. Hopefully, World War II will forever live on as a tribute to American courage and unity, as well as a reminder that war should always be a last resort.

Madam Speaker, 23,000 veterans live in the 37th district of California, many of them veterans of World War II. I am deeply grateful for their service and show my gratitude by working to ensure that they have the benefits that they need and deserve. Also, Long Beach is home to the Gold Star Manor, which provides affordable and quality housing to mothers who have lost sons or daughters in the service of their country. We must continue supporting the family members of our men and women in uniform and always express our gratitude for our troops' willingness to risk their lives on behalf of our nation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 1516.

Mr. SKELTON. 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 Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1516.

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. SKELTON. 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 111TH FIGHTER WING

Mr. CRITZ. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1411) honoring the service and commitment of the 111th Fighter Wing, Pennsylvania Air National Guard, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1411

Whereas the 111th Fighter Wing's roots date back to the establishment of the 103rd Observation Squadron on June 27, 1924, in the sod fields of the Philadelphia Airport;

Whereas on February 17, 1941, the 103rd was ordered to active service, performing anti-submarine patrols off the coast of New England;

Whereas the squadron deployed to the China-Burma-India (CBI) Theater of World War II in 1943, executing support operations for the duration of the war;

Whereas the 391st Bombardment Group (Medium), constituted on January 15, 1943, earned the Distinguished Unit Citation for its service during World War II, performing ground attack missions in France and the Low Countries in advance of the invasion of Normandy, and in Germany in support of and in the aftermath of the Battle of the Bulge;

Whereas in 1946, the 391st was redesignated the 111th Bomb Group (Light), and the 111th Bomb Group and the 103rd Squad were designated to the Pennsylvania National Guard;

Whereas when the 111th Composite Wing was activated in April 1951, members honorably performed various missions in support of the U.S. war effort in Korea;

Whereas in 1963, the 111th ended its 39-year history at Philadelphia Airport, and moved into new housing on the north end of the Willow Grove Naval Air Station;

Whereas the 111th Air Transport Group flew numerous airlift missions in support of the U.S. war effort in Vietnam;

Whereas in 1995, the newly designated 111th Fighter Wing volunteered for deployment to Kuwait, where they conducted Combat Search and Rescue alert, Kill Box flights over Iraq, Airborne Forward Air Control, and joint training missions in support of Operation Southern Watch;

Whereas in 1999, the 111th again deployed to Al Jaber, Kuwait, to support joint combat flight operations for Operation Southern Watch;

Whereas immediately following the attacks of September 11, 2001, the 111th Fighter Wing voluntarily deployed on very short notice to support joint combat operations for Operation Southern Watch and Operation Enduring Freedom;

Whereas between 2002 and 2003, the wing was the lead unit for short notice, voluntary, out-of-cycle Air Expeditionary Force deployments to Bagram Air Base, Afghanistan, performing joint combat flight operations with the Army, Special Forces, and coalition ground troops despite total 'black out' conditions, a substantial number of mines on and around the airfield, extreme weather conditions, and unremitting enemy shelling;

Whereas in 2003, the 111th once again volunteered for deployment to Al Jaber, Kuwait, directly supporting coalition armor forces during the invasion of Iraq from the Kuwaiti border;

Whereas the 111th Fighter Wing was awarded the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, with Valor, for voluntarily deploying to austere bases in two separate combat operations within a five-month period;

Whereas the unit was also awarded the Reserve Family Readiness Award in 2003 and the Air National Guard Distinguished Flying Unit Award in 2004;

Whereas in its 86-year history, the wing has flown aircraft that includes the JN–4 Jenny, PT–1 Trusty, BT–1, Curtiss O–1 Falcon, Douglas O–2H, Curtiss O–11 Falcon, Douglas O–38, North American O–47A and O–47B, Stinson O–49 Vigilant, Curtiss O–52 Owl, Taylorcraft O–57 Grasshopper, Piper L–4 Grasshopper, Stinson L–1B Vigilant, Lockheed P–38(F–5) Lightning, Douglas A–26 Invader, Boeing RB–29 Superfortress, North American F–51 Mustang, Lockheed T–33 Shooting Star, Republic F–84 Thunderjet, Lockheed F–94 Starfire, Northrop F–89 Scorpion, Boeing C–97 Stratofreighter, Cessna U–3A Blue Canoe, Cessna O–2 Skymaster, Cessna OA–37 Dragonfly, and Fairchild A–10 Thunderbolt II;

Whereas the members of the 111th Fighter Wing of the Pennsylvania Air National Guard have served with courage, selflessness, and compassion in every role they have been asked to fulfill, and have earned the respect and gratitude of the citizens of Pennsylvania and of all Americans;

Whereas the ruling of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission of 2005 marks the end of an era for the 111th Fighter Wing at Willow Grove Naval Air Station; and

Whereas even though the Base Realignment and Closure Commission of 2005 removed the 111th's flying mission, the unit will continue proudly serving the United States through new missions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the exemplary service of members of the 111th Fighter Wing of the Pennsylvania Air National Guard; and

(2) honors and thanks all members of the 111th Fighter Wing of the Pennsylvania Air National Guard, past and present, for their tremendous contributions to the defense and security of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CRITZ) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1411, recognizing the service and sacrifice of the members of the 111th Fighter Wing of the Air National Guard. I would like to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ) for bringing this resolution before the House.

The distinguished history of the 111th Fighter Wing began in 1924. Since then, the men and women of this outstanding unit have, with great honor and dignity, represented the finest of America's Armed Forces. Thoroughly immersed in the greatest conflict of our time, they protected the coasts of New England, aided missions in the China-Burma-India theater of World War II, and earned the Distinguished Unit Citation for their contributions to the invasion of Normandy and the Battle of the Bulge.

Members of the 111th Fighter Wing also remained involved during the Korean and Vietnam wars, honorably performing various airlift missions in support of the war efforts.

The 111th Fighter Wing has not shied from battle, but has time and time again demonstrated their dedication to defending the United States and its principles. The 111th Fighter Wing volunteered to deploy in support of Operation Southern Watch and Operation Enduring Freedom on very short notice immediately following the September 11 attacks of 2001.

To honor their commitment and to recognize their contributions by voluntarily deploying to the heart of the conflict in two separate combat operations within a 5-month period, the 111th Fighter Wing was awarded the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, with Valor.

Madam Speaker, the courage and commitment consistently demonstrated by the 111th Fighter Wing over the last 86 years deserves the thanks of the United States Congress today. The success of the United States is contingent upon the bravery and honor of units like the 111th Fighter Wing.

I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring the patriotism and valor of the 111th Fighter Wing by supporting House Resolution 1411.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1411, as amended, which honors the service and commitment of the 111th Fighter Wing, Pennsylvania Air National Guard. I would like to thank the gentlelady from Pennsylvania for introducing this resolution.

I am honored to pay tribute to the current and former Members of the 111th Fighter Wing who have steadfastly and courageously defended and served this great country on our shores and in distant lands.

With roots that date back to the 103rd Observation Squadron, operating out of the Philadelphia Airport, the unit first saw action in World War II patrolling for submarines off the east coast of the United States. The squadron then deployed to the China-Burma-India theater to support the war operations there.

A second parent organization, the 391st Bombardment Group (Medium), earned the Distinguished Unit Citation for its service in the European Theater in support of the Normandy invasion and the Battle of the Bulge.

Later designated the 111th Composite Wing, the unit supported the war effort in Korea, and as the 111th Air Transport Group the members flew numerous airlift missions to support military operations during the war in Vietnam.

More recently, the 111th Fighter Wing has participated in Operation Southern Watch in Kuwait, supporting joint combat flight operations. During Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan and Operation Iraqi Freedom in Iraq, the 111th has directly supported coalition ground troops despite extreme conditions and at times unremitting enemy shelling.

□ 1550

Madam Speaker, I would also like to read into the RECORD today the aircraft flown and operated, maintained, armed, and fought with during the proud history of this group. Just the names of these airplanes will invoke memories and wonderful nostalgic feelings about some of them just by saying their names out loud.

The 111th Fighter Wing has flown the JN–4 Jenny, PT–1 Trusty, the BT–1, the Curtiss 0–1 Falcon, the Douglas 0–2H, the Curtiss 0–11 Falcon, the Douglas 0–38, the North American 0–47A and 0–47B, the Stinson 0–49 Vigilant, the Curtiss 0–52 Owl, the Taylorcraft 0–57 Grasshopper, the Piper L–4 Grasshopper, the Stinson L–1B Vigilant, the Lockheed P–38 Lightning, the Douglas A–26 Invader, the Boeing RB–29 Superfortress, the North American F–51 Mustang, the Lockheed T–33 Shooting Star, the Republic F–84 Thunderjet, the Lockheed F–94 Starfire, the Northrop F–89 Scorpion, the Boeing C–97 Stratofreighter, the Cessna U–3A Blue Canoe, the Cessna 0–2 Skymaster, the Cessna OA–37 Dragonfly, and the Fairchild A–10 Thunderbolt II.

Madam Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not pay tribute today to the incredible families of these brave airmen who waited at home while their loved ones answered our Nation's call.

The entire Nation joins the citizens of Pennsylvania to say thank you to the members and the veterans of the 111th Fighter Wing Pennsylvania Air National Guard. We are all proud of their service and, therefore, Madam Speaker, I strongly urge Members to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRITZ. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to my friend and colleague and the sponsor of this resolution, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today to honor the service and the commitment of the Pennsylvania National Guard 111th Fighter Wing. Their bravery and sacrifice over the years has helped to ensure our Nation's safety and freedom.

Originally growing out of the sod fields of the Philadelphia airport in 1924, the squad was first called to active service in February of 1941 to perform antisubmarine patrols off the coast of New England. The squad saw a lot of action during World War II. In 1943, they deployed and performed support operations in the China-Burma-India theater of combat. The same year, they earned the Distinguished Unit Citation for their execution of ground attack missions in France and the low countries in advance of the invasion of Normandy and in Germany for their support in the aftermath of the Battle of the Bulge.

Members of the 111th honorably served in support of the U.S. war efforts during both the Korean and Vietnam wars. In 1963, the 111th ended their 39-year history at the Philadelphia airport and relocated to the Willow Grove Naval Air Station now in my district.

In 1995 and 1999, they performed combat operations in support of Operation Southern Watch. Immediately following the attacks of September 11, 2001, the 111th Fighter Wing deployed on very short notice to support our joint combat operations for Operation Enduring Freedom.

In 2002 and 2003, the wing was the lead unit on short notice, voluntary, out-of-cycle air expeditionary force deployments to Bagram Air Force Base in Afghanistan.

In 2003, they volunteered for deployment yet again, this time in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. So outstanding was their service during this period that they earned the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, with Valor, for voluntarily deploying to austere bases in two separate combat operations within a 5-month period.

It has been my honor to represent the 111th Fighter Wing as a Member of Congress. Though the latest round of BRAC decisions removed the squad's fighter mission, they will remain stationed at Willow Grove, Pennsylvania, and will undoubtedly continue to serve our Nation.

To quote the resolution before us, ''Members of the 111th Fighter Wing of the Pennsylvania National Guard have served with courage, selflessness, and compassion in every role that they have been asked to fulfill and have earned the respect and gratitude of the citizens of Pennsylvania and of all Americans.''

I appreciate the bipartisan support for Resolution 1411 and thank the members of the 111th Fighter Wing—I have met many of them—who currently serve in the 111th Fighter Wing, for the dedication, honor, service, and sacrifice to this country.

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution honoring the 111th Fighter Wing from Pennsylvania.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRITZ. Madam Speaker, I would like to commend Ms. SCHWARTZ for her leadership in bringing the 111th to our attention and honoring their service.

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. 1411, 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. CRITZ. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECOGNIZING 14TH ARMORED DIVISION

Mr. CRITZ. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1483) recognizing the exemplary service and sacrifice of the soldiers of the 14th Armored Division of the United States Army, known as the Liberators, during World War II, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1483

Whereas the 14th Armored Division was activated on November 15, 1942, at Camp Chaffee, Arkansas, as a unit of the United States Army;

Whereas the Division's 19th, 62d, and 68th Armored Infantry Battalions traced their lineage back to the 62d Infantry Regiment, which was organized in 1917;

Whereas the Division landed in southern France on October 29, 1944, and first entered combat on November 20, 1944;

Whereas the Division participated in the Rhineland, Ardennes-Alsace, and Central Europe campaigns;

Whereas the Division participated in the liberation of most of the French province of Alsace in late November, 1944, and was engaged in an offensive against the Siegfried Line itself when, on December 19, General Dwight D. Eisenhower ordered the 7th Army to withdraw from Germany in response to the serious threat posed by a major German offensive in the Ardennes;

Whereas when the German army launched Operation Nordwind, the last major German offensive of the European war, against 7th Army positions, elements of the Division engaged several German divisions between January 1 and January 7, 1945, contributing materially to deflecting the initial German attacks;

Whereas it was during one of these engagements on January 3 and 4, 1945, that the Division's Private First Class George B. Turner earned the Medal of Honor for his heroic actions in helping to repel repeated German attacks at Philippsbourg, France;

Whereas, on January 9, 1945, the Division stopped the German XXXIX Panzer Corps from breaking through the 7th Army's lines at the villages of Hatten and Rittershoffen;

Whereas, between January 9 and January 21, 1945, the Division fought the 21st Panzer Division, 25th Panzer Grenadier Division, 20th Regiment of the 7th Parachute Division, and the 104th Regiment of the 47th Volksgrenadier Division to a standstill during the ensuing Battle of Hatten-Rittershoffen;

Whereas elements of the Division were awarded two Presidential Unit Citations;

Whereas, on March 24, 1945, after days of heavy fighting, the Division broke through the Siegfried Line and advanced to the Rhine River;

Whereas, after crossing the Rhine River, the Division liberated Stalag XIII–C and Oflag XIII–B, two large prisoner of war camps at Hammelburg, Germany;

Whereas, during April 1945, the Division rapidly advanced hundreds of miles across southern Germany, fighting numerous battles before crossing the Danube River north of Munich;

Whereas, on April 29, 1945, the Division, after a fierce engagement with several thousand SS troops, liberated Stalag VII–A, one

of the largest prisoner of war camps in Germany;

Whereas the Division is designated a ''Liberating Unit'' by the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in recognition of its liberation of civilians of many nationalities and ethnicities from forced labor and concentration camps, including several large sub-camps of the notorious Dachau concentration camp system;

Whereas the Secretary of the Army awarded the Division the distinctive unit designation, ''Liberators'', in recognition of the Division's role in liberating large numbers of U.S. and Allied prisoners of war; and

Whereas the proud fighting tradition and accomplishments of the Division and its men, especially those who made the ultimate sacrifice, must not be forgotten: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes the exemplary service and sacrifice of the soldiers of the 14th Armored Division of the United States Army, known as the Liberators, during World War II.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CRITZ) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRITZ. Madam 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. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1483, recognizing the exemplary service and sacrifice of the soldiers of the 14th Armored Division of the United States Army, known as the Liberators, during World War II. I'm very grateful to my colleague from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, for his work in authoring this resolution.

Madam Speaker, the distinctive designation ''Liberator'' is a title well-earned by the brave men of the 14th Armored Division for their valor, heroism, and sacrifice in the Allied invasion of Western Europe and the liberation of prisoners of war, forced laborers, and concentration camps.

Crossing over the Danube River in southern Germany through the concentration camps at Dachau, the troops of the 14th Armored Division became witness to evidence of some of the most appalling and brutal atrocities the world has ever seen. The resolve in the face of unspeakable evil is testament to the strength of their conviction in the American ideals of freedom and democracy that eventually led the Allies to victory in 1945.

As the soldiers of the 14th Armored Division advanced toward the Stalag VII A POW camp near Moosburg, Allied prisoners of war, including American soldiers, sailors, and airmen waited in nervous hope as the sounds of fighting and the prospect of their own freedom grew even closer. Despite being outnumbered by SS troops, the men of the 14th fought valiantly to overpower them and went on to carry out the liberation of one of the largest POW camps in Germany.

The flag of the 14th Armored Division, along with those of many other liberating units, is displayed at the entrance of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum as a permanent reminder of the courage of these and other American liberators who put their own lives in danger so that others could be free from oppression and fear.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to recognize and commend the service of the soldiers of the 14th Armored Division, of whom it has been said that heroism, sacrifice, and achievements above and beyond the call of duty were everyday occurrences, by voting in favor of House Resolution 1483.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of House Resolution 1483, as amended, which recognizes the service and sacrifices of the members of the 14th Armored Division during World War II and want to commend my friend, PHIL GINGREY of Georgia, for sponsoring this legislation.

□ 1600

The 14th Armored Division first went into action in November 1944 and established an impressive fighting record in France and Germany during more than 130 days of combat.

In January 1945, a 46-year-old World War I marine veteran, Private First Class George B. Turner, earned the Medal of Honor for his extraordinary heroism that helped the division repel repeated German attacks. Turner was a graduate of Wentworth Military Academy in Missouri, that fine educational institution long supported by our chairman, IKE SKELTON, and despite Pfc Turner's age and prior service, he again volunteered for military service out of a sense of duty.

As the division history notes: ''During training, many of the young soldiers and officers with whom he served came to admire his quiet strength and dedication to duty. Turner soon gained the reputation of being a good soldier who truly wanted to come to grips with the enemy.''

''Coming to grips with the enemy'' is something that Turner and his fellow soldiers of the 14th Armored Division did unhesitatingly and very well.

As we approach the 65th anniversary of the end of World War II, it's fitting that this House honor the sacrifices of the men of that division who served the Nation in securing a lasting victory.

Today, our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines have made the same commitment to this Nation. We must heed the lessons to be learned from the 14th Armored Division and today fully support our troops and families with the resources necessary for them to finish the job in the wars America is fighting today.

I urge every Member of our body to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, it's with great pleasure I yield such time as he may consume to my good colleague from Georgia, PHIL GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1483, to honor the service and sacrifice of the 14th Armored Division during World War II; and I thank my friend, the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, IKE SKELTON of Missouri, for being an original cosponsor and also want to thank Representative CRITZ of Pennsylvania and Representative CONAWAY of Texas for their support.

As Americans learn about World War II, most are familiar with the Battle of the Bulge; yet few know about Hitler's last major offensive along the Western front. Operation Nordwind was Hitler's final attempt at pushing back the Allied march toward Germany. The Allies blocked the German counterattack, and the Germans began withdrawing to defensive positions. But victory came with a heavy price, Madam Speaker. Of the approximately 41,000 casualties, roughly 16,000 were from Allied forces.

Today, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in honoring one armored division, the 14th, that played a vital part in stopping this offensive. Madam Speaker, the 14th Armored Division arrived in Marseilles, France, on October 29, 1944, and soon after participated in the liberation of the French province of Alsace that November. The 14th went on to enter Germany on December 6, 1944. In addition to its efforts in Operation Nordwind, the men of the 14th Armored Division liberated tens of thousands of Allied personnel from German captivity. Among them were thousands of Americans.

So celebrated is the legacy of the 14th, Madam Speaker, that the division has been distinguished and designated as a ''Liberating Unit'' by the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in recognition of its liberation of civilians of many nationalities from concentration camps. All in all, Madam Speaker, in their selfless efforts to free those confined to these camps, 447 of the 14th's finest were killed in action, 1,998 were wounded in combat, and to this day, 442 are missing in action.

Madam Speaker, I came to know the storied history of the 14th Armored Division through my deputy district director, John O'Keefe, whose grandfather, Private First Class Norman Narsted, served in the 62nd Armored Infantry Battalion of the 14th Armored Division; and he, indeed, was killed in action on March 1, 1945. With John's help and that of the division's historian, Jim Langford, we were able to put together House Resolution 1483. It is especially timely given that the 14th

Armored Division Association will be holding its 45th annual reunion on September 8, and with the anniversary of the end of World War II right around the corner.

In honor of this occasion, Madam Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me today in honoring the liberators.

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

Mr. CRITZ. Madam Speaker, I urge support of H. Res. 1483. I commend Dr. GINGREY for his leadership.

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 Pennsylvania (Mr. CRITZ) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1483, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMELAND SECURITY SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2010

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4842) to authorize appropriations for the Directorate of Science and Technology of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal years 2011 and 2012, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4842

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 ''Homeland Security Science and Technology Authorization Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.
Sec. 3. Definitions.
Sec. 4. References.

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE II—MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 201. Research prioritization and requirements; professional development; milestones and feedback.
Sec. 202. Testing, evaluation, and standards.
Sec. 203. External review.
Sec. 204. Office of Public-Private Partnerships.

TITLE III—REPORTS

Sec. 301. Directorate of Science and Technology strategic plan.
Sec. 302. Report on technology requirements.
Sec. 303. Report on venture capital organization.

TITLE IV—DIRECTORATE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

Sec. 401. Limitations on research.
Sec. 402. University-based centers.
Sec. 403. Review of university-based centers.
Sec. 404. Cybersecurity research and development.
Sec. 405. National Research Council study of cybersecurity incentives.
Sec. 406. Research on cyber compromise of infrastructure.
Sec. 407. Dual-use terrorist risks from synthetic genomics.
Sec. 408. Underwater tunnel security demonstration project.
Sec. 409. Threats research and development.
Sec. 410. Maritime domain awareness and maritime security technology test, evaluation, and transition capabilities.
Sec. 411. Rapid biological threat detection and identification.
Sec. 412. Educating the public about radiological threats.
Sec. 413. Rural resilience initiative.
Sec. 414. Sense of Congress regarding the need for interoperability standards for Internet protocol video surveillance technology.
Sec. 415. Homeland Security Science and Technology Fellows Program.
Sec. 416. Biological threat agent assay equivalency.
Sec. 417. Study of feasibility and benefit of expanding or establishing program to create a new cybersecurity capacity building track at certain institutions of higher education.
Sec. 418. Sense of Congress regarding centers of excellence.
Sec. 419. Assessment, research, testing, and evaluation of technologies to mitigate the threat of small vessel attack.
Sec. 420. Research and development projects.
Sec. 421. National Urban Security Technology Laboratory.
Sec. 422. Homeland security science and technology advisory committee.

TITLE V—DOMESTIC NUCLEAR DETECTION OFFICE

Sec. 501. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 502. Domestic Nuclear Detection Office oversight.
Sec. 503. Strategic plan and funding allocations for global nuclear detection architecture.
Sec. 504. Radiation portal monitor alternatives.
Sec. 505. Authorization of Securing the Cities Initiative.

TITLE VI—CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS

Sec. 601. Federally funded research and development centers.
Sec. 602. Elimination of Homeland Security Institute.
Sec. 603. GAO study of the implementation of the statutory relationship between the Department and the Department of Energy national laboratories.
Sec. 604. Technical changes.

TITLE VII—COMMISSION ON THE PROTECTION OF CRITICAL ELECTRIC AND ELECTRONIC INFRASTRUCTURES

Sec. 701. Commission on the Protection of Critical Electric and Electronic Infrastructures.

TITLE VIII—BORDER SECURITY TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION

Sec. 801. Ensuring research activities of the Department of Homeland Security include appropriate concepts of operation.
Sec. 802. Report on basic research needs for border and maritime security.
Sec. 803. Incorporating unmanned aerial vehicles into border and maritime airspace.
Sec. 804. Establishing a research program in tunnel detection.
Sec. 805. Research in document security and authentication technologies.
Sec. 806. Study on global positioning system technologies.
Sec. 807. Study of mobile biometric technologies at the border.
Sec. 808. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE.—The term ''appropriate congressional committee'' means the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and any committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate having legislative jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or Senate, respectively, over the matter concerned.

(2) DEPARTMENT.—The term ''Department'' means the Department of Homeland Security.

(3) DIRECTORATE.—The term ''Directorate'' means the Directorate of Science and Technology of the Department.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(5) UNDER SECRETARY.—The term ''Under Secretary'' means the Under Secretary for Science and Technology of the Department.

SEC. 4. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a provision of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.).

TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Under Secretary $1,121,664,000 for fiscal year 2011 and $1,155,313,920 for fiscal year 2012 for the necessary expenses of the Directorate.

TITLE II—MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 201. RESEARCH PRIORITIZATION AND REQUIREMENTS; PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT; MILESTONES AND FEEDBACK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

''SEC. 318. RESEARCH PRIORITIZATION AND REQUIREMENTS.

''(a) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) by not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, establish requirements for how basic and applied homeland security research shall be identified, prioritized, funded, tasked, and evaluated by the Directorate of Science and Technology, including the roles and responsibilities of the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, the Under Secretary for Policy, the Under Secretary for Management, the Director of the Office of Risk Management and Analysis, the Director of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, and the heads of operational components of the Department; and

''(2) to the greatest extent possible, seek to publicize the requirements for the purpose of informing the Federal, State, and local governments, first responders, and the private sector.

''(b) CONTENTS.—In the requirements, the Secretary shall—

''(1) identify the Directorate of Science and Technology's customers within and outside of the Department;

''(2) describe the risk formula and risk assessment tools, including the risk assessment required under subsection (e)(1) that the Department considers to identify, prioritize, and fund homeland security research projects;

''(3) describe the considerations to be used by the Directorate to task projects to research entities, including the national laboratories, federally funded research and development centers, and university-based centers;

''(4) describe the protocols to be used to assess off-the-shelf technology to determine if an identified homeland security capability gap can be addressed through the acquisition process instead of commencing research and development of technology to address that capability gap;

''(5) describe the processes to be used by the Directorate to strengthen first responder participation in identifying and prioritizing homeland security technological gaps, including by—

''(A) soliciting feedback from appropriate national associations and advisory groups representing the first responder community and first responders within the components of the Department; and

''(B) establishing and promoting a publicly accessible portal to allow the first responder community to help the Directorate develop homeland security research and development goals;

''(6) describe a mechanism to publicize the Department's funded and unfunded homeland security technology priorities; and

''(7) include such other requirements, policies, and practices as the Secretary considers necessary.

''(c) ACTIVITIES IN SUPPORT OF THE RESEARCH PRIORITIZATION AND REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than one year after the date of the issuance of the requirements, the Secretary shall—

''(1) carry out the requirements of subsection (a);

''(2) establish, through the Under Secretary for Science and Technology and Under Secretary for Management, a mandatory workforce program for the Directorate's customers in the Department to better identify and prioritize homeland security capability gaps that may be addressed by a technological solution based on the assessment required under section 319(a)(2);

''(3) establish a system to collect feedback from customers of the Directorate on the performance of the Directorate; and

''(4) any other activities that the Secretary considers to be necessary to implement the requirements.

''(d) BIANNUAL UPDATES ON IMPLEMENTATION.—One hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this section, and on a biannually basis thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department shall submit a biannually update to the appropriate congressional committees on the status of implementation of the research prioritization and requirements and activities in support of such requirements.

''(e) RISK ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) submit to the appropriate congressional committees by not later than one year after the date of enactment of this subsection and annually thereafter—

''(A) a national-level risk assessment carried out by the Secretary, describing and prioritizing the greatest risks to the homeland, that includes vulnerability studies, asset values (including asset values for intangible assets), estimated rates of occurrence, countermeasures employed, loss expectancy, cost/benefit analyses, and other practices generally associated with producing a comprehensive risk assessment;

''(B) an analysis of the Directorate's approach to mitigating the homeland security risks identified under subparagraph (A) through basic and applied research, development, demonstration, testing, and evaluation activities, as appropriate;

''(C) an analysis, based on statistics and metrics, of the effectiveness of the Directorate in reducing the homeland security risks identified under subparagraph (A) through the deployment of homeland security technologies researched or developed by the Directorate, as appropriate;

''(D) a description of how the analysis required under subparagraph (A) shall be used to inform, guide, and prioritize the Department's homeland security research and development activities, including recommendations for how the Directorate should modify or amend its existing research and development activities, including for purposes of reducing the risks to the homeland identified under subparagraph (A); and

''(E) a description of input from other relevant Federal, State, or local agencies and relevant private sector entities in conducting the risk assessment required by subparagraph (A); and

''(2) conduct research and development on ways to most effectively communicate information regarding the risks identified under paragraph (1)(A) to the media as well as directly to the public, both on an ongoing basis and during a terrorist attack or other incident.

''(f) REPORT ON HSARPA ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with the Federal Acquisition Regulation and any other relevant Federal requirements, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this subsection and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees containing the research, development, testing, evaluation, prototyping, and deployment activities undertaken by the Homeland Security Advanced Research Projects Agency during the previous fiscal year, including funds expended for such activities in the previous fiscal year.

''(2) CONTENTS.—For each activity undertaken, the report shall—

''(A) describe, as appropriate, the corresponding risk identified in subsection (e)(1)(A) that supports the decision to undertake that activity; and

''(B) describe any efforts made to transition that activity into a Federal, State, or local acquisition program.

''(3) ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall include in each report a description of each proposal that was reviewed in the period covered by the report by the Director of the Homeland Security Advanced Research Projects Agency under section 313(d)(3), including a statement of whether the proposal received a grant, cooperative agreement, or contract from the Director.

''SEC. 319. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

''(a) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Sixty days before establishing the mandatory workforce program as required by section 318(c)(2), the Secretary shall report to the appropriate congressional committees on the following:

''(1) A description of how homeland security technological requirements are developed by the Directorate of Science and Technology's customers within the Department.

''(2) A description of the training that should be provided to the Directorate's customers in the Department under the mandatory workforce program to allow them to identify, express, and prioritize homeland security capability gaps.

''(3) A plan for how the Directorate, in coordination with the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office and other Department components, can enhance and improve technology requirements development and the technology acquisition process, to accelerate the delivery of effective, suitable technologies that meet performance requirements and appropriately address an identified homeland security capability gap.

''(4) An assessment of whether Congress should authorize, in addition to the program required under section 318(c)(2), a training program for Department employees to be trained in requirements writing and acquisition, that—

''(A) is prepared in consultation with the Department of Veterans Affairs Acquisition Academy and the Defense Acquisition University; and

''(B) if the Secretary determines that such additional training should be authorized by Congress, includes specification about—

''(i) the type, skill set, and job series of Department employees who would benefit from such training, including an estimate of the number of such employees;

''(ii) a suggested curriculum for the training;

''(iii) the type and skill set of educators who could most effectively teach those skills;

''(iv) the length and duration of the training;

''(v) the advantages and disadvantages of training employees in a live classroom, or virtual classroom, or both;

''(vi) cost estimates for the training; and

''(vii) the role of the Directorate in supporting the training.

''(b) USE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER.—The Secretary is encouraged to use a federally funded research and development center to assist the Secretary in carrying out the requirements of this section.

''SEC. 320. CUSTOMER FEEDBACK.

''In establishing a system to collect feedback under section 318(c)(3), the Secretary shall—

''(1) create a formal process for collecting feedback from customers on the effectiveness of the technology or services delivered by Directorate of Science and Technology, including through randomized sampling, focus groups, and other methods as appropriate;

''(2) develop metrics for measuring customer satisfaction and the usefulness of any technology or service provided by the Directorate; and

''(3) establish standards and performance measures to be met by the Directorate in order to provide high-quality customer service.

''SEC. 321. RESEARCH PROGRESS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a system to monitor the progress of Directorate for Science and Technology research, development, testing, and evaluation activities, including the establishment of initial and subsequent research milestones.

''(b) SYSTEM.—The system established under subsection (a) shall—

''(1) identify and monitor the progress toward research milestones;

''(2) allow the Directorate to provide regular reports to its customers regarding the status and progress of research efforts of the Directorate;

''(3) allow the Secretary to evaluate how a technology or service produced as a result of the Directorate's programs has affected homeland security capability gaps; and

''(4) allow the Secretary to report the number of products and services developed by the Directorate that have been transitioned into acquisition programs.

''(c) GUIDANCE.—The Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall publicize and implement guidance on setting valid initial and subsequent research milestones for homeland security research funded by the Directorate.

''SEC. 322. REPORT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees—

''(1) by not later than one year after the date of enactment of sections 320 and 321 identifying what actions have been taken to carry out the requirements of these sections; and

''(2) annually thereafter describing—

''(A) research milestones for each large project with a Federal cost share greater than $80,000,000 that have been successfully met and missed, including for each missed milestone, an explanation of why the milestone was missed; and

''(B) customer feedback collected and the success of the Directorate in meeting the customer service performance measures and standards, including an evaluation of the effectiveness of the technology or services delivered by the Directorate.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) is amended in the items relating to subtitle D of title II—

(1) in the item relating to the heading for the subtitle, by striking ''Office of'';

(2) in the item relating to section 231, by striking ''office'' and inserting ''Office of Science and Technology''; and

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

''Sec. 318. Research prioritization and requirements.
''Sec. 319. Professional development.
''Sec. 320. Customer feedback.
''Sec. 321. Research progress.
''Sec. 322. Report.

SEC. 202. TESTING, EVALUATION, AND STANDARDS.

Section 308 (6 U.S.C. 188) is amended by adding at the end of the following new subsection:

''(d) TEST, EVALUATION, AND STANDARDS DIVISION.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Directorate of Science and Technology a Test, Evaluation, and Standards Division.

''(2) DIRECTOR.—The Test, Evaluation, and Standards Division shall be headed by a Director of Test, Evaluation, and Standards, who shall be appointed by the Secretary and report to the Under Secretary for Science and Technology.

''(3) RESPONSIBILITIES, AUTHORITIES, AND FUNCTIONS.—The Director of Test, Evaluation, and Standards—

''(A) is the principal adviser to the Secretary, the Under Secretary of Management, and the Under Secretary for Science and Technology on all test and evaluation or standards activities in the Department; and

''(B) shall—

''(i) prescribe test and evaluation policies for the Department, which shall include policies to ensure that operational testing is done at facilities that already have relevant and appropriate safety and material certifications to the extent such facilities are available;

''(ii) oversee and ensure that adequate test and evaluation activities are planned and conducted by or on behalf of components of the Department in major acquisition programs of the Department, as designated by the Secretary, based on risk, acquisition level, novelty, complexity, and size of the acquisition program, or as otherwise established in statute;

''(iii) review major acquisition program test reports and test data to assess the adequacy of test and evaluation activities conducted by or on behalf of components of the Department; and

''(iv) review available test and evaluation infrastructure to determine whether the Department has adequate resources to carry out its testing and evaluation responsibilities, as established under this title.

''(4) DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION.—Within the Division there shall be a Deputy Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, who—

''(A) is the principal operational test and evaluation official for the Department; and

''(B) shall—

''(i) monitor and review the operational testing and evaluation activities conducted by or on behalf of components of the Department in major acquisition programs of the Department, as designated by the Secretary, based on risk, acquisition level, novelty, complexity, and size of the acquisition program, or as otherwise established in statute;

''(ii) provide the Department with assessments of the adequacy of testing and evaluation activities conducted in support of major acquisitions programs; and

''(iii) have prompt and full access to test and evaluation documents, data, and test results of the Department that the Deputy Director considers necessary to review in order to carry out the duties of the Deputy Director under this section.

''(5) STANDARDS EXECUTIVE.—Within this Division, there shall be a Standards Executive as described in Office of Management and Budget Circular A–119. The Standards Executive shall—

''(A) implement the Department's standards policy as described in section 102(g); and

''(B) support the Department's use of technical standards that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies in accordance with section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note).

''(6) LIMITATION.—The Division is not required to carry out operational testing.

''(7) EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TECHNOLOGIES.—The Director of Test, Evaluation, and Standards may evaluate technologies currently in use or being developed by the Department of Defense to assess whether they can be leveraged to address homeland security capability gaps.''.

SEC. 203. EXTERNAL REVIEW.

(a) RESPONSIBILITIES AND AUTHORITIES OF THE UNDER SECRETARY.—Section 302 (6 U.S.C. 183) is amended by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (14) and inserting ''; and'', and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(15) developing and overseeing the administration of guidelines for periodic external review of research and development programs or activities, including through—

''(A) consultation with experts, including scientists and practitioners, about the research and development activities conducted by the Directorate of Science and Technology; and

''(B) ongoing independent, external review—

''(i) initially at the division level; or

''(ii) when divisions conduct multiple programs focused on significantly different subjects, at the program level.''.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary shall report to Congress not later than 60 days after the completion of the first review under section 302(15)(B) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended by subsection (a) of this section on—

(1) the findings of the review; and

(2) any future efforts to ensure that the Department's research programs or activities are subject to external review, as appropriate.

SEC. 204. OFFICE OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 313 (6 U.S.C. 193) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 313. OFFICE OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE.—There is established an Office of Public-Private Partnerships in the Directorate of Science and Technology.

''(b) DIRECTOR.—The Office shall be headed by a Director, who shall be appointed by the Secretary. The Director shall report to the Under Secretary for Science and Technology.

''(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Director, in coordination with the Private Sector Office of the Department, shall—

''(1) engage and initiate proactive outreach efforts and provide guidance on how to pursue proposals to develop or deploy homeland security technologies (including regarding Federal funding, regulation, or acquisition), including to persons associated with small businesses (as that term is defined in the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.));

''(2) coordinate with components of the Department to issue announcements seeking unique and innovative homeland security technologies to address homeland security capability gaps;

''(3) promote interaction between homeland security researchers and private sector companies in order to accelerate transition research or a prototype into a commercial product and streamline the handling of intellectual property; and

''(4) conduct technology research assessment and marketplace analysis for the purpose of identifying, leveraging, and integrating best-of-breed technologies and capabilities from industry, academia, and other Federal Government agencies, and disseminate research and findings to Federal, State, and local governments.

''(d) RAPID REVIEW DIVISION.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Rapid Review Division within the Office of Public-Private Partnerships.

''(2) PURPOSE AND DUTIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Division—

''(i) is responsible for maintaining a capability to perform business and technical reviews to assist in screening unsolicited homeland security technology proposals submitted to the Secretary; and

''(ii) shall assess the feasibility, scientific and technical merits, and estimated cost of such proposals.

''(B) SPECIFIC DUTIES.—In carrying out those duties, the Division shall—

''(i) maintain awareness of the technological requirements of the Directorate's customers;

''(ii) establish and publicize accessible, streamlined procedures allowing a participant to have their technology assessed by the Division;

''(iii) make knowledgeable assessments of a participant's technology after receiving a business plan, a technology proposal, and a list of corporate officers, directors, and employees with technical knowledge of the proposal, within 60 days after such a submission;

''(iv) review proposals submitted by components of the Department to the Division, subject to subsection (e); and

''(v) in reviewing proposals submitted to the Secretary, give priority to any proposal submitted by a small business concern as defined under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

''(3) COORDINATION.—The Director shall submit for consideration promising homeland security technology research, development, testing, and evaluation proposals,

along with any business and technical reviews, to the appropriate subcomponents of the Directorate and the appropriate operational components of the Department for consideration for support.

''(e) LIMITATION ON CONSIDERATION OR EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS.—The Office may not consider or evaluate homeland security technology proposals submitted in response to a solicitation for offers for a pending procurement or for a specific agency requirement.

''(f) SATELLITE OFFICES.—The Under Secretary, acting through the Director, may establish up to 3 satellite offices across the country to enhance the Department's outreach efforts. The Secretary shall notify the appropriate congressional committees in writing within 30 days after establishing any satellite office.

''(g) PERSONNEL.—The Secretary shall establish rules to prevent the Director or any other employee of the Office from acting on matters where a conflict of interest may exist.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) is amended by striking the item relating to such section and inserting the following:

''Sec. 313. Office of Public-Private Partnerships.''.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Of the amount authorized by section 101, there is authorized to be appropriated $30,000,000 for the Office of Public-Private Partnerships for each of fiscal years 2011 and 2012.

TITLE III—REPORTS

SEC. 301. DIRECTORATE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), as amended by section 201, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 323. STRATEGIC PLAN.

''(a) REQUIREMENT FOR STRATEGIC PLAN.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section and every other year thereafter, the Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall prepare a strategic plan for the activities of the Directorate.

''(b) CONTENTS.—The strategic plan required by subsection (a) shall be prepared in accordance with applicable Federal requirements, and shall include the following matters:

''(1) The long-term strategic goals of the Directorate.

''(2) Identification of the research programs of the Directorate that support achievement of those strategic goals.

''(3) The connection of the activities and programs of the Directorate to requirements or homeland security capability gaps identified by customers within the Department and outside of the Department, including the first responder community.

''(4) The role of the Department's risk analysis in the activities and programs of the Directorate.

''(5) A technology transition strategy for the programs of the Directorate.

''(6) A description of the policies of the Directorate on the management, organization, and personnel of the Directorate.

''(c) SUBMISSION OF PLAN TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress any update to the strategic plan most recently prepared under subsection (a) at the same time that the President submits to Congress the budget for each even-numbered fiscal year.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b), as amended by section 201, is further amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title III the following new item:

''Sec. 323. Strategic plan.''.

SEC. 302. REPORT ON TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS.

Section 302 (6 U.S.C. 182) is amended by inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before the first sentence, and by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) REPORT ON TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Within 90 days after the date of enactment, the Under Secretary shall, for each current project conducted by the Directorate and having a Federal cost share greater than $80,000,000, and on an ongoing basis thereafter for any new project conducted by the Directorate and having a Federal cost share greater than $80,000,000, provide to the appropriate congressional committees a description of—

''(A) the Department components and customers consulted during the development of the operational and technical requirements associated with the project; and

''(B) the extent to which the requirements incorporate the input of those components or customers.

''(2) LARGE PROJECTS.—Within 90 days after the date of enactment, the Secretary shall, for each current project conducted by a component of the Department besides the Directorate, and having a life-cycle cost greater than $1,000,000,000, and on an ongoing basis thereafter for any new project conducted by a component of the Department besides the Directorate, and having a life-cycle cost greater than $1,000,000,000, provide to the appropriate congressional committees detailed operational and technical requirements that are associated with the project.''.

SEC. 303. REPORT ON VENTURE CAPITAL ORGANIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) assessing the current role of the venture capital community in funding advanced homeland security technologies, including technologies proposed by small business concerns as defined under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632); and

(2) providing recommendations about creating a nonprofit organization for the purposes of delivering advanced homeland security technologies to the homeland security community to further its missions.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the current awareness and insight that the Department has regarding advanced private sector homeland security innovation, and the Department's ability to quickly transition innovative products into acquisitions.

(2) A description of how the Department currently finds and works with emerging companies, particularly firms that have never done business with the Federal Government, small business concerns, small business concerns that are owned and operated by women, small business concerns that are owned and operated by veterans, and minority-owned and operated small business concerns.

(3) An assessment and analysis of the current role that venture capitalists play in the development of homeland security technologies, including an assessment of how the venture capital community could be leveraged to accelerate technology, foster development, and introduce new technologies needed by the homeland security community.

(4) An assessment of whether the Department could help nascent commercial technologies mature into commercial-off-the-shelf products the homeland security community could acquire.

(5) An analysis of whether the Central Intelligence Agency's In-Q-Tel organization or the Department of Defense's OnPoint Technologies organization could serve as a model for the development of homeland security technology at the Department.

(6) Recommendations of the Secretary regarding how Congress could authorize the establishment of a private, independent, not-for-profit organization to bridge the gap between the technology needs of the homeland security community and new advances in commercial technology, including specifics on potential funding levels, activities for the organization, including the provision of technical assistance, and whether to establish set-asides for small businesses that are minority-owned and operated or located in socially and economically disadvantaged areas.

(c) USE OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER.—The Secretary is encouraged to use a federally funded research and development center to produce the report under this section.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Of the amount authorized by section 101, there is authorized to be appropriated $500,000 for the report under this section.

TITLE IV—DIRECTORATE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

SEC. 401. LIMITATIONS ON RESEARCH.

Section 302(a)(4), as designated by section 302, is further amended by inserting after ''extramural programs,'' the following: ''that, to the greatest extent possible, addresses a prioritized risk to the homeland as identified by a risk analysis under section 226(e) of this Act''.

SEC. 402. UNIVERSITY-BASED CENTERS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Of the amount authorized by section 101, there is authorized to be appropriated $40,000,000 for fiscal year 2011 and $41,200,000 for fiscal year 2012 to the Secretary to carry out the university-based centers program of the Department.

(b) CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION.—Section 308(b)(2)(B)(iii) (6 U.S.C. 188(b)(2)(B)(iii)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', including medical readiness training and research, and community resiliency for public health and healthcare critical infrastructure''.

(c) EXPLOSIVE COUNTERMEASURES OR DETECTION.—Section 308(b)(2)(B)(iv) (6 U.S.C. 188(b)(2)(B)(iv)) is amended by striking ''and nuclear'' and inserting ''nuclear, and explosive''.

SEC. 403. REVIEW OF UNIVERSITY-BASED CENTERS.

(a) GAO STUDY OF UNIVERSITY-BASED CENTERS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall initiate a study to assess the university-based centers for homeland security program authorized by section 308(b)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 188(b)(2)), and provide recommendations to the appropriate congressional committees for appropriate improvements.

(b) SUBJECT MATTERS.—The study under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A review of the Department's efforts to identify key areas of study needed to support the homeland security mission, and criteria that the Department utilized to determine those key areas for which the Department should maintain, establish, or eliminate university-based centers.

(2) A review of the method by which university-based centers, federally funded research and development centers, and Department of Energy national laboratories receive tasking from the Department, including a review of how university-based research is identified, prioritized, and funded.

(3) A review of selection criteria for designating university-based centers and a weighting of such criteria.

(4) An examination of best practices from other agencies efforts to organize and use university-based research to support their missions.

(5) A review of the Department's criteria and metrics to measure demonstrable progress achieved by university-based centers in fulfilling Department taskings, and mechanisms for delivering and disseminating the research results of designated university-based centers within the Department and to other Federal, State, and local agencies.

(6) An examination of the means by which academic institutions that are not designated or associated with the designated university-based centers can optimally contribute to the research mission of the Directorate.

(7) An assessment of the interrelationship between the different university-based centers.

(8) A review of any other essential elements of the programs determined in the conduct of the study.

(c) MORATORIUM ON NEW UNIVERSITY-BASED CENTERS.—The Secretary may not designate any new university-based centers to research new areas in homeland security prior to the completion of the Comptroller General's review.

SEC. 404. CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary shall support research, development, testing, evaluation, and transition of cybersecurity technology, including fundamental, long-term research to improve the ability of the United States to prevent, protect against, detect, respond to, and recover from acts of terrorism and cyber attacks, with an emphasis on research and development relevant to large-scale, high-impact attacks.

(b) ACTIVITIES.—The research and development supported under subsection (a) shall include work to—

(1) advance the development and accelerate the deployment of more secure versions of fundamental Internet protocols and architectures, including for the domain name system and routing protocols;

(2) improve and create technologies for detecting attacks or intrusions, including real-time monitoring and real-time analytic technologies;

(3) improve and create mitigation and recovery methodologies, including techniques and policies for real-time containment of attacks, and development of resilient networks and systems that degrade gracefully;

(4) develop and support infrastructure and tools to support cybersecurity research and development efforts, including modeling, testbeds, and data sets for assessment of new cybersecurity technologies;

(5) assist the development and support of technologies to reduce vulnerabilities in process control systems;

(6) develop and support cyber forensics and attack attribution; and

(7) test, evaluate, and facilitate the transfer of technologies associated with the engineering of less vulnerable software and securing the information technology software development lifecycle.

(c) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the Under Secretary shall coordinate activities with—

(1) the Under Secretary for National Protection and Programs; and

(2) the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, including the National Science Foundation, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, the Information Assurance Directorate of the National Security Agency, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Department of Commerce, and other appropriate working groups established by the President to identify unmet needs and cooperatively support activities, as appropriate.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF CYBERSECURITY PREPAREDNESS CONSORTIUM AND TRAINING CENTER.—

(1) CYBERSECURITY PREPAREDNESS CONSORTIUM.—Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 226. CYBERSECURITY PREPAREDNESS CONSORTIUM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—To assist the Secretary in carrying out the requirements of section 404(a) of the Homeland Security Science and Technology Authorization Act of 2010, the Secretary may establish a consortium to be known as the 'Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium'.

''(b) FUNCTIONS.—The Consortium shall—

''(1) provide training to State and local first responders and officials specifically for preparing and responding to cybersecurity attacks;

''(2) develop and update a curriculum and training model for State and local first responders and officials;

''(3) provide technical assistance services to build and sustain capabilities in support of cybersecurity preparedness and response;

''(4) conduct cybersecurity training and simulation exercises to defend from and respond to cyber attacks; and

''(5) coordinate all cybersecurity preparedness training activities conducted by the Department.

''(c) MEMBERS.—The Consortium shall consist of academic, nonprofit, and government partners that—

''(1) have demonstrated expertise in developing and delivering cybersecurity training in support of homeland security;

''(2) have demonstrated ability to utilize existing courses and expertise developed by the Department;

''(3) have demonstrated ability to coordinate with the National Domestic Preparedness Consortium and other training programs within the Department; and

''(4) include at least 3 academic institutions that are any combination of historically Black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, or tribal colleges and universities, that fulfill the criteria of paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) of this subsection.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.—The term 'historically Black college or university' has the meaning given the term 'part B institution' in section 322(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061(2)).

''(2) HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTION.—The term 'Hispanic-serving institution' has the meaning given that term in section 502 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1101(a)).

''(3) TRIBAL COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.—The term 'tribal college or university' has the meaning given that term in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b)).''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 1(b) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end of the items relating to such subtitle the following new item:

''Sec. 226. Cybersecurity Preparedness Consortium.''.

(3) CYBERSECURITY TRAINING CENTER.—Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 227. CYBERSECURITY TRAINING CENTER.

''The Secretary may establish where appropriate a Cybersecurity Training Center to provide training courses and other resources for State and local first responders and officials to improve preparedness and response capabilities.''.

(4) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 1(b) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end of the items relating to such subtitle the following new item:

''Sec. 227. Cybersecurity Training Center.''.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Of the amount authorized by section 101, there is authorized to be appropriated $75,000,000 to the Department for each of fiscal years 2011 and 2012 for the cybersecurity research and development activities of the Directorate to prevent, detect, and respond to acts of terrorism and other large-scale disruptions to information infrastructure.

SEC. 405. NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL STUDY OF CYBERSECURITY INCENTIVES.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary and the Under Secretary for National Protection and Programs of the Department shall seek to enter into an agreement with the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study to assess methods that might be used to promote market mechanisms that further cybersecurity and make recommendations for appropriate improvements thereto.

(b) SUBJECT MATTERS.—The study required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Liability that subjects software and system vendors and system operators to potential damages for system breaches.

(2) Mandated reporting of security breaches that could threaten critical functions, including provision of electricity and resiliency of the financial sector.

(3) Regulation that under threat of civil penalty, imposes best practices on system operators of critical infrastructure.

(4) Certification from standards bodies about conformance to relevant cybersecurity standards that can be used as a marketplace differentiation.

(5) Accounting practices that require companies to report their cybersecurity practices and postures and the results of independently conducted red team simulated attacks or exercises.

(6) Cybersecurity risk insurance, including analysis of the current marketplace and recommendations to promote cybersecurity insurance.

(c) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the results of the study required under subsection (a), together with any recommendations of the Secretary related thereto.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Of the amount authorized by section 101, there is authorized to be appropriated $500,000 to the Department for fiscal year 2011 to carry out this section.

SEC. 406. RESEARCH ON CYBER COMPROMISE OF INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to section 201 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121) and in furtherance of domestic preparedness for and collective response to a cyber attack by a terrorist or other person, the Secretary, working with the heads of other national security and intelligence agencies, shall periodically conduct research to determine if the security of federally owned programmable electronic devices and communication networks, including hardware, software, and data, essential to the reliable operation of critical electric infrastructure has been compromised.

(b) SCOPE OF RESEARCH.—The scope of the research required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The extent of any compromise.

(2) An identification of any attackers, including any affiliations with terrorists, terrorist organizations, state entities, and non-state entities.

(3) The method of penetration.

(4) Ramifications of any such compromise on future operations of critical electric infrastructure.

(5) Secondary ramifications of any such compromise on other critical infrastructure sectors and the functioning of civil society.

(6) Ramifications of any such compromise on national security, including war fighting capability.

(7) Recommended mitigation activities.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date a determination has been made under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the findings of such determination. The report may contain a classified annex if the Secretary determines it to be appropriate.

SEC. 407. DUAL-USE TERRORIST RISKS FROM SYNTHETIC GENOMICS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the field of synthetic genomics has the potential to facilitate enormous gains in fundamental discovery and biotechnological applications, but it also has inherent dual-use homeland security risks that must be managed.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—The Under Secretary shall examine and report to the appropriate congressional committees by not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act on the homeland security implications of the dual-use nature of synthetic genomics and, if the Under Secretary determines that such research is appropriate, may conduct research in that area, including—

(1) determining the current capability of synthetic nucleic acid providers to effectively differentiate a legitimate customer from a potential terrorist or other malicious actor;

(2) determining the current capability of synthetic nucleic acid providers to effectively screen orders for sequences of homeland security concern; and

(3) making recommendations regarding screening software, protocols, and other remaining capability gaps uncovered by the study.

SEC. 408. UNDERWATER TUNNEL SECURITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of the Transportation Security Administration, shall conduct a demonstration project to test and assess the feasibility and effectiveness of certain technologies to enhance the security of underwater public transportation tunnels against terrorist attacks involving the use of improvised explosive devices.

(b) INFLATABLE PLUGS.—At least one of the technologies tested under subsection (a) shall be inflatable plugs that may be rapidly deployed to prevent flooding of an underwater public transportation tunnel.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the completion of the demonstration project under subsection (a), the Under Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the results of the demonstration project.

SEC. 409. THREATS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary, in carrying out responsibilities under section 302 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 182), may support research, development, testing, evaluation, and transition of technology that increases the Nation's preparedness against chemical and biological threats and strengthens the Nation's preparedness and collective response against those threats through improved threat awareness and advanced surveillance, detection, and protective countermeasures, and to enhance the development of border security technology.

(b) BIOLOGICAL SECURITY.—To carry out subsection (a), the Under Secretary may conduct research to develop understanding, technologies, and systems needed to protect against biological attacks on the Nation's population or infrastructure, including—

(1) providing advanced planning tools, concepts of operations (including alarm resolution protocols), and training exercises for responding to and recovering from biological attacks;

(2) developing biological assays and improved detection technology that will operate with faster detection times, lower costs, and the potential for increased geographical coverage to the Nation when compared to existing homeland security technologies;

(3) characterizing threats posed by biological weapons, anticipating future threats, conducting comprehensive threat and risk assessments to guide prioritization of the Nation's biodefense investments, and developing population threat assessments that inform the issuance of material threat determinations;

(4) conducting bioforensics research in support of criminal investigations to aid attribution, apprehension, and prosecution of a terrorist or other perpetrator of a biological attack, and providing tools and facilities that Federal law enforcement investigators need to analyze biological threat evidence recovered, including operation of the National Bioforensic Analysis Center; and

(5) conducting appropriate research and studies that will increase our understanding of and uncertainties associated with risk and threats posed by biological agents through the Biological Threat Characterization Center and other means as determined by the Secretary.

(c) AGRICULTURAL SECURITY.—The Under Secretary may conduct research and development to enhance the protection of the Nation's agriculture and food system against terrorist attacks, and other emergency events through enhancement of current agricultural countermeasures, development of new agricultural countermeasures, and provision of safe, secure, state-of-the-art biocontainment laboratories for researching foreign animal and zoonotic diseases, including—

(1) developing technologies to defend the Nation against the natural and intentional introduction of selected foreign animal diseases, developing next-generation vaccines and diagnostics in coordination with the Department of Agriculture, and modeling the spread of foreign animal diseases and their economic impact to evaluate strategies for controlling outbreaks; and

(2) leading the Department effort to enhance interagency coordination of research and development of agricultural disease countermeasures.

(d) CHEMICAL SECURITY.—The Under Secretary may develop technology to reduce the Nation's vulnerability to chemical warfare agents and commonly used toxic industrial chemicals, including—

(1) developing a robust and enduring analytical capability in support of chemical countermeasures development, including developing and validating forensic methodologies and analytical tools, conducting risk and vulnerability assessments based on chemical threat properties, and maintaining infrastructure including the Chemical Security Analysis Center;

(2) developing technology to detect a chemical threat release; and

(3) developing technologies and guidance documents to foster a coordinated approach to returning a chemically contaminated area to a normal condition, and to foster analysis of contaminated areas both before and after the restoration process.

(e) RISK ASSESSMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary shall produce risk assessments for biological and chemical threats, and shall coordinate with the Director of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office of the Department, the Assistant Secretary of the Office of Health Affairs of the Department, and the Assistant Secretary of Infrastructure Protection of the Department on an integrated risk assessment, including regarding chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosive threats.

(2) USAGE.—The assessments required under paragraph (1) shall be used to inform and guide the threat assessments and determinations by the Secretary regarding agents and toxins pursuant to section 302(9) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 182(9)), and to guide prioritization of other homeland defense activities, as appropriate.

(3) TASK FORCE.—The Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall convene an interagency task force of relevant subject matter experts to assess the proposed methodology to be used for each assessment required under paragraph (1), and to provide recommendations to the Under Secretary as to the adequacy of such methodology.

(f) BORDER SECURITY.—The Under Secretary may develop technology, in coordination with the Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection, to gain effective control of the international land borders of the United States within 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act. In carrying out such development activities, the Under Secretary shall ensure coordination and integration between new technologies developed and those already utilized by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

SEC. 410. MARITIME DOMAIN AWARENESS AND MARITIME SECURITY TECHNOLOGY TEST, EVALUATION, AND TRANSITION CAPABILITIES.

(a) GLOBAL MARITIME DOMAIN AWARENESS AND MARITIME SECURITY TECHNOLOGY TEST, EVALUATION, AND TRANSITION CAPABILITIES.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish capabilities for conducting global maritime domain awareness and maritime security technology test, evaluation, and transition, as provided in this subsection.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of such capabilities shall be to—

(A) direct technology test, evaluation, and transition activities in furtherance of border and maritime security; and

(B) evaluate such technology in diverse environments including coastal, seaport, and offshore locations.

(b) COORDINATION.—The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary, shall ensure that—

(1) technology test, evaluation, and transition efforts funded by the Department in furtherance of border and maritime security avoid duplication of efforts, reduce unnecessary redundancies, streamline processes, increase efficiencies, and otherwise complement existing Department and other efforts in border and maritime security; and

(2) the results of such efforts are shared with the appropriate congressional committees and others as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

SEC. 411. RAPID BIOLOGICAL THREAT DETECTION AND IDENTIFICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 302(4) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6

U.S.C. 182(4)), the Secretary shall require the Under Secretary, in consultation with other relevant operational components of the Department, to assess whether the development of screening capabilities for pandemic influenza and other infectious diseases should be undertaken by the Directorate to support entry and exit screening at ports of entry and for other purposes.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF METHODS.—If the Under Secretary determines that the development of such screening capabilities should be undertaken, the Secretary shall, to the extent possible, initiate development of safe and effective methods to rapidly screen incoming travelers at ports of entry for pandemic influenza and other infectious diseases.

(c) COLLABORATION.—In developing methods under subsection (b), the Secretary may collaborate with other Federal agencies, as appropriate.

SEC. 412. EDUCATING THE PUBLIC ABOUT RADIOLOGICAL THREATS.

(a) PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGN.—The Secretary shall develop a public awareness campaign to enhance preparedness and collective response to a radiological attack, including the following:

(1) A clear explanation of the dangers associated with radioactive materials.

(2) Possible effects of different levels of radiation exposure, including a clear description of the how radiation exposure occurs and the amount of exposure necessary to be of concern.

(3) Actions that members of the public should take regarding evacuation, personal decontamination, and medical treatment.

(b) RECOVERY.—The Secretary shall develop a plan for postevent recovery from a radiological attack. Such plan shall include the following:

(1) A definition of the demarcation between response and recovery from a radiological attack.

(2) Consideration of multiple attack scenarios, including a worst-case scenario.

(3) Consideration of multiple recovery strategies, including decontamination, demolition and removal, and relocation.

(4) Consideration of economic, health, and psychological effects.

SEC. 413. RURAL RESILIENCE INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary shall conduct research intended to assist State, local, and tribal leaders and the private sector in developing the tools and methods to enhance preparation for, and response and resilience to, terrorist events and other incidents.

(b) INCLUDED ACTIVITIES.—Activities under this section may include—

(1) research and implementation through outreach activities with rural communities;

(2) an examination of how communities employ resilience capabilities and response assets;

(3) a community resilience baseline template for determining the resilience capacity of a rural community;

(4) a plan to address community needs for resilience;

(5) an education program for community leaders and first responders about their resilience capacity and mechanisms for mitigation, including via distance learning; and

(6) a mechanism by which this research can serve as a model for adoption by communities across the Nation.

SEC. 414. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE NEED FOR INTEROPERABILITY STANDARDS FOR INTERNET PROTOCOL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) video surveillance systems that operate over the Internet are an emerging homeland security technology that has the potential of significantly improving homeland security forensic and analytical capability;

(2) to realize the full security benefits of such emerging homeland security technology, there should be interoperability standards for such technology;

(3) the Directorate, working with the National Institute of Standards and Technology and any other appropriate Federal agencies, should encourage the private sector to develop interoperability standards for such emerging homeland security technology; and

(4) such efforts will help the Federal Government, which is one of the largest users of surveillance technology, in detecting, deterring, preventing, and responding to terrorist attacks.

SEC. 415. HOMELAND SECURITY SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FELLOWS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 324. HOMELAND SECURITY SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FELLOWS PROGRAM.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, shall establish a fellows program, to be known as the Homeland Security Science and Technology Fellows Program, under which the Under Secretary shall facilitate the temporary placement of scientists in relevant scientific or technological fields for up to two years in components of the Department with a need for scientific and technological expertise.

''(b) UTILIZATION OF FELLOWS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Under the Program, the Under Secretary may employ fellows—

''(A) for the use of the Directorate of Science and Technology; or

''(B) for the use of Department components outside the Directorate, under an agreement with the head of such a component under which the component will reimburse the Directorate for the costs of such employment.

''(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Under such an agreement—

''(A) the Under Secretary shall—

''(i) solicit and accept applications from individuals who are currently enrolled in graduate programs, or have received a graduate degree within 3 years prior to the time of application in scientific and engineering fields related to the promotion of securing the homeland, including—

''(I) biological, chemical, physical, behavioral, social, health, medical, and computational sciences;

''(II) geosciences;

''(III) all fields of engineering; and

''(IV) such other disciplines as are determined relevant by the Secretary;

''(ii) screen applicant candidates and interview them as appropriate to ensure that they possess the appropriate level of scientific and engineering expertise and qualifications;

''(iii) provide a list of qualified applicants to the heads of Department components seeking to utilize qualified fellows;

''(iv) pay financial compensation to such fellows;

''(v) coordinate with the Chief Security Officer to facilitate and expedite provision of security clearances to fellows, as appropriate; and

''(vi) otherwise administer all aspects of the fellows' employment with the Department; and

''(B) the head of the component utilizing the fellow shall—

''(i) select a fellow from the list of qualified applicants provided by the Under Secretary;

''(ii) reimburse the Under Secretary for the costs of employing the fellow selected; and

''(iii) be responsible for the day-to-day management of the fellow.

''(c) APPLICATIONS FROM ASSOCIATIONS.—The Under Secretary may accept applications under subsection (b)(2)(A) that are submitted by science or policy associations on behalf of individuals whom such an association has determined may be qualified applicants under the program.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title III the following new item:

''Sec. 324. Homeland Security Science and Technology Fellows Program.''.

SEC. 416. BIOLOGICAL THREAT AGENT ASSAY EQUIVALENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 325. BIOLOGICAL THREAT AGENT ASSAY EQUIVALENCY PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—To facilitate equivalent biological threat agent identification among federally operated biomonitoring programs, the Under Secretary, in consultation with other relevant Federal agencies, may implement an assay equivalency program for biological threat assays.

''(b) FEATURES.—In order to establish assay performance equivalency to support homeland security and public health security decisions, the program may—

''(1) evaluate biological threat detection assays, their protocols for use, and their associated response algorithms for confirmation of biological threat agents, taking performance measures and concepts of operation into consideration; and

''(2) develop assay equivalency standards based on the findings of the evaluation under paragraph (1).

''(c) UPDATE.—The Under Secretary shall update the program as necessary.

''(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) require implementation of the standards developed under subsection (b)(2) for all Department biomonitoring programs; and

''(2) make such standards available to support all other Federal biomonitoring programs.

''(e) ASSAY DEFINED.—In this section the term 'assay' means any scientific test that is—

''(1) designed to detect the presence of a biological threat agent; and

''(2) of a type selected under criteria established by the Secretary.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) is further amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title III the following new item:

''Sec. 325. Biological threat agent assay equivalency program.''.

SEC. 417. STUDY OF FEASIBILITY AND BENEFIT OF EXPANDING OR ESTABLISHING PROGRAM TO CREATE A NEW CYBERSECURITY CAPACITY BUILDING TRACK AT CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Within 90 days of enactment, the Secretary, in coordination with the National Science Foundation, shall commission a study by a nonprofit research institution to determine the feasibility and potential benefit of expanding the Federal Cyber Service Scholarship for Service Program, or establishing a parallel program, as methods to create a new cybersecurity or information assurance capacity building track at institutions of higher education that are not currently designated as a National Center of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance Education or a National Center of Academic Excellence in Research.

(b) SUBJECT MATTERS.—The study under subsection (a) shall include examinations of the following:

(1) The feasibility and potential benefit of allowing the following types of institutions into the existing Federal Cyber Service program:

(A) Community colleges.

(B) Institutions offering an undergraduate degree, graduate degree, or post-graduate degree, but do not qualify under the existing program.

(C) Institutions offering a certificate or industry-recognized credential.

(2) The feasibility and potential benefit of establishing a new program modeled after the Federal Cyber Service program to build capacity at—

(A) community colleges;

(B) institutions offering an undergraduate degree, graduate degree, or post-graduate degree, but do not qualify under the existing program; or

(C) institutions offering a certificate or industry-recognized credential.

(3) The projected extent to which an expansion of the existing Federal Cyber Service program as described in paragraph (1) would—

(A) expand the availability of qualified individuals to work in information assurance and cybersecurity within the Department and other Federal, State, local, and tribal agencies, and the private sector;

(B) encourage institutions of higher education to develop a new information assurance or cybersecurity education undergraduate degree programs, graduate degree programs, or programs conferring a certificate or industry-recognized credential;

(C) increase the number of students graduating annually from existing information assurance or cybersecurity education undergraduate degree programs, graduate degree programs, or programs conferring a certificate or industry-recognized credential; or

(D) improve existing information assurance or cybersecurity education undergraduate degree programs, graduate degree programs, or programs conferring a certificate or industry-recognized credential.

(4) The projected extent to which the establishment of a new program modeled after the Federal Cyber Service program as described in paragraph (2) would—

(A) expand the availability of qualified individuals to work in information assurance and cybersecurity within the Department and other Federal, State, local, and tribal agencies, and the private sector;

(B) encourage institutions of higher education to develop a new information assurance or cybersecurity education undergraduate degree programs, graduate degree programs, or programs conferring a certificate or industry-recognized credential;

(C) increase the number of students graduating annually from existing information assurance or cybersecurity education undergraduate degree programs, graduate degree programs, or programs conferring a certificate or industry-recognized credential; or

(D) improve existing information assurance or cybersecurity education undergraduate degree programs, graduate degree programs, or programs conferring a certificate or industry-recognized credential.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after receiving the findings of the study, the Secretary shall transmit the findings, together with any comments thereon by the Secretary, to the appropriate congressional committees.

SEC. 418. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.

It is the sense of Congress that centers of excellence have the potential—

(1) to be a very useful tool in developing defensive countermeasures to secure critical infrastructure and prevent terrorism; and

(2) to play a key role in the Department's efforts to research and develop new technologies to secure the homeland.

SEC. 419. ASSESSMENT, RESEARCH, TESTING, AND EVALUATION OF TECHNOLOGIES TO MITIGATE THE THREAT OF SMALL VESSEL ATTACK.

The Under Secretary may—

(1) assess what technologies are available to mitigate the threat of small vessel attack in secure zones of ports, including the use of transponders or radio frequency identification devices to track small vessels; and

(2) conduct research, testing, and evaluation of new technologies that might be capable of tracking small vessels.

SEC. 420. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

Section 831 (6 U.S.C. 391) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''2010,'' and inserting ''2012,'';

(2) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) PRIOR APPROVAL.—In any case in which the Under Secretary for Science and Technology intends to exercise other transaction authority, the Under Secretary must receive prior approval from the Secretary after submitting to the Secretary a proposal that includes the rationale for why a grant or contract issued in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation is not feasible or appropriate and the amount to be expended for such project. In such a case, the authority for evaluating the proposal may not be delegated by the Secretary to anyone other than the Under Secretary for Management.''; and

(3) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (i), and by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsections:

''(e) ANNUAL REPORT ON EXERCISE OF OTHER TRANSACTION AUTHORITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an annual report on the exercise of other transaction authority.

''(2) CONTENT.—The report shall include the following:

''(A) The subject areas in which research projects were conducted using other transaction authority.

''(B) The extent of cost-sharing for such projects among Federal and non-Federal sources.

''(C) The extent to which use of other transaction authority has addressed a homeland security capability gap identified by the Department.

''(D) The total amount of payments, if any, that were received by the Federal Government as a result of such exercise of other transaction authority during the period covered by the report.

''(E) The rationale for using other transaction authority, including why grants or contracts issued in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation were not feasible or appropriate.

''(F) the amount expended for each such project.

''(f) TRAINING.—The Secretary shall develop a training program for acquisitions staff in the use of other transaction authority to help ensure the appropriate use of such authority.

''(g) REVIEW AUTHORITY.—The exercise of other transaction authority shall be subject to review by the Comptroller General of the United States to ensure that an agency is not attempting to avoid the requirements of procurement statutes and regulations.

''(h) OTHER TRANSACTION AUTHORITY DEFINED.—In this section the term 'other transaction authority' means authority under subsection (a).''.

SEC. 421. NATIONAL URBAN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Urban Security Technology Laboratory (formerly the Environmental Measurements Laboratory) is authorized within the Directorate for fiscal years 2011 and 2012.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Under Secretary shall utilize the National Urban Security Technology Laboratory to test, evaluate, and analyze homeland security capabilities and serve as a technical authority to first responders and State and local entities, including by—

(1) conducting test programs, pilots projects, demonstrations, and other forms of evaluations of homeland security technologies both in the field and in the laboratory;

(2) applying knowledge of operational end-user environments and support for operational integration to technology development, including—

(A) training;

(B) exercises;

(C) equipment;

(D) tactics;

(E) techniques; and

(F) procedures;

(3) representing interests and requirements between technology developers and operational end-users; and

(4) supporting development and use of homeland security equipment and operational standards.

SEC. 422. HOMELAND SECURITY SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Section 301 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 191) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following new subsection:

''(a) There is established within the Department a science and technology advisory committee (in this section referred to as the 'advisory committee'). The advisory committee shall make recommendations with respect to the activities of the under secretary for science and technology, including—

''(1) identifying research areas of potential importance to the security of the Nation; and

''(2) providing advice in developing and updating the strategic plan required under section 318.''.

(2) by striking subsection (j).

TITLE V—DOMESTIC NUCLEAR DETECTION OFFICE

SEC. 501. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated for the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office of the Department—

(1) $305,840,000 for fiscal year 2011; and

(2) $315,005,000 for fiscal year 2012.

SEC. 502. DOMESTIC NUCLEAR DETECTION OFFICE OVERSIGHT.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Directorate should conduct basic and innovative research and nondevelopmental testing on behalf of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (in this section referred to as ''DNDO''), in order to advance next generation nuclear detection technologies.

(b) INTERNAL REVIEW OF PROJECT SELECTION AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the DNDO, the Under Secretary, and the heads of all operational components of the Department that own, operate, or maintain nuclear or radiological detection equipment shall begin an internal review of the methodology by which research, development, testing, and evaluation is identified, prioritized, and funded within the Department.

(c) CONTENTS OF REVIEW.—In carrying out the review under subsection (b), the Director of the DNDO shall—

(1) identify the process by which basic and applied research and operational testing that should be conducted in concert and under agreement with the Directorate;

(2) describe the roles, responsibilities, common definitions, standard operating procedures, and decision process for research, development, testing, and evaluation activities;

(3) describe and implement a transparent system for tracking research, development, testing, and evaluation requirements;

(4) describe and implement a mechanism to provide regular updates to components of the Department on the progress of such research;

(5) evaluate the degree to which needs of the operational components of the Department and State and local first responders are being adequately addressed by the existing project selection process, and if not, how such process can be improved;

(6) establish a method to collect and evaluate Department component feedback;

(7) utilize departmental matrices and systems to determine if technologies produced by the Directorate have enhanced the ability of Department components to perform their missions;

(8) identify appropriate five-year levels of investment in basic and applied research and development, in particular among the Department laboratories, federally funded research and development centers, university-based centers, Department of Energy national laboratories, and other Federal laboratories;

(9) project balance of use of the entities referred to in paragraph (8) among the Directorate and other Department components; and

(10) establish a formal merit review process, with external peer review where appropriate.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the completion of the review required by subsection (b), the Director of the DNDO shall submit to the Secretary and the appropriate congressional committees a report containing the findings of such review, together with information on the systems, methods, and mechanisms established, and recommendations for additional improvements.

(e) UPDATES ON IMPLEMENTATION.—One hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an update on the status of implementation of this section and activities in support of such implementation.

SEC. 503. STRATEGIC PLAN AND FUNDING ALLOCATIONS FOR GLOBAL NUCLEAR DETECTION ARCHITECTURE.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report containing the following:

(1) A strategic plan for the global nuclear detection architecture to deter and detect the transport of nuclear or radioactive materials by all means possible, with specific focus on establishing the goals, objectives, and cost projections for the next five years, including a discussion of—

(A) technological and nontechnological methods to increase detection capabilities;

(B) the preventive nature of the global nuclear detection architecture, including projected impact on would-be terrorists;

(C) detection capability enhancements for the various transportation modes, at ports of entry and between ports of entry;

(D) balanced risk-based deployment of detection assets across all border and other pathways; and

(E) any emerging threat vectors identified by the Director of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office.

(2) In consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of State, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Intelligence Community, and the Attorney General, an analysis of overall budget allocations that determines whether Government wide nuclear detection resources clearly align with identified priorities to maximize results and minimize duplication of efforts.

SEC. 504. RADIATION PORTAL MONITOR ALTERNATIVES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that in view of the Secretary's decision not to certify advanced spectroscopic portal monitors for primary screening applications because they do not offer a significant increase in operational effectiveness over existing technology, the Director must attempt to identify viable alternatives.

(b) ANALYSIS AND REPORT.—The Director of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office shall analyze and report to the appropriate congressional committees by not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act on both existing and developmental alternatives to existing radiation portal monitors and advanced spectroscopic portal monitors that would provide the Department with a significant increase in operational effectiveness for primary screening for radioactive materials.

SEC. 505. AUTHORIZATION OF SECURING THE CITIES INITIATIVE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Securing the Cities Initiative of the Department uses next generation radiation detection technology to detect the transport of nuclear and radiological material in urban areas by terrorists or other unauthorized individuals.

(2) The technology used by partners in the Securing the Cities Initiative leverages radiation detection technology used at ports of entry.

(3) The Securing the Cities Initiative has fostered unprecedented collaboration and coordination among its Federal, State, and local partners.

(4) The Securing the Cities Initiative is a critical national capability to detect the dangerous introduction of nuclear and radiological material.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Of amounts authorized by section 501, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Director of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office of the Department for the Securing the Cities Initiative such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2011 and 2012, including—

(1) for each city in which it has been implemented by fiscal year 2009—

(A) $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2011; and

(B) $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2012; and

(2) for additional Securing the Cities initiatives to be implemented in not fewer than 2 sites participating in the Urban Area Security Initiative, such sums as may be necessary each fiscal year to implement and sustain each additional initiative.

TITLE VI—CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 601. FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.

Section 305 (6 U.S.C. 184) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—'' before the first sentence; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(b) CONGRESSIONAL TASKING.—Upon a request of the chairman and the ranking minority member of an appropriate congressional committee, a federally funded research and development center established under this section may perform independent analysis of homeland security issues and report its findings to the appropriate congressional committees and the Secretary.

''(c) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.—Federally funded research and development centers established under this section are encouraged, upon request of the chairman and the ranking minority member of an appropriate congressional committee, to provide to the committee a copy of any report it produces for the Department or any of its components.

''(d) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—The Secretary shall review and revise, as appropriate, the policies of the Department relating to personnel conflicts of interest to ensure that such policies specifically address employees of federally funded research and development centers established under this section who are in a position to make or materially influence research findings or agency decisionmaking.

''(e) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Each federally funded research and development center established under this section shall transmit to the Secretary and appropriate congressional committees an annual report on the activities of the center.''.

SEC. 602. ELIMINATION OF HOMELAND SECURITY INSTITUTE.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 312 (6 U.S.C. 192) is repealed.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) is amended by striking the item relating to such section.

SEC. 603. GAO STUDY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STATUTORY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENT AND THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL LABORATORIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study to assess the implementation of the statutory relationship between the Department and the Department of Energy national laboratories, as established by section 309(a)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 189(a)(2)); and

(2) submit recommendations to the appropriate congressional committees for appropriate improvements to such relationship.

(b) STUDY SUBJECTS.—The study shall include the following:

(1) Review of how the Department and the Department of Energy national laboratories—

(A) communicate needs and capabilities; and

(B) select projects to be performed by the Department of Energy national laboratories under such statutory relationship.

(2) Review of contracting mechanisms that the Department and the Department of Energy national laboratories use to initiate and track work under such statutory relationship.

(3) Review of the fraction of Department of Energy national laboratory work performed for the Department under such statutory relationship, compared to other Department of Energy national laboratory work performed for the Department on a ''work for others'' basis.

(4) Review the cost savings identified by the Department and the Department of Energy achieved through use of such statutory relationship, compared to other Department of Energy national laboratory work performed for the Department on a ''work for others'' basis.

SEC. 604. TECHNICAL CHANGES.

Section 1902 of the Homeland Security Act (6 U.S.C. 592) is amended by—

(1) striking paragraph (6); and

(2) redesignating paragraphs (7) through (14) as paragraphs (6) through (13), respectively.

TITLE VII—COMMISSION ON THE PROTECTION OF CRITICAL ELECTRIC AND ELECTRONIC INFRASTRUCTURES

SEC. 701. COMMISSION ON THE PROTECTION OF CRITICAL ELECTRIC AND ELECTRONIC INFRASTRUCTURES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Commission on the Protection of Critical Electric and Electronic Infrastructures (in this section referred to as the ''Commission'').

(b) PURPOSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The purposes of the Commission are to—

(A) assess vulnerabilities of electric and electronic infrastructures, including—

(i) all components of the United States electric grid, including electricity generation, transmission, distribution and metering; and

(ii) all computerized control systems used in all United States critical infrastructure sectors;

(B) provide a clear and comprehensive strategy and specific recommendations for protecting these critical electric and electronic infrastructures; and

(C) test, evaluate, and report on specific mitigation protection and recovery devices or methods.

(2) IN PARTICULAR.—The Commission shall give particular attention to threats that can disrupt or damage critical electric and electronic infrastructures, including—

(A) cyber attacks or unintentional cyber disruption;

(B) electromagnetic phenomena such as geomagnetically induced currents, intentional electromagnetic interference, and electromagnetic pulses caused by nuclear weapons; and

(C) other physical attack, act of nature, or accident.

(c) COMPOSITION OF COMMISSION.—

(1) MEMBERS.—The Commission shall be composed of 9 members, of whom—

(A) 1 member shall be appointed by the Chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security;

(B) 1 member shall be appointed by the ranking minority member of the House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security;

(C) 1 member shall be appointed by the Chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Energy and Commerce;

(D) 1 member shall be appointed by the ranking minority member of the House of Representatives Committee on Energy and Commerce;

(E) 1 member shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs;

(F) 1 member shall be appointed by the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs;

(G) 1 member shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources;

(H) 1 member shall be appointed by the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; and

(I) 1 member who shall serve as the Chairman of the Commission, and who shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives with the concurrence of the President Pro Tempore of the Senate.

(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—It is the sense of Congress that individuals appointed to the Commission should have significant depth of experience in electric and electronic infrastructures, their function, and their protection, as well as the threats to these infrastructures as identified in subsection (b)(2).

(3) DEADLINE FOR APPOINTMENT.—All members of the Commission shall be appointed within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) INITIAL MEETING.—The Commission shall meet and begin the operations of the Commission as soon as practicable.

(5) QUORUM; VACANCIES.—After its initial meeting, the Commission shall meet upon the call of the Chairman or a majority of its members. Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) RESPONSIBILITIES OF COMMISSION.—The Commission shall address—

(1) the quantification of the threats identified in subsection (b)(2) to the United States electric and electronic infrastructure, and a cost-benefit analysis of possible protection and recovery strategies;

(2) the roles, missions, and structure of all relevant Federal, State, and local government departments and agencies with responsibilities for ensuring protection and reliability for electric and electronic infrastructures;

(3) the roles, missions, and structure of all relevant private sector entities with responsibilities for ensuring protection and reliability for electric and electronic infrastructures;

(4) inter-agency coordination between and among the entities identified in paragraphs (2) and (3); and

(5) recommendations for protections and recovery devices and measures.

(e) POWERS OF COMMISSION.—

(1) HEARINGS AND EVIDENCE.—The Commission or, on the authority of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out this section, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and administer such oaths as the Commission or such designated subcommittee or designated member may determine advisable.

(2) CONTRACTING.—The Commission may, to such extent and in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts, enter into contracts to enable the Commission to discharge its duties under this subtitle.

(3) STAFF OF COMMISSION.—

(A) APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION.—The Chairman of the Commission, in accordance with rules agreed upon by the Commission, may appoint and fix the compensation of a staff director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that no rate of pay fixed under this subsection may exceed the equivalent of that payable for a position at level I of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(B) PERSONNEL AS FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The executive director and any employees of the Commission shall be employees under section 2105 of title 5, United States Code, for purposes of chapters 63, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, and 90 of that title.

(ii) MEMBERS OF COMMISSION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed to apply to members of the Commission.

(C) DETAILEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement from the Commission, and such detailee shall retain the rights, status, and privileges of his or her regular employment without interruption.

(D) CONSULTANT SERVICES.—The Commission may procure the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the daily rate paid a person occupying a position at level I of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(E) SECURITY CLEARANCES.—The Chairman shall place an emphasis on hiring and retaining employees, contractors, and detailees with active security clearances. For employees who do not have security clearances but are determined by the Chairman to need them, the Central Intelligence Agency, Department of Energy, Department of Defense, and any other relevant agency shall expedite the necessary clearance processes.

(F) FORMER EMP COMMISSION STAFF AND RESOURCES.—The Chairman may make use of any existing and viable staff and resources previously employed by the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack established by section 1401 of Public Law 106–398 (114 Stat. 1654A–345).

(4) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Government, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this section. Each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality shall, to the extent authorized by law, furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman, the chairman of any subcommittee created by a majority of the Commission, or any member designated by a majority of the Commission.

(B) RECEIPT, HANDLING, STORAGE, AND DISSEMINATION.—Information shall only be received, handled, stored, and disseminated by members of the Commission and its staff consistent with all applicable statutes, regulations, and Executive orders.

(5) ASSISTANCE FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(A) GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis and as necessary, administrative support and other services for the performance of the Commission's functions.

(B) OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—In addition to the assistance prescribed in paragraph (1), departments and agencies of the United States may provide to the Commission such services, funds, facilities, staff, and other support services as they may determine advisable and as may be authorized by law.

(6) GIFTS.—The Commission may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

(7) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States.

(f) PUBLIC MEETINGS AND RELEASE OF PUBLIC VERSIONS OF REPORTS.—The Commission shall—

(1) hold public hearings and meetings to the extent appropriate;

(2) release public versions of the report required under subsection (g); and

(3) conduct any public hearing in a manner consistent with the protection of sensitive or classified information provided to or developed for or by the Commission as required by any applicable statute, regulation, or Executive order.

(g) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the appointment of the Commission, and annually thereafter, the Commission shall submit to the President and Congress a report containing such findings, conclusions, and recommendations for protection and recovery measures for electric and electronic infrastructures as have been agreed to by a majority of Commission members.

(h) FUNDING.—Of the amounts authorized by section 101, there is authorized to be appropriated for the activities of the Commission under this section—

(1) $4,000,000 for fiscal year 2011; and

(2) $4,000,000 for fiscal year 2012.

TITLE VIII—BORDER SECURITY TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION

SEC. 801. ENSURING RESEARCH ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY INCLUDE APPROPRIATE CONCEPTS OF OPERATION.

The Under Secretary shall ensure that any Federal Government interagency or intra-agency agreement entered into by the Under Secretary to develop and transition new technology explicitly characterizes the requirements, expected use, and concept of operations for that technology, including—

(1) the manpower needed to effectively operate the technology;

(2) the expected training requirements; and

(3) the expected operations and maintenance costs.

SEC. 802. REPORT ON BASIC RESEARCH NEEDS FOR BORDER AND MARITIME SECURITY.

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall enter into an arrangement with the National Research Council for a one-year assessment of the basic science research needs in the border and maritime security domain. The assessment shall include consideration of—

(1) detection, tracking, and identification technologies for cargo and people;

(2) personal protective equipment;

(3) document security and authentication technologies;

(4) nonradiological advanced screening technologies at ports of entry; and

(5) technologies for real time tactical scene awareness.

SEC. 803. INCORPORATING UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES INTO BORDER AND MARITIME AIRSPACE.

(a) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary and the Director of the Joint Planning and Development Office shall research and develop technologies to permit routine operation of unmanned aerial vehicles, including autonomously piloted drones, within the national airspace for border and maritime security missions without any degradation of existing levels of safety for all national airspace system users.

(b) PILOT PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall coordinate with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Director of the Joint Planning Office to enter into pilot projects in sparsely populated, low-density Class G air traffic airspace to conduct experiments and collect data in order to accelerate the safe integration of unmanned aircraft systems into the national airspace system as part of research activities of the Joint Planning and Development Office.

SEC. 804. ESTABLISHING A RESEARCH PROGRAM IN TUNNEL DETECTION.

(a) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—The Under Secretary shall research and develop technologies to permit detection of near surface voids, such as tunnels, with an emphasis on technologies with real time capability.

(b) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate with other appropriate Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense and the United States Geological Survey, and ensure the integration of activities under subsection (a) with relevant efforts of such other agencies and the Department's Centers of Excellence Program.

SEC. 805. RESEARCH IN DOCUMENT SECURITY AND AUTHENTICATION TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—The Under Secretary, in coordination with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, shall conduct a research and development program on document security, validation, and authentication technologies and standards. The program may include assessment or development of imitation-resistant and tamper-resistant documentation, imitation-resistant or tamper-resistant devices, document validation and authentication technologies, and document identification standards.

(b) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the program in subsection (a), the Under Secretary shall coordinate with other Federal agencies engaged in similar activities, including Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the United States Coast Guard, and the Department of Justice.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary and the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall provide to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs of the Senate, a report detailing the actions taken by the Under Secretary and the Director under this section.

SEC. 806. STUDY ON GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary shall conduct a study of the need for next generation global positioning system technology as it relates to border security, including—

(1) conducting an analysis of the frequency of unintended border crossings and the capability of global positioning system technologies to address unintended border crossings by government personnel;

(2) undertaking an examination of the potential end user requirements for global positioning system technologies, including cost limitations, accessibility, and reliability; and

(3) developing recommendations for potential near-term and long-term research, development, testing, and evaluation of border security-focused global positioning technologies.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Under Secretary shall consult with U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the National Institute of Standards and Technology and appropriate Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall report to Congress the findings of the study conducted under this section.

SEC. 807. STUDY OF MOBILE BIOMETRIC TECHNOLOGIES AT THE BORDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary, in coordination with the Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection, shall establish a research program on the use of mobile biometric technology at the Nation's borders between the ports of entry, including—

(1) conducting an analysis of existing mobile biometric technologies and the extent to which they can be deployed in Border Patrol agents' vehicles and used at the border, in terms of operability, reliability, cost, and overall benefit to border operations;

(2) undertaking an examination of the potential end-user requirements of mobile biometric technology by the Border Patrol and other relevant end-users;

(3) developing recommendations for addressing capability gaps in mobile biometric technologies; and

(4) examining the feasibility of implementing a pilot program for use of mobile biometric technologies at the border.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the research program under subsection (a), the Under Secretary shall consult the National Institute of Standards and Technology, other appropriate Federal agencies, and appropriate Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials.

(c) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that the research program is coordinated with other biometric identification programs within the Department.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the findings of the research program conducted under this section.

SEC. 808. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Of the amount authorized by section 101 of this Act, such sums as may be necessary are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEUTCH). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of thousands of Americans who work day in and day out to protect our communities and our Nation. They perform a wide range of services for the country, responding to emergencies, screening bags and cargo, watching our borders. They are outstanding public servants, and we thank them for their service. We know that without them we are less secure. They know that without science and technology they can't accomplish their mission.

So today we consider H.R. 4842, to acknowledge the importance of science and technology research, development, testing and evaluation, to ensuring the safety and security of the American people and our Nation.

□ 1610

H.R. 4842, the Homeland Security Science and Technology Authorization Act of 2010, reauthorizes the Department of Homeland Security, Science

and Technology Directorate, and Domestic Nuclear Detection Office through fiscal year 2012. Since 2003, S&T has been responsible for developing technologies to address Homeland Security capability gaps as identified by DHS and its operational components, most notably Customs and Border Protection, the U.S. Coast Guard, the Transportation Security Administration, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency. DNDO was established in 2006 to develop detection technologies for nuclear and radiological devices, a high-consequence terrorist threat.

This bipartisan legislation reauthorizes the activities of S&T and DNDO and puts these two DHS components on a path to greater effectiveness and efficiency by requiring strategic plans, benchmarking, and accountability systems.

For nearly a year, Mr. LUNGREN and I worked with my colleagues on the committee to craft this bipartisan authorization bill, which would ensure that the Department of Homeland Security Science and Technology Directorate has the right tools available to be successful. Success in this context means delivering products into the hands of our first responders, law enforcement officials, or critical infrastructure owners, to help them achieve their mission and make America more secure.

In conducting our review, we examined the Homeland Security Act and the Department's use of the authorities the Congress has vested in it. We have also received insight and information from DHS leadership, stakeholders, the R&D community, private sector leaders, and independent analysts.

I believe that by reaching out to key stakeholders, we developed a very good bill that will authorize important management functions and programs within the S&T Directorate while emphasizing efficiency and cost savings.

Within this legislation, we institutionalize the process by which research and development is identified, prioritized, and funded within DHS. We emphasize the importance of strategic planning and require DHS S&T to do so every 2 years.

We establish training programs for developing technology requirements at DHS. We authorize an Office of Testing and Evaluation designed to prevent problems that occurred in major acquisition programs like SBInet, the infamous virtual fence, which will help curb wasteful spending in the Department.

We create an Office of Public-Private Partnerships and establish within S&T a streamlined review process for unsolicited proposals. We authorize twice the current amount of funding for cybersecurity R&D.

We explore alternatives for ASP technologies for detecting nuclear and radiological materials, and we affirm the committee's support for university programs and small businesses.

I look forward to discussing these and other matters with my colleagues today.

Finally, I want to express my appreciation and thanks to our chairman, Mr. THOMPSON, and Ranking Member KING for their support of this important legislation.

Mr. LUNGREN was very instrumental in crafting the bill, and I thank him for working with me on it. I want to also thank the majority and minority committee and personal office staffs for their efforts.

We often say that Homeland Security is not a partisan issue, and that is evidenced today by this bipartisan legislation.

JUNE 25, 2010.

Hon. BART GORDON,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Technology, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to you regarding H.R. 4842, the ''Homeland Security Science and Technology Authorization Act of 2010.''

I agree that provisions in H.R. 4842 are of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Science and Technology. I acknowledge that by forgoing further consideration, your Committee is not relinquishing its jurisdiction and I will fully support your request to be represented in a House-Senate conference on those provisions over which the Committee on Science and Technology has jurisdiction in H.R. 4842.

This exchange of letters will be inserted in the Congressional Record as part of the consideration of this legislation in the House.

I look forward to working with you on this legislation and other matters of great importance to this nation.

Sincerely,

BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman.

Hon. BENNIE G. THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Ford House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Science and Technology in H.R. 4842, the Homeland Security Science and Technology Authorization Act of 2010.

H.R. 4842 was favorably reported by the Committee on Homeland Security on May 18, 2010. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner, and, accordingly, I will waive further consideration of this bill in Committee. However, agreeing to waive consideration of this bill should not be construed as the Committee on Science and Technology waiving its jurisdiction over H.R. 4842.

Further, I request your support for the appointment of Science and Technology Committee conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation. I also ask that a copy of this letter and your response be placed in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

BART GORDON,
Chairman.

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4842, the Homeland Security Science and Technology Authorization Act of 2010. It gives me great pleasure to work with the gentlewoman in bringing forward this authorization bill to the floor.

This bipartisan legislation reauthorizes the Science and Technology Directorate and the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office for fiscal years 2011 and 2012, and I want to thank the chairwoman for her bipartisan leadership on this legislation.

This process started last summer with numerous stakeholder meetings, followed by meetings and recommendations from the Department of Homeland Security and concluding with the recent improvements and support of the House Science and Technology Committee. When it comes to homeland security, there is no room for partisanship. Chairwoman Clark and the chairman of our full committee, Chairman THOMPSON, working together with Mr. KING from New York, the ranking Republican on the committee, all deserve a great deal of credit for reaching out across the aisle to craft a more effective bill, and, I must say, it does include provisions of importance to our Republican members.

These provisions would include the establishment of research initiatives to bolster border and maritime security; the development of tools to enhance resilience to terrorist attacks and other incidents, especially in rural communities; research and testing of technologies to help secure the border and ensure the safety of our underground mass transit systems; as well as an assessment of how useful rapid screening tools for influenza and other biological threats would be at our border ports of entry.

Our bill emphasizes management and administrative reforms that target the needs of the Science and Technology customers, those being the Border Patrol, TSA, Coast Guard, FEMA, and ICE, by most closely aligning the Directorate's research and development activities with identified homeland security risks so there will be a more rapid application of the technology to the true needs as identified by S&T's customers.

It will improve our homeland security by establishing a more rigorous process within the S&T Directorate for identifying, prioritizing, and funding these important research opportunities.

It recognizes the need to prioritize research around risk and authorizes the establishment of a Testing, Evaluation, and Standards Division within the S&T Directorate to help ensure that technology is properly evaluated.

So, Mr. Speaker, in order to foster closer collaboration between the Science and Technology Directorate and commercial companies with promising Homeland Security technologies, our bill authorizes the Office of Public-Private Partnerships to be established within the S&T Directorate.

Importantly, title VII of our legislation establishes a Commission on the Protection of Critical Electric and Electronic Infrastructures to assess the vulnerabilities of this infrastructure and make recommendations for better securing this critically important infrastructure in the future.

While we rely on the cyberworld for much of our embedded command and control systems, perhaps it is no more important than in the area of critical electric and electronic infrastructure, and it is our hope that this commission will help us in the Congress to prioritize those needs with respect to the vulnerabilities of the infrastructure and the protection of that infrastructure.

We depend on the Science and Technology Directorate to develop state-of-the-art technology to protect our citizens and critical infrastructure from terrorist attacks. Timely and accurate intelligence is always our best defense against the terror threat. However, when we have no actionable intelligence, we must rely on the skill of our personnel and the effectiveness of our technology in order to detect, deter, and defend against the terrorist enemy. The better technology we develop and deploy, the stronger, therefore, our homeland security. We believe this legislation will help provide the necessary technology tools to bolster our homeland defenses.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to highlight a very important provision in this bill that is critical to both Ranking Member KING and the security of New York City, as well as to our Nation as a whole. It is the authorization and expansion of the Securing the Cities program.

Securing the Cities is a vital Homeland Security program to help prevent terrorist attacks in major cities using nuclear radiological weapons such as a dirty bomb. The program has enabled the establishment of a network ring of radiological detectors on highways, toll plazas, bridges, tunnels, and waterways leading into and out of New York City, which, as we know, is perhaps the top terrorist target for al Qaeda and affiliated terrorist organizations.

□ 1620

The detonation of a nuclear or dirty bomb in the New York City Tri-State area or any other major metropolitan area would inflict serious damage to our country's economy in addition to the terrible tragedy of the human lives involved, and it would be much like the 9/11 attacks.

Securing the Cities is a successful program that can and should be replicated in other areas around the country. That's why language in this bill would expand the program to at least two additional high-risk cities where these capabilities are most needed, therefore leveraging what we already have learned about building defenses against nuclear and radiological weapons in New York City to erect similar security perimeters in and around other cities.

I want to remind our colleagues that the threat of nuclear or radiological terrorism is real. It's not just an academic exercise. It's not just some fiction. It is real. The Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission, the WMD Commission, warned in 2008 that an attack using a weapon of mass destruction was likely to happen somewhere in the world by 2013. Commissioners Graham and Talent, appearing before our committee on April 21 of this year, repeated this warning.

The President's National Security Strategy that was released earlier this year concluded this: ''The American people face no greater or more urgent danger than a terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon. The potential of nuclear or radiological terrorism is a nightmare scenario that we must guard against with every available capability and resource. We believe that authorizing and expanding Securing the Cities will help protect our country, not just New York City but the entire country, from such a danger.''

Now, let me close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that while I'm pleased we are considering this bill today, I do believe that the House should be considering a comprehensive authorization bill for the Department of Homeland Security. This House has not done so since 2007, with one of the reasons being that we, frankly, have too many committees and subcommittees having jurisdiction over homeland security.

The 9/11 Commission recommended, in 2004, that ''Congress should create a single, principal point of oversight review for homeland security.'' Unfortunately, the current jurisdictional web of congressional oversight under the Department of Homeland Security results in conflicting guidance to the Department and is a serious drain on its time and resources. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't say this as a Republican criticizing the majority in the House. This was true when the Republicans were in control. It is the remaining recommendation by the 9/11 Commission that has not been enacted into law here by this House.

The chairman and the vice chairman of the 9/11 Commission, Governor Kean and Congressman Hamilton, testified that this jurisdictional maze is unworkable, and they said it could make our country less safe. Those are strong words, but they repeated them in their testimony before our committee.

I hope that we can streamline congressional jurisdiction moving forward so that Congress can enact a comprehensive authorization bill for the Department, which, I say, has not happened since its creation in 2003. The failure to do so jeopardizes our ability to ensure that our Nation's homeland security policies are as robust as they need to be to meet the evolving nature of terrorism.

I want to again thank Chairman THOMPSON, Chairwoman CLARKE, and Ranking Member KING for all their help in crafting a very good bipartisan bill that strengthens our homeland security capabilities, and I would, of course, urge all my colleagues to support passage of the bill.

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

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, the subcommittee chairwoman of the Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection Committee of Homeland Security, Ms. JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentlelady who chairs the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity and has done an excellent job. I thank the ranking member that shares that responsibility with her, Mr. LUNGREN.

I rise today to congratulate these members for the Homeland Security Science and Technology Authorization Act of 2010 and to make the point that under Chairman THOMPSON we have, in actuality, passed more authorization bills on our committee, and particularly those that relate to subcommittees. The Committee on Transportation Security has passed H.R. 2200 and is waiting for action in the Senate.

I join my friend from California and indicate that homeland security is not a partisan issue; it is a bipartisan issue, as he has indicated. And I join him in wondering when we can adhere to the 9/11 Commission report and get a more single-focused review of homeland security in the Homeland Security Committee. I hope that maybe we will have the opportunity to work in a bipartisan manner, to work with the other body, and to really accomplish the idea of maintaining homeland security issues in the Homeland Security committees, both in the House and the Senate.

This legislation shows what our committee can do under the leadership of Chairwoman CLARKE and Ranking Member LUNGREN to be able to establish a roadmap for Science and Technology. After listening to the oversight findings of the Committee on Homeland Security, the GAO, and the DHS Inspector General, H.R. 4842 requires Science and Technology to establish requirements for how basic and applied homeland security research is identified, prioritized, funded, passed, and evaluated, and emphasizes the need to prioritize research around risk.

We all know that Science and Technology really is the backbone of our homeland security efforts. It is to keep us ahead of the terrorists who want to do us harm. H.R. 4852 authorizes the establishment of a more quasi-autonomous Testing, Evaluations and Standards Division within S&T to help ensure that technology is properly evaluated.

Additionally, in an effort to foster better collaboration between S&T and the private sector firms—most especially small firms—with promising homeland security technologies, H.R.

4842 authorizes the Office of Public-Private Partnerships. I want to congratulate the chairwoman and the ranking member on this issue.

Before my committee, the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, many times small businesses will come before us and really act in angst about the fact that their new technology is languishing at the Department of Homeland Security. Now we have, because of this legislation, the Rapid Review Division that is in charge of establishing an accessible, streamlined system to conduct timely reviews of unsolicited technology proposals in order to more effectively harness the ingenuity of the American private sector in an area where DHS continues to struggle. It is important that we do that.

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

Ms. CLARKE. I yield an additional 2 minutes to Ms. JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentlelady for her courtesy.

To be able to help our small businesses is a leap forward, and I congratulate them for this innovative division that will help move these technologies forward. I hope that small businesses are listening. They now have a rapid ear under Science and Technology to listen to them in the Department of Homeland Security.

I am very excited about handheld detectors for the Department of Homeland Security to do rapid detection of biological threats at ports and airports and the dual-use terrorist risks of synthetic genomics.

I think it is also important that we have enhancements to unmanned aerial surveillance technology for safe and effective deployment for border and maritime missions. We had a hearing on this just recently. Many of us questioned the safety or the results-oriented work of that unmanned aerial surveillance being used at the border. We need to have those results, and I believe that this legislation will help us do so.

So this is a great step forward, in addition to the authorization of $20 million for the Securing the Cities program for fiscal year 2011 and directs DNDO, in fiscal year 2012, to add at least two new cities, based on risk, to this radiation detection program in operation in New York City. We all know that the threat of nuclear attacks as a homeland security threat is evident, and radiation detection is crucial for us to be sure that we have a number of elements to assess the potential of that kind of threat.

This legislation takes advantage of the concerns we all have of making sure our science and technology is an integral part of defending the homeland. I believe this legislation, H.R. 4842, takes a giant leap forward in being part of the work that we do for defending this Nation, the work that is done by this committee, led by Chairman THOMPSON and Ranking Member KING, and of course the work of this subcommittee, Chairwoman CLARKE and Ranking Member LUNGREN. I thank them for their work and ask my colleagues to support this legislation, H.R. 4842.

H.R. 4842, the "Homeland Security Science and Technology Authorization Act of 2010" reauthorizes the Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) Science and Technology Directorate (S&T) and Domestic Nuclear Detection Office (DNDO) through 2012, and puts these two DHS components on a path to greater effectiveness and efficiency by requiring strategic plans, milestones, and accountability systems.

This bipartisan legislation was introduced by the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity, Science and Technology Chairwoman YVETTE CLARKE and Ranking Member DAN LUNGREN.

In advance of floor consideration, the Committees on Homeland Security and Science and Technology collaborated extensively on this legislation and worked together to deliver a bill with the bipartisan support of both committees.

Since 2003, S&T has been responsible for developing technologies to address homeland security capability gaps, as identified by DHS and its operational components—Customs and Border Protection (CBP), the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), Infrastructure Protection (IP), and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

DNDO was established in 2006 to develop detection technologies for nuclear and radiological devices—a high-consequence terrorist threat.

H.R. 4842 takes a two-layered approach to authorizing S&T and DNDO: an overarching approach aimed at creating more accountability and effective management of each component; and a more targeted approach focused on specific programs and activities.

In response to oversight findings of the Committee on Homeland Security, the Government Accountability Office, and the DHS Inspector General, H.R. 4842 requires S&T to establish requirements for how basic and applied homeland security research is identified, prioritized, funded, tasked, and evaluated and emphasizes the need to prioritize research around risk.

H.R. 4842 authorizes the establishment of a more quasi-autonomous Testing, Evaluations and Standards Division within S&T to help ensure that technology is properly evaluated.

Additionally, in an effort to foster better collaboration between S&T and private sector firms—most especially small firms—with promising homeland security technologies, H.R. 4842 authorizes the Office of Public-Private Partnerships. Within this office, the Rapid Review Division is charge with establishing an accessible, streamlined system to conduct timely reviews of unsolicited technology proposals in order to more effectively harness the ingenuity of the American private sector, an area where DHS continues to struggle.

With respect to specific programs, H.R. 4842 directs S&T to work towards giving DHS new tools to address the threat of terrorism and enhance homeland security by conducting researching and development regarding: Mobile biometric technologies for deployment at the border (Sec. 807), technology to enhance detection of border tunnels (Sec.804), and utilization of global positioning satellite systems for detection of unauthorized border crossings (Sec. 806);

Hand-held detectors for DHS to do rapid detection of biological threats at ports and airports (Sec. 411) and the dual-use terrorist risks of synthetic genomics (Sec. 407);

Maritime domain awareness enhancements (Sec. 410), technologies to improve the security of underwater public transportation tunnels against explosives (Sec. 408), and technologies to mitigate the threat of small vessel attack (Sec. 419);

Cyber compromises to federally-owned networks and devices that are essential to the reliable operation of critical infrastructure (Sec. 406);

Enhancements to unmanned aerial surveillance technology for safe and effective deployment for border and maritime missions (Sec. 803); and

Technologies to strengthen document security and authentication (Sec. 805).

H.R. 4842 requires S&T to give particular attention to the border security mission. Specifically, the Homeland Security Science and Technology Authorization Act of 2010 authorizes S&T, in coordination with CBP, to pursue research and development to improve effective control of the international land borders of the United States within 5 years (Sec. 409).

In addition to the S&T directorate, H.R. 4842 reauthorizes the DNDO.

Important provisions regarding this vital agency include:

Language to codify in statute the movement of basic and transformational nuclear and radiological research and development activities to S&T;

Requirements for strategic planning, milestones, and accountability in place at DNDO that are parallel to the requirements for S&T;

Authorization of $20 million for the Securing the Cities program for fiscal year 2011 and directs DNDO, in fiscal year 2012, to add at least two new cities, based on risk, to this radiation detection program in operation in New York City. (The House approved H.R. 2611, which authorized the Securing the Cities program on January 20, 2010.)

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

S&T—$1.12 billion for fiscal year 2011 ($12 million over the President's request to restore funding for the University Programs) and $1.15 billion for fiscal year 2012 (3% increase over the 2011 level).

DNDO—$305.8 million for fiscal year 2011 (President's request) and $315 million for fiscal year 2012 (3% increase over 2011 level).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU), who is a leader on the Science and Technology Committee, who worked very closely with our committee to make this legislation a reality. We want to thank him for his leadership in that regard.

□ 1630

Mr. WU. I thank the gentlewoman for her kind comments.

I rise in support of the Homeland Security Science and Technology Authorization Act of 2010, which reauthorizes

the activities of the Science and Technology Directorate and the DNDO at the Department of Homeland Security.

As the chair of the Science and Technology Committee's Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation, I very much appreciate the important role that technology plays in empowering DHS to carry out its very, very important mission. The Science and Technology Directorate is responsible for ensuring that those who are responsible for keeping us safe have the best tools and the most up-to-date technologies to get their job done.

Over the last year and a half, my subcommittee, the Technology and Innovation Subcommittee, has held multiple hearings on the work being carried out by the Science and Technology Directorate and the DNDO. Through these hearings, we were able to identify critical areas where the directorate could use new tools or, in some cases, new direction to help it achieve its mission effectively and efficiently.

I look forward to working with the Homeland Security Committee to address some of the issues that arose during my subcommittee's hearings, particularly those relating to the public's acceptance of new technologies.

For example, I remain very concerned about TSA's decision to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to deploy full-body scanners in airports across the country without fully understanding the potential reluctance of the public to accept these technologies. This research into acceptance should be done before purchase to avoid wasting taxpayer money.

I want to thank Chairman THOMPSON, Chairwoman CLARKE, Ranking Member KING, and Ranking Member LUNGREN for their work on this important legislation.

I am pleased that our committees were able to work together over the last couple of months to craft this important bipartisan legislation, and I hope that this reauthorization bill will improve the way the Department sets priorities for its research and involves the end users of equipment to ensure that new technology is actually deployable and usable in the field. This has been a gaping shortfall to date.

The reauthorization bill we are considering today takes important steps forward in improving the research and development conducted by DHS, and I look forward to having the Science and Technology Committee work with the chairwoman's subcommittee in exercising our oversight and in continuing to improve the vital research capacity at the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a very valuable member of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AUSTRIA).

Mr. AUSTRIA. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4842, the Homeland Security Science and Technology Authorization Act of 2010. This bipartisan legislation is the first authorization bill for the Science and Technology Directorate of the Department of Homeland Security since the Department was created in 2002.

The Science and Technology Directorate is a critical component within the Department of Homeland Security as it works in collaboration with national laboratories, universities and other public and private entities to develop the technologies needed to address our Nation's security needs.

The Homeland Security Committee included an important amendment to this bill. It would add ''medical readiness and community resiliency for health care critical infrastructure'' to the existing criteria for the university-based Homeland Security Centers of Excellence program. In bringing together leading experts and researchers in university-based settings, the Centers of Excellence program has been successful in facilitating the development of homeland security solutions.

While this program does a good job in strengthening the use of technology and the role of our first responders, such as law enforcement officers, firefighters and EMTs, when it comes to recovering from and responding to a man-made or natural disaster, it currently lacks a distinct focus on medical readiness and community resiliency for existing health care critical infrastructure.

First responders and medical care providers are critical to our Nation's ability to recover from a terrorist attack or from a natural disaster, and they deserve our support and the support of the Department of Homeland Security. In adding medical readiness to the criteria for the university-based Homeland Security Centers of Excellence program, this gap will be addressed, further advancing our country's homeland security initiatives.

Again, I strongly support this important and much needed piece of legislation.

I would like to thank Chairwoman CLARKE and Ranking Member LUNGREN for their hard work as well as Chairman THOMPSON and Ranking Member KING.

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say in my remaining time that I hope that this is a unanimous vote in support of this legislation. It gives a framework to the S&T directorate, and it is an assertion of the proper jurisdiction of this committee and of this House, and I do believe this moves us in the right direction.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important Homeland Security legislation. This legislation authorizes a program that has been very instrumental in keeping the City of New York and its environs safe, and that is securing the city. This initiative has proven to be an effective tool, and we are looking forward to a whole range of other important R&D programs to come forth as a result of this reauthorization. Securing the city should be expanded and will be expanded through this authorization to other environs throughout this Nation that could use that level of security through our efforts, as has been the case with securing the cities.

So I am urging my colleagues, once again, to make sure that this authorization passes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4842, the ''Homeland Security Science and Technology Authorization Act of 2010.''

This bill authorizes the Department of Homeland Security's Science and Technology Directorate, S&T, and Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, DNDO, through fiscal year 2012.

Introduced by Representatives YVETTE CLARKE and DAN LUNGREN—the Chairwoman and Ranking Member of the Committee's Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity, and Science and Technology Subcommittee—H.R. 4842 seeks to strengthen our homeland security by ensuring more effective research, development, testing, and evaluation activities.

As Chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, I strongly believe that recurring authorizations are important mechanisms to effectuate oversight findings and help steer an agency on the right course.

This legislation represents the first reauthorization of S&T—which was authorized in 2002—and DNDO—which was established in 2006.

Taking into account the Committee's extensive oversight findings as well as findings of GAO, the Inspector General, and the National Academy of Sciences, H.R. 4842 directs DHS to put robust management, administration, and programmatic systems in place at S&T and DNDO.

Specifically, to foster greater alignment between S&T research and the needs of DHS' operational components—such as TSA, CBP, and the Coast Guard—H.R. 4842 directs the establishment of rigorous processes within S&T for identifying, prioritizing, and setting requirements for research opportunities.

The bill also recognizes that, in order to conduct the best research, we need the best people.

H.R. 4842 contains advanced professional development provisions and creates fellowship opportunities for new scientists and engineers to bring their skills to DHS.

H.R. 4842 also takes into account that innovation is often fueled by the private sector and that the challenging and evolving nature of the terrorist threat demands closer collaboration between S&T and the private sector.

Accordingly, in an effort to improve collaboration between S&T and the private sector, H.R. 4842 authorizes an office of Public-Private Partnerships and, within the office, establishes a ''Rapid Review Division'' to evaluate technological proposals and provide feedback within 60 days.

A common concern that I hear from firms with novel homeland security technologies is

that they do not know who to contact at S&T to pursue research opportunities and that they cannot seem to get anyone at S&T to look at their technologies.

Establishment of this new review division will go a long way to improving collaboration and innovation.

Further, H.R. 4842 directs DHS to evaluate whether establishing a venture capital program—modeled after the Defense Department's InQtel program—could facilitate swifter development of homeland security technologies.

H.R. 4842 also authorizes several specific programmatic areas for research including: mobile biometric technologies for deployment at the border; enhanced detection of border tunnels; hand-held detectors for DHS to do rapid detection of biological threats at ports and airports; technologies to mitigate the threat of small vessel attack; research to assess the extent of cyber compromises to federally-owned networks and devices; and enhancements to unmanned aerial surveillance technology for safe and effective deployment for border and maritime missions.

From the very beginning, H.R. 4842 was developed in an open, collegial, and bipartisan manner.

The Full Committee favorably reported H.R. 4842—which authorizes $2.3 billion to S&T and $620 million to DNDO through 2012—by a unanimous vote of "26 to 0".

H.R. 4842 also reflects collaboration between my Committee and the Committee on Science and Technology.

I would like to thank Chairman BART GORDON and Ranking Member RALPH HALL for their contributions to the bill and for working with us to get H.R. 4842 to the floor today.

I think our process has proven that the barriers of partisanship and jurisdiction can be overcome when we put the good of the country first.

Finally, I would like to thank Under Secretary for Science and Technology Tara O'Toole, and the Acting Director of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office Bill Hagan, as well as the dozens of stakeholders who took the time to give their input, as we worked through the process of developing this bill.

Again, I congratulate Representatives CLARKE and LUNGREN on their solid work steering this important homeland security bill and urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4842.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4842, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SEPTEMBER 11 MEMORIAL & MUSEUM COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL ACT OF 2010

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4684) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to strike medals in commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States and the establishment of the National September 11 Memorial & Museum at the World Trade Center, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4684

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National September 11 Memorial & Museum Commemorative Medal Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. STRIKING AND DESIGN OF MEDALS.

(a) STRIKING OF MEDALS.—In commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States and the establishment of the National September 11 Memorial & Museum at the World Trade Center, the Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall strike and make available for sale not more than 2,000,000 silver medals, each of which shall contain 1 ounce of silver.

(b) DESIGN REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The design of the medals struck under this Act shall be emblematic of the courage, sacrifice, and strength of those individuals who perished in the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the bravery of those who risked their lives to save others that day, and the endurance, resilience, and hope of those who survived.

(2) INSCRIPTIONS.—On each medal struck under this Act, there shall be—

(A) an inscription of the years "2001–2011"; and

(B) an inscription of the words "Always Remember".

(c) SELECTION.—The design for the medals struck under this Act shall be—

(1) selected by the Secretary, after consultation with the National September 11 Memorial & Museum at the World Trade Center and the Commission of Fine Arts; and

(2) reviewed by the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee.

SEC. 3. ISSUANCE OF MEDALS.

(a) QUALITY OF MEDALS.—The medals struck under this Act shall be made available for sale in the quality comparable to proof coins.

(b) MINT FACILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Only 2 facilities of the United States Mint may be used to strike medals under this Act.

(2) USE OF THE UNITED STATES MINTS AT WEST POINT, NEW YORK, AND PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA.—It is the sense of Congress that, to the extent possible, approximately one-half of the medals to be struck under this Act should be struck at the United States Mint at West Point, New York, and approximately one-half struck at the United States Mint at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

(c) DATE OF ISSUANCE.—The Secretary may make the medals available for sale under this Act beginning on January 1, 2011.

(d) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—No medals shall be struck under this Act after December 31, 2012.

SEC. 4. NUMISMATIC ITEMS.

For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 5. NATIONAL MEDALS.

The medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 6. SALE OF MEDALS.

(a) SALES PRICE.—The medals made available for sale under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

(1) the cost of designing and selling such medals (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping); and

(2) the surcharge provided in section 7 with respect to such medals.

(b) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the medals at a reasonable discount.

(c) INTRODUCTORY ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept introductory orders for medals made available for sale under this Act.

(2) DISCOUNT.—Sale prices with respect to introductory orders under paragraph (1) shall be made at a reasonable discount.

SEC. 7. SURCHARGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—All sales of medals made available for sale under this Act shall include a surcharge of $10 per medal.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to section 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of medals under this Act shall be paid to the National September 11 Memorial & Museum at the World Trade Center to support the operations and maintenance of the National September 11 Memorial & Museum at the World Trade Center following its completion.

(c) AUDITS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall have the right to examine such books, records, documents, and other data of the National September 11 Memorial & Museum at the World Trade Center as may be related to the expenditures of amounts paid under subsection (b).

SEC. 8. BUDGET 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 Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert any additional material that they wish to insert on this issue.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to commend my colleague from New York (Mr. NADLER) for his leadership on this bill and on so many other issues and for working selflessly to help the survivors and the residents and to help the city recover from 9/11. This is an example of another one of his efforts to help the city, to help our country, and to help us remember the terrible events of 9/11.

The monumental events in a nation's life have always warranted memorialization. The events of 9/11/2001 are no different.

□ 1640

Those who died on that day, just going about their lives, just going to work that day, as we went to work today, they truly deserve to be honored forever as heroes and heroines.

We know that we lost almost 3,000 lives on 9/11, but many thousands more lost their health. Those who came to the aid of those at the sites of the attack also deserve to be honored and remembered.

And each of us in this body who lived through that day, each of us in this country who lived through that day, we each have vivid memories of our own seared in our minds, which deserve recognition as well.

Thus, it is very fitting that, as we approach the ninth anniversary of the 9/11 attacks, we offer a means to honor the dead, and our memories, and the victims, and the heroes, and the heroines, and the responders, and the residents, with H.R. 4684, the National September 11 Memorial & Museum Commemorative Medal Act.

This bill authorizes the U.S. Mint to strike a commemorative medal in honor of the 10th anniversary of 9/11 next year, the price of which will include a $10 donation to support operations and maintenance of the National September 11 Memorial & Museum at the World Trade Center site, with a design which will include the inscription, and I quote, ''Always Remember.''

This medal will allow all Americans and, indeed, anyone around the world, an opportunity to remember and to honor the thousands of men, women and children who died on that horrible day.

This medal also supports the mission of the National September 11 Memorial & Museum, to ''Recognize the endurance of those who survived, the courage of those who risked their lives to save others, and the compassion of all who supported us during our darkest hour.''

The Memorial & Museum will demonstrate the consequences of terrorism on individual lives and its impact on communities at the local, national and international levels. The museum will attest to the triumph of human dignity over human depravity, and it will affirm an unwavering commitment to the fundamental value of human life.

Mr. Speaker, those not yet born cannot understand in the same way that we do the events of that day, so we who do understand must establish a means by which generations to come may, in their own way, note and remember what our generation went through. The National September 11 Memorial & Museum Commemorative Medal Act provides this means, this opportunity.

I am proud to recognize my fellow New Yorker and colleague, JERROLD NADLER, who is the chief sponsor of this bill, and I yield to him such time as he may consume.

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support, and I want to congratulate my colleague from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for the incredible amount of work she has put in over the years, with me and with others, on trying to improve the lives of those who survived September 11. And hopefully, one of the main products of that work will be on the floor next week on the health care legislation.

But today I rise in support of H.R. 4684, the National September 11 Memorial & Museum Commemorative Medal Act. Next year our Nation will mark the 10th anniversary of the September 11 attacks. It will have been 10 years since the most lethal terrorist attack ever committed on U.S. soil, when thousands lost their lives as planes were turned into missiles in the skies over New York, Pennsylvania, and right here in Washington, D.C.

In the years that have followed, that day's events have been transformed from searing headlines to indelible history. To pay tribute to those who lost their lives and to those still suffering because of the attacks of 9/11, I have introduced this bill, the National September 11 Memorial & Museum Commemorative Medal Act.

This bill will authorize the U.S. Mint to strike up to 2 million silver medals commemorating the 10th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks. The medals will be inscribed with the phrase ''Always Remember'' with the final design to be selected by the Treasury Secretary, in consultation with the National September 11 Memorial & Museum.

A surcharge of $10 on the sale of each medal will go directly to support the operations and maintenance of the National September 11 Memorial & Museum at the World Trade Center following the completion of the construction of the museum. These funds will help to preserve the history of 9/11 so that posterity will long remember the bravery and sacrifices of that day.

Issuing a 9/11 commemorative medal is a simple but poignant way to mark the 10th anniversary of the attacks on our Nation, while simultaneously supporting the World Trade Center Memorial.

I want to thank the more than 300 Members of the House from both parties who have signed onto this bill as cosponsors. I want to extend my special appreciation for the support given by Chairman FRANK and Ranking Member BACHUS as this bill passed through the Financial Services Committee. I also want to thank the leadership of the House for bringing this bill to the floor.

This medal will be a tribute to the terrible loss that we experienced on 9/11. And to truly honor those still suffering from the 9/11 attacks, we must finally provide them with the health care and compensation that their courage and sacrifice deserves.

After the towers fell on 9/11, thousands of firefighters, police officers, paramedics and volunteers from all across the country came to Ground Zero to search for survivors and to begin the rebuilding process. Once there, they, along with thousands of community members, students and area workers, were exposed to toxic dust from the collapsed towers that filled their lungs and, in many cases, caused lasting health problems.

It is our moral obligation to care for those who still bear the physical scars from this national tragedy. And, along with Mrs. MALONEY, we are working with the leadership to bring the 9/11 Health and Compensation Act to the floor, hopefully, next week. That bill is essential because the best way to truly pay our respect to the victims and heroes of 9/11 is with the proper health care and compensation for their 9/11-related injuries.

But today, let us honor those whose lives were lost in the attacks of 2001, and commit to preserving the memory of 9/11 for future generations. With this bill, let us reaffirm that no matter the passage of time, we will never forget.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for his statement and for his leadership. I also thank my good friend and colleague on the other side of the aisle, CHRISTOPHER LEE. This has been a strong bipartisan effort, and I congratulate him on his leadership in passing this important bill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, July 19, 2010.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
Chairman, Financial Services Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FRANK: I am writing regarding H.R. 4684, a bill requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to strike medals in commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States and the establishment of the National September 11 Memorial & Museum at the World Trade Center.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means maintains jurisdiction over bills that raise revenue. H.R. 4684 contains a provision that establishes a surcharge for the sale of commemorative medals that are minted under the bill, and thus falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

However, as part of our ongoing understanding regarding commemorative medals and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action. This is being done with the understanding that it 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 would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 4684, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Record.

Sincerely,

SANDER M. LEVIN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, July 19, 2010.

Hon. SANDER M. LEVIN,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing in response to your letter regarding H.R. 4684, a bill requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to strike medals in commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States and the establishment of the National September 11th Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center. This bill was introduced in the House and referred to the Committee on Financial Services on February 24, 2010. It is my understanding that this bill will be scheduled for floor consideration shortly.

I wish to confirm our mutual understanding on this bill. As you know, section 7 of the bill establishes a surcharge for the sale of commemorative medals that are minted under the bill. I acknowledge your committee's jurisdictional interest in such surcharges as revenue matters. However, I appreciate your willingness to forego committee action on H.R. 4684 in order to allow the bill to come to the floor expeditiously. I agree that your decision to forego further action on this bill will not prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation. I would support your request for conferees on those provisions within your jurisdiction should this bill be the subject of a House-Senate conference.

I will include this exchange of letters in the Congressional Record when this bill is considered by the House. Thank you again for your assistance.

BARNEY FRANK,
Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4684, the National September 11 Memorial & Museum Commemorative Medal Act.

No one can forget the September morning, where we were, the way we felt, what we feared. As the tragedy unfolded, all of us wondered what it meant for the future.

The attacks of September 11 occurred during a time of relative tranquility for this Nation. The country had entered a new decade, excited about the boundless opportunities that lay ahead of the new century and confident it would realize the potential of its people.

9/11 shook that confidence. The downed planes and the burning buildings and the shattered lives and families showed us just how vulnerable we truly were. At that moment the paths of prosperity and progress, of safety and liberty that our Nation had so surely followed seemed in jeopardy.

□ 1650

But more telling than that day was not how vulnerable we felt when the terrorists struck, but more so how resolute we were in our response and in the comforting arms extended to help our fellow citizens. First responders rushed to the scene. Upon seeing the devastation before them, these men and women rushed into the buildings knowing their lives were in danger. They put aside their personal safety and rushed to the aid of those in need. They epitomized the bravery and resilience that has been the foundation of this Nation since its inception, the compassion and the will that built the United States into truly what it is today.

As Americans and the world witnessed the response, it became clear that although the attacks would change the decisions and circumstances of our Nation, it would not change our resolve. Alongside the tragedy of that day, we watched America's greatness as ordinary citizens showed their capacity, America's capacity, in meeting challenges knows no bounds.

This bill, which enjoys the support of over 300 cosponsors and the entire New York delegation, asks us to remember the individuals who perished that fateful day. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to make available 2 million silver medals designed to be emblematic of the courage, sacrifice, and strength of those individuals who died in the terrorist attacks and the bravery of those who risked their lives to save others that day.

These medals will be sold with a $10 surcharge that will be paid to the National September 11 Memorial Museum at the World Trade Center. All of this will be accomplished at no cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today in remembrance of those who lost their lives on September 11. They will never be forgotten.

I commend my colleague from New York (Mr. NADLER), the chief sponsor of this measure, for his commitment to getting this issue before the House today. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for his statement, and I thank my colleague Mr. NADLER for his hard work in securing the 300 cosponsors. The World Trade Center site and museum will be in the district that he is honored to represent. And he has continued to be an outstanding, forceful spokesperson, as Mr. LEE has, in support of not only the suffering of those who lost their lives, but for the men and women who lost their health and who are in dire need of health care and support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank my colleagues in this Chamber. I thank Americans across this country.

On 9/11 many people remember the attack, but they do not remember that this was also one of the greatest rescue efforts in history. I was at the site on September 12, and they were estimating that 25,000 Americans perished. But because of the brave work of volunteers, of police and fire, of responders, many, many lives were saved. Many people on that day lost their lives, but more people lost their health.

As we know in this body, this was a response not only from New York, but 432 different congressional districts sent first responders, volunteers, help. They worked at the pile, they worked at the site, and they helped America recover. These men and women were there for us. We need to be there for them. That's why this bill is so important. I urge all of my colleagues to collectively vote and support it. I congratulate Mr. NADLER and Mr. LEE for their leadership in moving this to the floor for a vote.

I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4684, which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to create medals to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 4684, and I thank my colleague, Congressman NADLER for introducing this legislation.

September 11, 2001 was a day that changed America. Everyone remembers the events that unfolded that day, when we put differences aside and came together united and determined to respond to the unprovoked attack on our country.

As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I have worked with my colleagues to ensure that another terrorist attack like 9/11 never again occurs on our soil. This committee was formed in response to the events that occurred on that day. We must continue to vigilantly defend our country against potential threats.

Mr. Speaker, there were so many brave and courageous acts that occurred on September 11, 2001. The creation of these medals is a token of our appreciation to those individuals who put their lives on the line to save others. It also serves as a reminder of those who lost their lives on 9/11. It is especially appropriate that the medals will be inscribed with the words ''always remember'' since the medals will help support the operations and maintenance of the National September 11 Memorial & Museum at the World Trade Center.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4684, which honors and remembers the courage and sacrifice of those who perished in the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. The creation of these medals serves as a tribute to them, and also commemorates the brave men and women who risked their lives to save countless others. These medals remind us of the resilience of the people who live in our great country.

Mrs. MALONEY. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4684, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOYCE ROGERS POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5341) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Orndorf Drive in Brighton, Michigan, as the ''Joyce Rogers Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5341

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

SECTION 1. JOYCE ROGERS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Orndorf Drive in Brighton, Michigan, shall be known and designated as the ''Joyce Rogers Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Joyce Rogers Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

On behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to present H.R. 5341 for consideration. This measure designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Orndorf Drive in Brighton, Michigan, as the Joyce Rogers Post Office Building.

H.R. 5341 was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. JOHN DINGELL, on May 19, 2010. It was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which waived consideration of the measure to expedite its consideration to the floor today. It enjoys the support of the entire Michigan delegation to the House.

Joyce A. Rogers was born March 16, 1931, in Birmingham, Alabama, and passed away at her Brighton, Michigan, home on November 4, 2009, at the age of 78. Joyce Rogers was married to John Rogers for 57 years, and was the mother of five sons, including Michigan State Representative Bill Rogers, Major General James Rogers of the United States, and Congressman MIKE ROGERS.

Beyond her devotion to her family, Joyce Rogers was also a dedicated public servant who worked tirelessly to improve the Brighton community, serving an integral role in the economic development of the Brighton business community during the 1980s and 1990s.

She was an active member of the Livingston County Board of Commissioners from 1985 to 1992, and completed her public service career as executive director of the Greater Brighton Area Chamber of Commerce. Through her efforts, Brighton was able to transform into a thriving business community, attracting new residents and customers to the area. She is especially remembered as a tireless advocate for small businesses and a mentor to many women in the Brighton business community.

In closing, she has left a lasting impression on the Brighton community as well as a legacy which demonstrates the importance of public service. I therefore urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 5341, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Orndorf Drive in Brighton, Michigan, as the Joyce Rogers Post Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting and proper that we name this Post Office in Brighton for Joyce Rogers, a woman who fought day and night, day in and day out to promote business development and spur economic growth in and around Brighton, Michigan.

Known by many as the queen bee and matriarch of Brighton, Joyce Rogers was born in Birmingham, Alabama, in 1931. Mrs. Rogers and her husband, John Rogers, moved to Brighton in 1968. Within a few years of her relocation to Brighton, Mrs. Rogers became an executive director of the Greater Brighton Area Chamber of Commerce. When Mrs. Rogers took over the fledgling organization back in 1972, it consisted of roughly 50 members. Remarkably today, the chamber boosts well over 1,000 members. And under her stewardship, the chamber embarked on an ambitious journey to put Brighton on the map. The economic expansion that has followed in and around the Brighton area is truly remarkable and can be attributed to the leadership and perseverance of Mrs. Rogers.

For her tireless efforts, Mrs. Rogers was named the Most Powerful Person in Livingston County in 1996, and fittingly the Chamber of Commerce building has been named the Joyce A. Rogers Business Center. Aside from being executive director of the Chamber of Commerce, Mrs. Rogers also served in various other local organizations, including the Livingston County Board of Commissioners, the City of Brighton Downtown Development Authority, and the Livingston County Economic Development Council.

In 2001 Mrs. Rogers' health began to decline. In that year, she underwent open heart surgery. The following year she decided to step down from the chamber after three decades as the executive director. Sadly, on November 4, 2009, Mrs. Rogers lost her long battle with a chronic illness and passed away at the age of 78. She is survived by her husband of 57 years and her five sons.

The legacy left behind by Mrs. Rogers is not only marked by the economic development seen around Brighton, but also in the family that survives her, a family that, like their mother, is truly dedicated to public service. In fact, her youngest son, MIKE, is a colleague of ours here in the House of Representatives. It is truly a great privilege to have the opportunity to speak on the floor today to honor the mother of this distinguished colleague.

Aside from my colleague from Michigan, Mrs. Rogers' eldest son, Bill, served on the Livingston County Board of Commissioners and now represents Michigan's 66th district in the Michigan State House of Representatives. Another son, Jim Rogers, is a major general in the United States Army, making us all proud.

□ 1700

And still today her husband, John, is serving his community as the trustee of the Brighton Township Board of Trustees.

Mr. Speaker, it is proper that we pass this legislation to honor the memory of a true leader and public servant, Joyce Rogers. I urge all Members to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Michigan, MIKE ROGERS.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I would like to thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for her help and support, and I also want to thank Mr. DINGELL from Michigan. It's great to know that leadership and statesmanship is still alive in the people's House here in Washington, D.C.

You know, it is fitting, I think, that this great body, this great deliberative body stop along the way of its important business, its really world-changing business and Nation-changing business, to recognize that some of the greatest acts happen locally. The great things don't really happen here; they are just reflected here. And the great things do happen in communities like Brighton, Michigan, and every other State in this great Union. And today is really that day.

Very, very few times do you get to come to the floor and talk about some great community leader that you have such a personal relationship with, my mother. And this post office is being named, in short, for her great work in what is a great community in the great State of Michigan.

And I will tell you, nobody would be more, I think, shocked and embarrassed that we are doing this today than Joyce Rogers. As a matter of fact, she would often say that her greatest accomplishment was raising five boys and surviving. But she did more than

that. She got involved in the schools, in the local community. And her biggest accomplishment, I think, was the fact that she would talk to so many women and get them involved in small business and get them involved in politics and community service.

After her funeral service late last year, I can't tell you how many times people came up to me or one of my family members and talked with tears in their eyes about how she would take the time to sit them down as small business women and talk them through to a plan for success or offer them encouragement. One women said, I know she came to shop at my store three and four times. She must have bags of my staff. I know she didn't need any of it.

That's the kind of person she was. A kind of person where people of all stripes, of all political philosophies believe she made an impact on a community. And she certainly did that. I know she made an impact on five boys who are doing their best to do half as well as she did in life.

So, to this body, I thank you; to the Michigan delegation, for recognizing this wonderful woman, I thank you.

Ms. NORTON. May I commend the gentleman from Michigan for his honor to his mother, whom I'm sure would be particularly proud of him as he should be proud of what we do today in her name.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. NORTON. 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 District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5341.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. NORTON. 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.

CONGRATULATING SARATOGA RACE COURSE ON 142ND SEASON

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1513) congratulating the Saratoga Race Course as it celebrates its 142nd season, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1513

Whereas, July 23, 2010, marks the start of the Saratoga Race Course's 142nd season;

Whereas the Saratoga Race Course is the oldest continuously operating thoroughbred race track in the United States;

Whereas the Saratoga Race Course is the oldest organized sporting venue in the United States;

Whereas 2010 marks the 141st running of the Travers Stakes, the oldest major thoroughbred race in the United States;

Whereas horseracing enjoys a rich history whose traditions are beloved throughout the world;

Whereas the Saratoga Race Course welcomes an average of nearly 30,000 visitors per day throughout its race season and 1,000,000 visitors annually, tripling the population of Saratoga Springs each summer;

Whereas the Saratoga Race Course welcomes the best thoroughbreds from across the United States and from around the world;

Whereas the Saratoga Race Course has a total economic impact of approximately $200,000,000 throughout Saratoga County and the surrounding communities;

Whereas the Saratoga Race Course contributes more than 2,500 jobs to Saratoga Springs and the surrounding area as well as nearly 17,000 jobs in related fields;

Whereas Saratoga Springs is a top destination for tourists from around the world;

Whereas the Saratoga Race Course has been able to maintain its Victorian charm and original traditions; and

Whereas the Saratoga Race Course has been recognized by Sports Illustrated Magazine as one of the world's greatest sporting venues and has contributed to the town of Saratoga receiving the first ''Great American Place'' Award from American Heritage Magazine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the Saratoga Race Course as it celebrates its 142nd season; and

(2) recognizes the Saratoga Race Course's important place in horseracing history.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

On behalf of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, it is my privilege to rise in support of H. Res. 1513. This measure congratulates the Saratoga Race Course on its 142nd season. H. Res. 1513 was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from New York, Representative SCOTT MURPHY, on July 13, 2010. It was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which ordered it favorably by unanimous consent on July 15, 2010. The measure enjoys the support of 60 Members of the House.

The Saratoga Race Course was opened August 3, 1863, and it is the oldest organized sporting venue of any kind in the United States. The course is a top destination for tourists from all over the country and from all over the world. It now receives over 1 million visitors each year and supports thousands of jobs in Saratoga Springs and the surrounding communities.

Mr. Speaker, this venerable race course is one of the world's greatest sporting venues. It has continued many of its original traditions since its founding and has contributed to the town of Saratoga receiving the First Great American Place award from the American Heritage Magazine in 1997.

Let us now take the time to congratulate this historic race course on its 142nd season through the passage of this measure. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Bills brought before the House, the majority gets to direct which bills are brought up and which are not brought up, and with all due respect to Mr. MURPHY, a great Member of Congress, this is a wonderful race course—I know there are many Americans that enjoy horse racing—but candidly, I struggle to go through this and understand why on the floor of the House of Representatives that this seems to rise to the level of recognition.

We have so many problems and challenges facing this country, so many issues that we could and should be debating. We should be debating a budget, for instance, which is not being brought before this body. We should be talking about the debt and the deficit and those other things that are going to affect every Americans' life. And I recognize that there are times when we need to step up and recognize some truly worthy accomplishments, and we honor and name post offices and whatnot, but when it comes to the world of sport, I continue to voice my opposition that this is the time and the place to actually have a ''debate'' about whether or not the 142nd season is worthy of recognition in a resolution from the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure there are some young kids that are here. They're going to go back and talk about their time at the House of Representatives, and they're here in the audience. And they're going to go back and talk to their teachers and the teachers are going to ask, What did you talk about? Did you talk about the war on terror? Did you talk about the debt? Oh, no. They were honoring a race course. A race course. So it's terribly frustrating.

There is a way to honor and recognize, through Members of Congress, great accomplishments and a new racing season at a local race track, but, honestly, I just don't believe this is the way to do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1710

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to respond, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

If I had a dime for every trivial bill the minority has put on this floor, I could retire as a rich woman. This is not a trivial bill. This is the oldest racing course in the United States, a historic racing course that has been so recognized by the American Heritage Foundation. It ill-behooves the other side to trivialize a bill by a Member of this proportion. I know that my good friend on the other side would not like me to go through and call the roll on bills that would make us laugh. Nobody can think that this bill commemorating the oldest sporting venue in the United States would make us laugh. It ill-behooves us not to respect the bills each side puts up, particularly since the minority gets to put up an equal number of such bills that have been requested by their constituents, and we all ought to at least grant one another that privilege without demeaning it.

I'm pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY), who proudly sponsored the bill before us today, and I commend him for doing so.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I rise today to congratulate and commend the Saratoga Springs Race Course. In just 3 days, it will open its doors and embark on its 142nd consecutive season.

The Saratoga Race Course has a critical impact on our local community, contributing both its historic and economic value to upstate New York. Saratoga is the oldest continuously operating thoroughbred racetrack in the United States and the oldest organized sporting venue in the entire country.

The Graveyard of Champions, as Saratoga is so often known, has a rich history of competition. In 1973 Secretariat was defeated at Saratoga after winning the Triple Crown. But Secretariat was not the first to lose at Saratoga after coming in a heavy favorite. Others like Gallant Fox and Man o' War have also been bested by Saratoga at the Travers Stakes. Travers Stakes, the country's oldest major thoroughbred race, is held each year at the Saratoga summer meet and is arguably the most important and well-known thoroughbred event each summer.

Each year people from across the Nation and the world come to experience Saratoga's wonderful atmosphere and heart-stopping races. Perhaps that is why Saratoga has been recognized by Sports Illustrated as one of the world's great sports venues and has contributed to the town of Saratoga receiving the first ''Great American Place'' Award from American Heritage Magazine.

This past weekend an article in the Saratogian talked about the impact that each season has on the local economy and community. Shopkeepers, homemakers, hoteliers, and local restaurants all rely on the income generated from the Saratoga season to help promote and grow the economy, and it brings together the community so that they can celebrate this rich racing tradition.

The race course is one of the economic backbones not for only for Saratoga Springs, but for all of upstate New York and my entire district. Racing in Saratoga provides for more than 2,500 local jobs in the immediate community and 17,000 jobs in the surrounding communities. Each year over 30,000 visitors come each day to the racetrack and over 1 million visitors will visit annually. Racing will contribute more than $200 million annually to our local economy.

This year's season is extra long. We've added a few days, and it will be a 40-day season. That extra weekend will create even more revenue than usual and opportunities for tourists to come and see Saratoga's wonderful historic track and downtown.

Horse racing is the heart and soul of the Saratoga community, and I am proud to rise today to offer this resolution honoring the Saratoga Race Course and acknowledging the important place that it has in racing history, in our economy, and to join with my community and my colleagues here in congratulating Saratoga on opening its doors this Friday for another great season.

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

Again, Mr. Speaker, I voice my opposition. The idea, the notion that while there have been silly bills passed and offered by the minority, it's certainly not an argument to continue the status quo. I think the frustration of the American people is we're not dealing with the serious business. We're not offering a budget resolution. We're not debating appropriations bills. We're down here talking about racetracks. That's the frustration. You've got people at home right now watching on C–SPAN because they don't have a job, and we're here talking about race courses? Seriously?

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I did not hear the gentleman rise to voice the same opposition to a resolution that will be voted on in the next series of resolutions by a Member from his side of the aisle, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina; and it says congratulating the University of South Carolina Gamecocks on winning the 2010 NCAA Division. If you're going to rise because you think some bill shouldn't be on the floor, then you ought to rise all the time.

As for what we should be devoting our time to, both sides of the aisle give time to resolutions requested by their constituents, and we give equal time. That doesn't mean we don't give time to very important matters, and we have given very significant time to very important matters this session, which is why it is considered one of the most historic sessions of the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I do want to acknowledge the great work done in bringing to focus the importance of Saratoga and its race course and its season to the local economy. I commend my colleague SCOTT MURPHY, the Representative in the neighboring district. While he hosts the track in his district, I know the value to the entire region, to my district economically and certainly to his with this season. It is an important economic engine for the tourism economy. It strengthens our economy; and economic recovery is important, in whatever measure we can ascertain.

Today, I want to join my colleagues in celebration of Saratoga Race Course's 142nd season. Saratoga Race Course, located just outside the southern Adirondack region of New York State, is the oldest organized sporting venue in the country. Since 1863, Saratoga Race Course has been a summer destination enjoyed by many families, racing enthusiasts, and individuals from across this Nation and, indeed, around the world. The history in Saratoga Springs and at the track provide visitors with a window into the vibrant past of upstate New York.

Saratoga Race Course is also the home of the oldest major thoroughbred horse race in America, the Travers Stakes. The Travers Stakes, named after William R. Travers, the first president of the race course, has been exciting patrons since 1864. Travers Weekend, which is one of the most widely attended events at the track, attracts thousands of individuals and families to upstate New York.

Each year, that dynamic is felt vibrantly in the economy, and it showcases Saratoga's rich horse racing history. Today, racing enthusiasts who visit Saratoga Race Course are able to enjoy dozens of graded stakes races and thoroughbred races, in addition to the region's local cuisine and rich history and culture.

I applaud this important venue and the economic engine of upstate New York that it is for the beginning of yet another season of racing.

Again, I want to compliment and commend Representative MURPHY for his work on this commemorative resolution. It brings to focus the value added that is instilled into our regional economy with yet another season that will be falling upon us.

□ 1720

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

My colleagues here, these are good Members of Congress. My point is, we need to raise the bar and start doing some serious work around here. I would agree, this is a historic Congress, because we are doing nothing right now. We are doing nothing.

I would agree with you, I will stand here, and I will have the political guts

to vote against the resolution for the South Carolina recognition of the men's—I think it's the Men's College World Series.

It's ridiculous that we bring it up. I don't care if it's a Democrat, I don't care if it's a Republican. If it's in the world of sport, they get enough recognition.

And to cite this as, oh, it's important because Sports Illustrated recognized it, well, they have a swimsuit edition. I haven't seen a resolution on that yet, and I hope we never do. The people of the United States deserve better than to debate whether or not to recognize a racetrack on its 142nd anniversary.

We have got important business. We have troops that are in harm's way. We have yet to bring up a supplemental that the President is asking for.

We have not, since, I think it was 1974 when they changed the budget rules, we have not brought before this body—for the very first time since then—we have not brought up a budget resolution to discuss the outrageous deficit that we are suffering through.

This body has not brought up appropriations bills. These are the important things that we should be doing here. We flew in yesterday to do what, debate this, men's baseball and a racetrack?

The Democrats have the House, the Senate, and the presidency. They get to determine what bills are brought up, and I will grant you, there are silly bills offered by both sides, but it's time to get serious about the people's work. There are people who are suffering out there, and the frustration is that we waste our time on this.

These people in the audience travel from around the country, around the world, to come see us, what, debate a racetrack? It's an embarrassment. It is an absolute embarrassment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Well, just to indicate for the record, this has been called a historic Congress, not by the Democrats, but by historians who have looked at prior Congresses, including Republican-controlled Congresses, and, indeed, the last Congress before this side took control, which was especially historic in taking the country down to its knees, leaving it to a new, an entirely different administration in Congress, to pick the country up.

I do commend the gentleman for saying he will vote against Mr. WILSON's bill, having been called out, I guess he has to, to show he has any guts at all. But then we are going to be looking to see if he votes against all such bills in the future.

I want to say again that it is quite possible to make a point about what you want to see on the floor without trivializing a bill that is perfectly in order, perfectly respectable, in fact, helps the economy, commemorating a venue that helps the economy of another Member's district.

If you want to make the point that you think the Congress ought to be doing other things, then make the point, but don't do it by putting down other Members. That's not the model of civility either side should be offering on this floor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am trivializing it because it is trivial. It is trivial. There are other ways to recognize a racetrack without taking the time of this body and this country on this floor. I am trivializing it, and I think that's the proper course.

Weeks ago I took a position I would not vote in favor of any sports resolutions. I don't care if they are Republican, I don't care if they are Democrat. I think the principle is these people receive more than adequate recognition for what they have.

And, hey, look, I have stood behind some of these in the past. I am here long enough. I am just a freshman. I didn't create this mess here, but I am here to help clean it up. And given my months in Congress, yes, I took a position I am not going to support any of them. I don't care who offers them, and it's time this body starts to operate on principle.

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

Ms. NORTON. Does the gentleman yield back or does he want to keep this going?

I just want to say to the gentleman, it has been pointed out to me that the gentleman cosponsored a resolution, H. Res. 942, commending the Real Salt Lake Soccer Club for winning the 2009 Major League Soccer Cup.

* * *

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to take the gentlewoman's words down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will suspend. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia will take her seat.

The Clerk will report the words.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove from the RECORD an idiomatic expression that apparently was misunderstood. I never called the gentleman dishonest. I want to strike the words ''lie in his mouth,'' which is an idiomatic expression that means the gentleman has no business saying what he said. But if it is construed to mean that I'm calling him a liar, then I would certainly ask that that be stricken from the RECORD. Indeed, my comments were begun with words about civility here, so I certainly did not intend to call the gentleman dishonest or a liar.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just want to be clear; our intention here is pure. If she were asking for civility, I will take her word for it. We do have certain decorum here in the House. I just ask that we abide by that. To suggest that any Member is being dishonest or deceitful or a liar is obviously not within the history of the ongoing proceedings of this House. That's all I ask.

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the offending words are withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia may proceed.

Ms. NORTON. Well, I appreciate that the gentleman is withdrawing his objection, and I appreciate that he understood. He knows me well. He is the ranking member of one of my committees. He knows that I do not engage in pointless, uncivil remarks. Indeed, the whole import of my objection to the issues with the gentleman's resolution from Saratoga was I wanted to make sure everybody understood that we ought to respect one another, and I certainly respect the gentleman and certainly would not have meant otherwise through my remarks.

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

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

Let me make the point that, yes, I've voted for sports resolutions, I've even cosponsored resolutions, but I came to realize what a waste of time that is. So a number of weeks ago, I took the pledge that I was no longer going to participate. But there are examples in my past, and being a freshman year, I made some mistakes. That's one of them. But I just believe that there are more important, more worthy things that this body ought to be participating in. And probably the next thing we ought to be doing is voting on some things today; so I urge my colleagues to vote against House Resolution 1513.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I accept the gentleman's change on how he thinks these matters ought to be considered. I certainly don't think we ought to take it out on the Member from Saratoga, and I ask that we approve the resolution that was before us commemorating the 142nd anniversary of the Saratoga Race Course.

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 District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1513, 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. CHAFFETZ. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order: H. Res. 1491; H.R. 5604; and H. Res. 1516, each by the yeas and nays.

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

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA GAMECOCKS ON WINNING 2010 COLLEGE WORLD SERIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1491) congratulating the University of South Carolina Gamecocks on winning the 2010 NCAA Division I College World Series, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 6, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 451]

YEAS—400

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

NAYS—6

Berry
Bilbray
Chaffetz
Ehlers
Graves (GA)
Nye

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

DeFazio
Oberstar

NOT VOTING—24

Andrews
Barrow
Blunt
Capuano
Conyers
Davis (AL)
Ellsworth
Fallin
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Johnson (GA)
King (NY)
Mack
Meek (FL)
Moran (KS)
Reyes
Rogers (KY)
Sanchez, Loretta
Schrader
Tiahrt
Visclosky
Wamp

□ 1804

Mr. DEFAZIO changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''present.''

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.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SAVINGS 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. 5604) to rescind amounts authorized for certain surface transportation 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 Virginia (Mr. PERRIELLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 452]

YEAS—402

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert

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

NOT VOTING—30

Andrews
Barrow
Blunt
Boehner
Capuano
Carnahan
Carter
Conyers
Davis (AL)
Djou
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Fallin
Garamendi
Gerlach
Heller
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Johnson (GA)
King (NY)
Mack
Meek (FL)
Moran (KS)
Reyes
Rogers (KY)
Sanchez, Loretta
Tiahrt
Visclosky
Wamp
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1813

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 452, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

RECOGNIZING 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF END OF WORLD WAR II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1516) recognizing the 65th anniversary of the end of World War II, honoring the servicemembers who fought in World War II and their families, and honoring the servicemembers who are currently serving in combat operations, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) 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 408, nays 0, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 453]

YEAS—408

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

Walden	Waxman	Wittman
Walz	Weiner	Wolf
Wasserman Schultz	Welch	Woolsey
Waters	Westmoreland	Wu
Watson	Whitfield	Yarmuth
Watt	Wilson (OH)	Young (AK)
	Wilson (SC)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—24

Andrews	Ehlers	Meek (FL)
Barrow	Ellsworth	Moran (KS)
Blunt	Fallin	Reyes
Boehner	Hinojosa	Rogers (KY)
Capuano	Hoekstra	Sanchez, Loretta
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Tiahrt
Crowley	King (NY)	Visclosky
Davis (AL)	Mack	Wamp

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1821

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.

Stated for:

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 453, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my apologies for my absence on July 20, 2010, and for missing recorded votes held on this day. I regret that matters in my district required my personal attention and prevented me from being present to cast my vote. Although I was unable to vote, I wish to let my constituents and my colleagues know how I would have voted had I been present.

On H. Res. 1491—Congratulating the University of South Carolina Gamecocks on winning the 2010 NCAA Division I College World Series—I would have voted "aye."

On H.R. 5604—Surface Transportation Savings Act of 2010—I would have voted "aye."

On H. Res. 1516—Recognizing the 65th anniversary of the end of World War II, honoring the service members who fought in World War II and their families, and honoring the service members who are currently serving in combat operations—I would have voted "aye."

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. POLIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–552) on the resolution (H. Res. 1537) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and unable to vote on H.R. 5604, rollcall No. 452. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADLER of New Jersey). 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.

INTERNATIONAL ADOPTION HARMONIZATION ACT OF 2010

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5532) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to adopted alien children, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5532

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 "International Adoption Harmonization Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. MODIFICATION OF ADOPTION AGE REQUIREMENTS.

Section 101(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E)—

(A) by striking "(E)(i)" and inserting "(E)";

(B) by striking "sixteen" and inserting "eighteen";

(C) by striking "; or" and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by striking clause (ii);

(2) in subparagraph (F)—

(A) by striking "(F)(i)" and inserting "(F)";

(B) by striking "sixteen" and inserting "eighteen";

(C) by striking "Attorney General" and inserting "Secretary of Homeland Security"; and

(D) by striking clause (ii); and

(3) in subparagraph (G)—

(A) by striking "sixteen" and inserting "eighteen"; and

(B) by striking "Attorney General" each place such term appears and inserting "Secretary of Homeland Security".

SEC. 3. HARMONIZING ADOPTIONS BETWEEN HAGUE CONVENTION AND NON-HAGUE-CONVENTION COUNTRIES.

Section 212(a)(1)(C)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(1)(C)(ii)) is amended by striking "section 101(b)(1)(F)," and inserting "subparagraph (F) or (G) of section 101(b)(1),".

SEC. 4. COMPLIANCE WITH 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 Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I introduced H.R. 5532, the International Adoption Harmonization Act of 2010, to correct two longstanding problems and inconsistencies with respect to adoptions of foreign children by U.S. citizen parents.

First, the bill would harmonize the age requirements of such adoptions and provide some needed flexibility in cases where adoptions take longer than expected. Currently, our law contains two age requirements related to the adoption of foreign children. The general rule is that an adoption must be finalized before a child turns 16 in order for the child to qualify for legal status in the United States. For any sibling of such a child, the adoption must be finalized before the sibling's 18th birthday, but only if the sibling comes from the country that has not signed The Hague Convention on Intercountry Adoptions. The age cutoff for siblings from signatory countries is 16. These different requirements create confusion; and, in particular, with respect to more stringent requirements for the signatory countries, the 16-year-old cutoff provision, failing to meet the cutoff can have disastrous consequences.

Every year, the 16-year-old age requirement prevents a small number of foreign children who have been adopted by U.S. citizen parents from obtaining legal status in the United States. If an adoption takes longer than expected, even for reasons outside the parent's control, and the deadline is missed even by 1 day, the child is left with no remedy whatsoever. Although the child may be legally adopted by U.S. citizen parents, he or she cannot legally remain with them in the United States. Obviously, this is a nonsensical result where one's child has to be removed from the United States or, more likely, the individual comes to us for private relief which we may or may not succeed in granting.

H.R. 5532 remedies the above problem by harmonizing the provisions to require that all adoptions be finalized before a child's 18th birthday. This would

provide an additional 2 years by which to complete an adoption before a child is barred from living in the United States with his or her parents. As adoptions for foreign children are rarely completed beyond a child's 16th birthday—China, for example, allows adoptions only up to the age of 14—this bill would affect very few children; but for those few children, this bill is critical.

Second, H.R. 5532 would also harmonize immunization requirements with respect to international adoptions. Current law requires adopted children to have certain vaccinations prior to arrival, but there is an exemption for children under 10 if the adoptive parents certify that necessary vaccinations will be obtained within 30 days of entry.

□ 1830

This exemption, which was created by Congress in 1997, was designed to prevent parents from having to subject their children to numerous and often unsafe immunizations in foreign nations and to allow them to safely immunize their children in the United States.

This exception, however, applies only to children adopted from countries that are not signatories to the Hague Convention. It does not apply to children from signatory countries. This bill fixes this nonsensical discrepancy by expanding the definition to also cover children regardless of whether their home country is a signatory to the Hague Convention.

I want to thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, JOHN CONYERS; the ranking member, LAMAR SMITH; and Representative JEFF FORTENBERRY, for their support on this measure.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I cosponsored this legislation introduced by Congresswoman LOFGREN, chair of the Immigration Subcommittee, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Our Nation has a wonderful tradition of welcoming newcomers. We admit more than 1 million legal immigrants a year, as many as all other nations combined. This legislation continues that generosity by ensuring that American parents who want to open their homes and hearts to children from around the world are able to do so.

The Immigration and Nationality Act provides that U.S. citizens can adopt foreign children and have the children considered immediate relatives for immigration purposes if the children are adopted while under the age of 16 years.

American families who initiated adoptions of foreign children by their 16th birthdays but were not able to complete the adoptions by that date have often sought relief from their Representatives in Congress. We have responded sympathetically.

Congress has routinely passed private bills over the years to allow these families to sponsor their adopted children for permanent resident status in the U.S. In fact, Congress has so routinely passed such private bills that it makes sense for us to simply modify the law and provide a broad remedy.

This legislation provides that for immigration purposes, adoptions by U.S. parents have to be completed by the age of 18 instead of 16. Under the bill, the parents are still obligated to finalize the adoption by the 18th birthday in order to receive immigration benefits for their child.

Of course, we expect U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to continue to be on guard against any possible fraud in the foreign adoption process.

This bill accomplishes one more objective by making a technical correction regarding the Hague Convention on Intercountry Adoptions.

Under current law, prospective immigrants have to be vaccinated against certain diseases. The law provides an exemption to the general immunization requirement for adopted children if, one, a child is 10 years of age or younger and, two, the adoptive parents certify that the child will receive the necessary vaccinations within 30 days of entry into the U.S.

This exemption, enacted in 1997, is designed to ensure that parents don't have to subject their children to sometimes unsafe immunizations in foreign nations. Rather, they can more safely immunize their children in the United States.

However, when the Hague Convention on Intercountry Adoptions was later adopted, this exception was not extended to the children from signatory countries. Ms. LOFGREN'S bill simply extends the exemption to cover children from these countries.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members and staff are reminded not to traffic the well while other Members are under recognition.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5532, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELP HAITIAN ADOPTEES IMMEDIATELY TO INTEGRATE ACT OF 2010

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5283) to provide for adjustment of status for certain Haitian orphans paroled into the United States after the earthquake of January 12, 2010, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5283

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—

(1) the ''Help Haitian Adoptees Immediately to Integrate Act of 2010''; or

(2) the ''Help HAITI Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS FOR CERTAIN HAITIAN ORPHANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may adjust the status of an alien described in subsection (b) to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien—

(1) subject to subsection (c), applies for such adjustment;

(2) is physically present in the United States on the date the application for such adjustment is filed; and

(3) is admissible to the United States as an immigrant, except as provided in subsection (d).

(b) ALIENS ELIGIBLE FOR ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—An alien is described in this subsection if the alien was inspected and granted parole into the United States pursuant to the humanitarian parole policy for certain Haitian orphans announced on January 18, 2010, and suspended as to new applications on April 15, 2010.

(c) APPLICATION.—In the case of a minor, an application under this section may be submitted on behalf of the alien by—

(1) an adoptive parent; or

(2) a legal guardian.

(d) GROUNDS OF INADMISSIBILITY.—Paragraphs (4) and (7)(A) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)) shall not apply to adjustment of status under this section.

(e) VISA AVAILABILITY.—When an alien is granted the status of having been lawfully admitted for permanent residence under this section, the Secretary of State shall not be required to reduce the number of immigrant visas authorized to be issued under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(f) ALIENS DEEMED TO MEET DEFINITION OF CHILD.—An unmarried alien described in subsection (b) who is under the age of 18 years shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements applicable to adopted children under section 101(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(b)(1)) if—

(1) the alien obtained adjustment of status under this section; and

(2) a United States citizen adopted the alien before, on, or after the date of the decision granting adjustment of status under this section.

(g) NO IMMIGRATION BENEFITS FOR BIRTH PARENTS.—No birth parent of an alien who obtains adjustment of status under this section shall thereafter, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under this section or the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

SEC. 3. COMPLIANCE WITH 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 Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5283, the Help HAITI Act of 2010, was introduced by Representative JEFF FORTENBERRY and is an important bill to help us finish the job we undertook when we rescued just over 1,200 Haitian orphans immediately after the earthquake that devastated Haiti on January 12 of this year.

Six months after the earthquake, it is easy to forget how terrible this tragedy was. More than 220,000 people were killed and over 300,000 were injured. Over 300,000 homes were destroyed or severely damaged, and more than 1,300 schools and 50 health centers were reduced to rubble.

At least 1.5 million people were directly affected by the quake. In terms of human and economic impact, it's the worst natural disaster ever recorded in the Western Hemisphere.

In response to this disaster, I am proud that our country responded quickly and in many different ways. Many know about the search and recovery efforts, the dissemination of food and water, the private donations totaling more than $1.3 billion, the thousands of military, civilian, and medical personnel that went to Haiti to provide critical care and save lives, but there are other ways that our country provided humanitarian assistance.

Soon after the earthquake hit, the Department of Homeland Security's U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, otherwise known as USCIS, took several steps to provide critical assistance to vulnerable populations in Haiti. This included creating a humanitarian parole policy for the immediate evacuation of Haitian orphans who had been adopted or were in the process of being adopted by U.S. citizens.

These children had been previously identified as being available for intercountry adoptions, so they were not at risk of being separated from their families during the chaos that followed the earthquake. Now in the United States with their adoptive or prospective adoptive American parents, these children need one more bit of assistance from us so they can live lives like Americans.

Had the earthquake not hit and disrupted the adoption processes in Haiti, each of these children would have entered the country as U.S. citizens under current immigration law. But because of the current emergency procedures that were used to evacuate these children, they must now wait years before they can get permanent residency and years more before they can qualify for citizenship. Some are even in danger of aging out before they can get their residency, which would make them ineligible for legal status in this country.

H.R. 5283 would simply treat these children as if the earthquake had not happened and they had come to the U.S. under normal procedures.

Specifically, the bill would allow an adoptive parent or legal guardian in the United States to apply for permanent residency on behalf of one of the 1,200 Haitian orphans brought to the U.S. under the USCIS parole policy announced on January 18 and terminated on April 15 of this year. This is the least we can do to help the orphans we rescued and the U.S. citizen parents who have adopted or are seeking to adopt them.

I commend Representative JEFF FORTENBERRY for introducing this bill and committee Ranking Member LAMAR SMITH for his support on this measure.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this year, a devastating earthquake hit Haiti and claimed 200,000 lives. The Department of Homeland Security quickly acted in the best American humanitarian tradition.

DHS announced a humanitarian parole policy to allow orphaned Haitian children who were in the middle of adoption proceedings with American parents to quickly enter the U.S. DHS paroled about 1,200 Haitian orphans into the U.S. as a result of this policy.

Adoption proceedings had not yet been completed when these children were airlifted to the U.S. Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, the children will have to live with their U.S. adoptive parents for 2 years before their parents can apply for permanent resident status for the children. During the interim period, the children must have their temporary parole status renewed each year.

As a result, these children will wait an appreciable amount of time in parole status.

□ 1840

Representative FORTENBERRY was concerned about how this delay could affect the new lives of these young children in the U.S.; for instance, what happens if the adoptive parents die during their parole period? In order to address these concerns and ensure the futures of these Haitian orphans, Representative FORTENBERRY introduced the Help HAITI Act of 2010. The bill allows the Haitian orphans brought to the U.S. in the aftermath of the earthquake to receive permanent residence immediately. This legislation helps future American citizens who have already suffered much but who will have bright futures in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), who is the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman from Texas for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to add that, as we heard, more than 1,000 Haitian orphans who were already in the process of being adopted by American families prior to the earthquake that struck Haiti last January stand today in legal limbo; and, as mentioned by Chairwoman LOFGREN, in the tragic aftermath, these orphans were evacuated by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security for humanitarian reasons and with the Haitian Government's permission to American soil. Catastrophic circumstances prompted the evacuation of these children to the United States before their adoptions could be finalized in Haitian courts.

Happily, in my home State of Nebraska and throughout the United States, many of these Haitian orphans were able to unite with the very American families who were seeking to adopt them and who are now working to finalize their adoptions in the courts of the United States. Due to a technicality in the law, however, these Haitian children, upon establishing a legal relationship with their adoptive U.S. parents, will have to wait 2 years before they become legal permanent residents.

As international adoption case workers can attest, much can happen to these orphans and their families in 2 years. So long as their status in the United States remains temporary, these vulnerable children will have few legal protections. They may not be eligible for critical resources, and they may face the risk of being forced to repatriate to Haiti if something were to happen to their adoptive families.

To mitigate the risks that these orphaned children from Haiti face, I introduced the Help Haitian Adoptees Immediately to Integrate Act of 2010, also known as the Help HAITI Act. This legislation is the product of continual dialogue and outreach both to the United States Department of Homeland Security's U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service and to my Republican and Democratic colleagues in the House of Representatives and the Senate. The Help HAITI Act would provide legal certainty and protections to these evacuated Haitian orphans by enabling adoptive American families to obtain permanent residency for these children more quickly and more efficiently.

Had the earthquake not happened, these orphaned Haitian children would have gone through the normal process

for international adoptions. American families would have finalized the adoption of these orphans in Haitian courts. Then, upon entering the United States to join their adoptive families, these children would have automatically received U.S. citizenship. However, the catastrophe disrupted the normal process for international adoption for these children.

The Help HAITI Act would help to normalize the immigration procedures that these adopted orphans now face. It would allow adoptive American families to apply immediately to obtain legal, permanent residency for these vulnerable children and enable them eventually to qualify for U.S. citizenship. This legislation, I would like to point out, would also help reduce the staff, monetary and other resource demands on the Department of Homeland Security's U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, these orphaned Haitian children have endured great hardships, and they have also endured heartbreaking tragedy to come to this country and unite with their American adoptive parents. Given the uncertainty and danger that these children have faced, we now are in a position to provide them with a measure of comfort and certainty as to their future with their adoptive families here in America.

So, with that, I would like to thank Chairwoman LOFGREN for her leadership and work on this bill, along with Ranking Member SMITH. I appreciate your input and support.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 5283, the Help Haitian Adoptees Immediately to Integrate Act, which provides for adjustment of status for certain Haitian orphans paroled into the United States after the earthquake of January 12, 2010. This legislation will give legal resident status to over 1,000 Haitian orphans whose adoptions by U.S. citizens had already been processed prior to the earthquake in Haiti on January 12, 2010.

When the earthquake crippled the Haitian governmental infrastructure, Haiti was no longer able to provide the paperwork necessary to give these children U.S. citizenship. As a result, their final approval of citizenship has been held up since the earthquake in January, and could continue to be delayed indefinitely. In the meantime, the U.S. has provided them with humanitarian parole visas, but it could take years for them to achieve legal resident status. The Help HAITI Act will empower the U.S. Secretary of Homeland Security to allow American parents who adopted Haitian children before the earthquake to apply for legal permanent-resident status on behalf of their children. This will finally set these orphans on the path to citizenship.

The devastating earthquake created significant trauma for all Haitians that will last for generations. While the United States assists in the rebuilding efforts, with my support and the support of this Congress, we should also act now to remove the unnecessary complications the Haitian orphans are experiencing as they try to start a new life with their American families. Under normal circumstances, these would have been routine adoptions, and I urge Congress to pass the Help HAITI Act, which will enable the Department of Homeland Security to quickly relieve the hardships these orphans and their new families have encountered since the earthquake.

I encourage my colleagues to support this important resolution.

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

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to ask our colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ZOE LOFGREN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5283, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAM S. RICHARDSON

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1470) honoring the life, achievements, and distinguished career of Chief Justice William S. Richardson.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1470

Whereas William S. Richardson was born on December 22, 1919, and spent most of his childhood in Palama and Kaimuki;

Whereas William S. Richardson was born to a working class family of Hawaiian, Chinese, and Caucasian ancestry;

Whereas William S. Richardson served as a platoon leader in the United States Army during World War II and was later inducted into the Infantry Officer Candidate School Hall of Fame;

Whereas William S. Richardson served as Lieutenant Governor of Hawaii from 1962–1966;

Whereas William S. Richardson led the Hawaii Democratic Party from 1956–1962;

Whereas William S. Richardson served as the Chief Justice of the Hawaii Supreme Court from 1966–1982;

Whereas the William S. Richardson School of Law honors his leadership by opening educational and professional avenues for the Islands' most disadvantaged groups;

Whereas William S. Richardson upheld traditional Hawaiian laws and expanded public rights for Native Hawaiians and all people in Hawaii;

Whereas as William S. Richardson was awarded the Spirit of Excellence Award from the American Bar Association; and

Whereas, on June 21, 2010, at the age of 90, William S. Richardson passed away in Honolulu, Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors the life, achievements, and distinguished career of Chief Justice William S. Richardson;

(2) emphasizes that, among his judicial accomplishments, Chief Justice William S. Richardson changed the face of higher education in Hawaii by opening avenues for the Islands' most disadvantaged groups and by building a more equitable society for the people of Hawaii; and

(3) recognizes the William S. Richardson School of Law, the educational institution that bears his name, as a significant part of the legacy of William S. Richardson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. DJOU) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 1470 honors the life, achievements, and distinguished career of Chief Justice William S. Richardson. Chief Justice Richardson was a leading proponent of the rights of Native Americans throughout his 16-year tenure as Hawaii State Supreme Court Chief Justice.

He was primarily known for drawing on ancestral Hawaiian customs rather than Western common law in his decisions. He has been credited with triggering a "renaissance" in pride in native identity and the language and culture of Native Hawaiians.

Born in 1919, William Richardson worked his way through the University of Hawaii, where he received his undergraduate degree. He went on to earn a law degree from the University of Cincinnati.

Upon graduating from law school in 1941, he volunteered for the Army Air Corps, and later served as a platoon leader with the 1st Filipino Infantry Regiment. After World War II ended, he returned to Hawaii, where he served in the Judge Advocate General Corps. He was later inducted into the Infantry Office Candidate School Hall of Fame.

Fueled by a sense of patriotism, William Richardson aligned himself with the emerging Hawaii Democratic Party, eventually serving as its chairman from 1956 to 1962.

In 1963, he became the lieutenant governor under Governor John Burns. Just a few years later, he was appointed Chief Justice of the Hawaii Supreme Court, where he served for 16 years.

Under Chief Justice Richardson's guidance, the Hawaii Supreme Court oversaw judgments ensuring public beach access, expanding Native Hawaiian rights to use private property, and affirming public ownership of natural resources.

He was famously quoted as saying that "the Western concept of exclusivity is not universally applicable in Hawaii."

Education was paramount to Chief Justice Richardson. One of his proudest accomplishments was his successful effort to see a law school opened in Hawaii. In 1973 The University of Hawaii opened the only law school in

the State. It was named the William S. Richardson School of Law upon his retirement from the bench.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO).

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. SCOTT, for yielding me time.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 1470, which recognizes the life, achievements, and distinguished career of the late Bill Richardson, Chief Justice of the Hawaii Supreme Court.

William Shaw Richardson was born in Honolulu on December 22, 1919. Raised in Kaimuki and a graduate of a public school, Roosevelt High School, Bill worked in pineapple canneries to pay his way through the University of Hawaii. He then earned a law degree from the University of Cincinnati. Bill later enlisted in the Army and served as platoon leader with the 1st Filipino Infantry Regiment during World War II.

In 1956, Bill served as chairman of Hawaii's Democratic Party. He was elected to the office of Lieutenant Governor in 1962. In 1966, Governor John A. Burns appointed him as chief justice of the Hawaii Supreme Court. C.J. Richardson served on the court for 16 years.

C.J. Richardson was our Nation's first native Hawaiian Supreme Court chief justice. Working closely with his fellow justices, C.J. incorporated native Hawaiian traditional and customary practices into State law and expanded public rights. In perhaps his most famous case, in 1968, C.J. Richardson, in essence, asked, ''Why should Hawaii follow Anglo-American common law rather than its own ancient traditions regarding the use of property?'' C.J. recalled not being allowed on the beach in front of Waikiki's Royal Hawaiian and Moana hotels as a boy. The historic 4-to-1 ruling he wrote incorporated Hawaiian customs by preserving public access to the shoreline. No Hawaii beach could be considered a private beach like on the mainland.

Under his leadership, the court also established the water rights of people living downstream from privately owned property that surrounded rivers or streams. It awarded new land created by lava flows to the State instead of adjacent property owners, and it ruled that native Hawaiians could cross private property to gather traditional cultural resources, like particular plants used by hula dancers as part of their ceremonies.

Among C.J. Richardson's proudest achievements was the opening of Hawaii's only law school in 1973. He knew that those with the greatest stake in building a more just and equitable society were often denied the opportunity to attend law school because of the high cost. He fought a lengthy uphill battle to create and shape the law school that now proudly bears his name. Over the last years, C.J. had an office at the school, where he was a regular source of support and inspiration to students and faculty alike.

I would like to extend my deepest condolences to C.J. Richardson's son, William; his two daughters, Barbara Richardson-Phillips and Corinne Wolfe; his two sisters, Amy Kahoiwai and Pearl Nishimura; his six grandchildren and two great grandchildren. Mahalo nui loa—Hawaiian for thank you very much—for sharing the great C.J. with all of us.

□ 1850

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

Mr. Speaker, I support House Resolution 1470.

I want to thank my colleague from Hawaii for her kind words, and I want to echo much of her sentiment—a voice on the life of Chief Justice William S. Richardson.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, this resolution honors the life, achievements, and the distinguished career of William S. Richardson, the former chief justice of the Hawaii Supreme Court, Lieutenant Governor of the State of Hawaii and former Democratic chairman of the Democratic Party of Hawaii.

Chief Justice Richardson passed away on June 21 of this year. He was one of Hawaii's most influential figures. As Hawaii's Governor, Linda Lingle, recently stated, ''The former chief justice played an integral role in shaping Hawaii's political and legal landscape.''

For myself and my family, personally, Chief Justice Richardson touched my wife and I, as my wife is a graduate of the William S. Richardson School of Law, and I taught at the law school that bears his name.

Chief Justice Richardson was born on December 22, 1919, and always referred to himself as ''just a local boy from Hawaii.'' He graduated from the University of Hawaii at Manoa, and he later attended law school at the University of Cincinnati.

Then, at the outset of World War II, he volunteered to serve in the U.S. Army. He saw combat as a platoon leader with the 1st Filipino Infantry Regiment. He was later inducted into the Infantry Officer Candidate School Hall of Fame.

After service in World War II, he returned to Hawaii where he played a key role in promoting Hawaii statehood. In 1959, when Hawaii became a State, Chief Justice Richardson was one of the most prominent figures, and he deserves the thanks of all of us for Hawaii's becoming the 50th State.

In 1962, Hawaii elected John Burns as its Governor. Chief Justice Richardson was his Lieutenant Governor, serving one term as the Lieutenant Governor of Hawaii from 1962 to 1966, as a Democrat. He was the first person of Hawaiian ancestry to hold that office.

Then, from 1966 to 1982, Richardson served as the chief justice of Hawaii's Supreme Court. During his 16 years as chief justice, he made a number of landmark rulings that have shaped Hawaii and our Nation's case law to this day.

Most of all, he is much loved by his family. As his son Bill Richardson recently stated, we should always remember him as a grandfather: ''When school ended, I could always count on him ready to pick me up. He'd come by and watch my practices as much as he could.''

I think that is the legacy all of us want to remember Chief Justice Richardson for.

For many years, Chief Justice Richardson fought for the establishment of a law school. His efforts culminated in 1973, establishing the first and, thus far, only law school in the State of Hawaii: the University of Hawaii's William S. Richardson School of Law. Chief Justice Richardson shared his wealth of knowledge with students, attorneys and judges; and he leaves a lasting legacy in our State.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, this resolution honors this long-time leader and path-breaking American. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution.

Mahalo and aloha.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my two colleagues from Hawaii for their bipartisan cooperation on this resolution. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1470.

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.

PREVENTION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE IN ANIMAL CRUSH VIDEOS ACT OF 2010

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5566) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interstate commerce in animal crush videos, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5566

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 ''Prevention of Interstate Commerce in Animal Crush Videos Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Federal Government and the several States have a compelling interest in preventing animal cruelty.

(2) Each of the several States and the District of Columbia criminalize intentional acts of animal cruelty.

(3) The clandestine nature of certain acts of animal cruelty allows the perpetrators of such crimes to remain anonymous, thus frustrating the ability of Federal and State authorities to enforce the criminal statutes prohibiting such behavior.

(4) These criminal acts constitute an integral part of the production of and market for so-called crush videos and other depictions of animal cruelty.

(5) The creation and sale of crush videos provide an economic incentive for, and are intrinsically related to, the underlying acts of the criminal conduct.

(6) The United States has a long history of prohibiting the interstate sale of obscene and illegal materials.

(7) Animal crush videos appeal to the prurient interest and are obscene.

SEC. 3. ANIMAL CRUSH VIDEOS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 48 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 48. Animal crush videos

''(a) PROHIBITION.—Whoever knowingly and for the purpose of commercial advantage or private financial gain sells or offers to sell, or distributes or offers to distribute, an animal crush video in interstate or foreign commerce shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

''(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subsection (a) does not prohibit the sale, distribution, or offer for sale or distribution, of any visual depiction of—

''(1) customary and normal veterinary or agricultural husbandry practices; or

''(2) hunting, trapping, or fishing.

''(c) DEFINITION.—In this section the term 'animal crush video' means any obscene photograph, motion-picture film, video recording, or electronic image that depicts actual conduct in which one or more living animals is intentionally crushed, burned, drowned, suffocated, or impaled in a manner that would violate a criminal prohibition on cruelty to animals under Federal law or the law of the State in which the depiction is created, sold, distributed, or offered for sale or distribution.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 48 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''48. Animal crush videos.''.

SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS PROVISION.

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 Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation addresses a disturbing subject in need of congressional action.

In the late 1990s, Congress was made aware of a growing market of videotapes and still photographs depicting animals, typically small animals, being slowly and sadistically crushed to death. These depictions are commonly referred to as ''crush videos.'' Much of the material features women inflicting torture with their bare feet or while wearing high-heeled shoes. The depictions often appeal to people with a very specific sexual fetish.

Even in States where harming the animals in such a way itself violates State laws prohibiting cruelty to animals, prosecutors had difficulty obtaining convictions. For example, the faces of the persons inflicting the torture were often not shown in the videos; and the locations, times and dates of the acts could not be ascertained from the depictions themselves. So defendants were often able to successfully assert as a defense that the State could not prove its jurisdiction over the place where the acts occurred nor that it could prove that the actions took place within the statute of limitations.

In short, it has been difficult enough to find the perpetrators of the underlying acts of cruelty to animals. Then, even after they have been found, it has been difficult to obtain convictions.

So Congress enacted a new law prohibiting the creation, sale, and possession of the depictions of such acts. The new law was codified as section 48 of title XVIII of the U.S. Code. The motivation for passing the law was to address the sale of crush videos, but the statute was written in such a way that it also could be read, in some circumstances, to apply to more mainstream material, such as videos depicting hunting and fishing and other activity protected by the First Amendment of the Constitution.

Because of this susceptibility to a broader reading, in April the United States Supreme Court invalidated the entire statute in the case United States v. Stevens, holding that the law was overbroad and violated the First Amendment. The Court made it clear, however, it did not rule out the possibility of Congress' adopting a bill that would hold up under constitutional scrutiny.

In May, the Subcommittee on Crime held a hearing about the decision. It heard from witnesses who testified that a narrower legislative approach would likely be constitutional and survive court challenge.

The bill before us is much more narrow than the original law. The most important difference is that the bill would only prohibit the sale of crush videos that are obscene under current law. This would address a key flaw in the original statute because obscenity is outside the protections of the First Amendment. Whereas some of the activity covered by the prior law under the broader reading was, in fact, protected by the First Amendment, a much narrower range of conduct is covered in the depictions prohibited by this bill. Furthermore, this legislation specifically makes it clear that hunting and fishing videos would not be covered by the prohibition.

I commend my colleague from California (Mr. GALLEGLY) and my colleague from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), who worked together to produce this bipartisan bill. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman CONYERS; my good friend, subcommittee chairman BOBBY SCOTT; and, of course, our ranking member, LAMAR SMITH, for working closely with me to draft a bill that would help put a stop to the sale of animal crush videos while, at the same time, addressing the First Amendment concerns that were raised by a recent Supreme Court ruling.

The district attorney of Ventura County, California, first brought this issue to my attention back in 1999. He explained that, although crush videos were illegal under State laws, the crime was difficult to prosecute because video producers moved their goods through interstate commerce to avoid prosecution.

The FBI, the U.S. Department of Education, and the U.S. Department of Justice consider animal cruelty to be one of the early warning signs of potential violent youth. The Boston Strangler, the Unabomber, Jeffrey Dahmer, and Ted Bundy all tortured animals before they began to murder people.

□ 1900

Everyone agrees that these disgusting videos must be stopped. My first bill passed the House in 1999 by a bipartisan vote of 372–42, by unanimous consent in the Senate, and was signed into law by then-President Bill Clinton. The Supreme Court ruled in April of this year that the 1999 law was too broad, but indicated it may uphold a law that is more narrowly drafted.

In response to the court's decision, I, along with my good friend Representative GARY PETERS, introduced H.R. 5566, the Prevention of Interstate Commerce in Animal Crush Videos Act of 2010. Based on the testimony of the constitutional experts at the May 26 Crime Subcommittee hearing, I worked with Members on both sides of the aisle to craft legislation that is narrowly focused on prohibiting crush videos rather than prohibiting depiction of animal cruelty.

Immediately after the 1999 bill became law, the crush video business virtually disappeared. It has recently reemerged in light of the court ruling.

Quick passage of H.R. 5566 will once again stop these revolting videos that depict the torture of animals and killing defenseless animals.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 5566.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), who has worked extremely hard on this legislation.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, animal torture videos are heinous, barbaric, and completely unacceptable, and we must stop them once and for all. It's hard to believe that this sort of thing even exists, and that a new law is needed to prevent it. Animal torture is outrageously disturbing, and common decency and morality dictates that those engaged in it should not be profiting from it. They should be in prison.

This is why I have introduced H.R. 5566, along with Representatives GALLEGLY and MORAN, the Prevention of Interstate Commerce in Animal Crush Videos Act of 2010. This legislation will ban the sale or distribution of so-called crush videos, depictions of small animals being tortured and slowly crushed to death, and other videos depicting abhorrent animal torture. Our bill responds to the Supreme Court's recent holding that a 1999 statute banning crush videos was overbroad, and therefore invalid under the First Amendment. H.R. 5566 carefully parses and responds to the Stevens decision, and it is written to survive another round of judicial review if challenged after enactment.

I appreciate the leadership of my colleagues, Representatives GALLEGLY, MORAN, and BLUMENAUER, on animal protection issues generally, and specifically on animal crush legislation. As cochairs of the Congressional Animal Protection Caucus, of which I am a member, Representatives MORAN and GALLEGLY are committed to advancing commonsense animal protection legislation.

I would also like to thank the Humane Society for their help throughout the drafting process, and for all of their tireless animal protection efforts. Finally, I would like to thank Chairman CONYERS, Chairman SCOTT, and the members of the Judiciary Committee for their commitment to advancing this necessary, commonsense legislation. I urge its passage.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for the time and for his leadership on this very important issue.

I rise today in strong support and as a cosponsor for the Prevention of Interstate Commerce in Animal Crush Videos Act. And I thank Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. PETERS, and all of those who are involved in dealing with this horrific, horrific problem.

The recent Supreme Court decision overturned 10 years of Federal law that outlawed animal crush videos. They said that the 1999 law was overbroad. And the Supreme Court also left open an avenue for a more targeted law. So today we make it clear, again, that the intentional crushing, burning, drowning, suffocating, and impaling of animals for profit is beyond sick, and it must be stopped.

Today, with this narrowly tailored measure, we will end the trade of crush videos, videos where animals are tortured for profit. Animal abuse and profiting from these actions are beyond wrong. It's our responsibility to close the loopholes to crack down and end the trade in crush videos, and I urge a ''yes'' on the Prevention of Interstate Commerce in Animal Crush Videos Act to end this unconscionable practice.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this, as I appreciate his hard work with the Judiciary Committee, and my friend Mr. GALLEGLY from California.

This is an area, Mr. Speaker, that I personally think that we ought to be able to come together. I supported the original legislation. I found it horrific that we would have people profiting from the most obscene displays of cruelty to animals. I understand the arguments that were made before the Supreme Court, but I think they made it clear that there was an opportunity to craft it more narrowly, and I think the Judiciary Committee has done a good job in doing so.

I am pleased that this is one of the areas where Congress has been able to come together, people on both sides of the aisle, to act quickly in an area that actually is important to avoid demeaning us all.

Mr. Speaker, cruelty to animals is not something that is just sort of an esoteric issue that is one that is only nominally of interest. This is something that speaks to the fundamentals of whether or not our communities are going to be livable, whether or not we can relate positively to one another. There is study after study that documents that people who are abusive to animals are also people who are likely to be abusive to their fellow human beings. It is a broad, far-reaching problem we have in our communities still.

Having worked with the committee in the past on issues that relate to animal fighting, there is a dark subculture here with people who get satisfaction, emotional, sexual, out of seeing animals suffer. It seems to me that it is important for us to respond quickly to be able to fill the gap. I don't think anybody benefits from this type of activity other than people who profit from it and people who have their own sadomasochistic satisfaction.

I appreciate what the committee has done to meet the court's First Amendment concerns and still speak to making sure that there are not people who are engaged in these activities and profiting from it. At the time of the original legislation, there were thousands of animal crush videos, for example on the Internet. But after the enactment of the original ban, they essentially disappeared. Now, after the Supreme Court decision, we have seen a resurgence, one that is not in anybody's interests. I hope that we are able to move with dispatch passing this today, and moving onto the Senate, to be able to enact this and have one significant, discrete area of progress that we can all take pride in.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join us in passing this bill, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all the people who have spoken and worked hard on this bill to get it in a form which we believe will pass constitutional muster. Any time you deal with a subject like this you have to deal with the First Amendment. The last bill didn't quite make it, but we believe, based on the testimony we have had today and the testimony we had at the hearing, that this bill will survive constitutional muster and deal with the trash that is being profited on.

So I thank my colleagues and urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank Congressman GALLEGLY for his effort to bring this to the floor.

It is Congressman GALLEGLY who originally brought this issue to the attention of Congress 10 years ago, and I have enjoyed working with him as Co-Chairs of the Animal Protection Caucus to pass this important bill.

Quite simply, animal crush videos contain some of the vilest treatment of animals imaginable. They feature scantily clad women crushing, impaling, or burning small animals of all types, apparently for the sexual gratification of some sick people. These videos have no redeeming value and clearly fall outside the realm of protected speech.

But although these videos contain behavior that would be considered animal cruelty under state and federal laws, it is nearly impossible to prove who produces the videos, making a ban on their sale through interstate commerce the only means of ending the market for this smut.

A law was passed by Congress 11 years ago that did just that, but earlier this year the Supreme Court struck down that law, claiming it could be used to violate free speech rights.

While I didn't agree with that decision, it was clear that Congress could not just stand by while these videos once again proliferated on the Internet. Not only are they viciously inhumane to the animals involved, but they also teach behavior that can lead to other violent crimes against animals and humans.

As demonstrated by the its long list of bipartisan cosponsors and its unanimous passage out of Committee, this bill represents a good faith effort by Members of both parties to maintain the effectiveness of the original law while addressing the constitutional concerns raised by the Court.

Those who attempt to make a profit off the sale of crush videos showing the torture of animals should not be allowed to hide behind the claim that they did not produce the content.

This bill will take away that pathetic excuse, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5566, the Prevention of Interstate Commerce in Animal Crush Videos Act.

Crush videos are videotapes depicting small animals, including cats, dogs, and even monkeys, being slowly crushed to death. Many of these videos feature women inflicting the torture with their bare feet or while wearing high heeled shoes. These videos capture the cries and squeals of the animals, obviously in great pain.

In 1999, Congress enacted H.R. 1887 to criminalize the commercial creation, sale, or possession of these heinous videos. However, in April of this year, the Supreme Court struck down as unconstitutional this Federal statute. The court held that the language of the statute was overly broad and would have extended to legitimate activities.

In response, Congressman GALLEGLY introduced and I cosponsored The Prevention of Interstate Commerce in Animal Crush Videos Act. This legislation amends the Federal criminal code to cure the defects in the Federal statute. The bill prohibits a person from knowingly selling or distributing an animal crush video in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of commercial advantage of private financial gain. This legislation also excludes from its scope the sale or distribution of any visual depiction of hunting, trapping, fishing, or customary and normal veterinary or agricultural husbandry practices.

In addition, the bill narrows the definition of "Animal Crush Video" to make clear that it is not targeting legitimate products and to tie the activity to the violation of a state or Federal law.

I believe it is important to stop these heinous activities, and I support this legislation that more effectively targets these crimes without affecting other, legitimate activities like hunting and fishing videos.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5566, Prevention of Interstate Commerce in Animal Crush Videos Act of 2010. As a cosponsor of this bill, I know how important it is to pass this piece of legislation to protect animals from being abused for crush videos.

Mohandas Gandhi once said "The greatness of a nation and its moral progress can be judged by the way its animals are treated." This wise man was correct; and we must uphold our nation's moral standards by protecting our animals. Animal crush videos depict conduct in which a living animal is intentionally maimed, mutilated, tortured, wounded or killed. In 1999, Congress passed a law outlawing the creation and trafficking of these videos. Recently, however, the Supreme Court struck down that law on first amendment grounds; arguing that law covered too much speech. This legislation was written, in response to the Supreme Court ruling, to narrowly outlaw animal crush videos while preserving all American's first amendment rights. I support this bill because animal crush videos depict living animals being tortured for human gratification. While all Americans have the right to free speech and expression, I can not in good conscience use the first amendment to justify allowing torture and abuse of animals.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIMES). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5566, 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. GALLEGLY. 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.

□ 1910

CELL PHONE CONTRABAND ACT OF 2010

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1749) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the possession or use of cell phones and similar wireless devices by Federal prisoners, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Cell Phone Contraband Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. WIRELESS DEVICES IN PRISON.

Section 1791 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (4), by striking "or (d)(1)(E)" and inserting ", (d)(1)(E), or (d)(1)(F)"; and

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking "(d)(1)(F)" and inserting "(d)(1)(G)"; and

(2) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (E), by striking "and" at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (G); and

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

"(F) a phone or other device used by a user of commercial mobile service (as defined in section 332(d) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 332(d))) in connection with such service; and".

SEC. 3. GAO STUDY.

Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to Congress with research and findings on the following issues:

(1) A study of telephone rates within Federal prisons to include information on interstate, intrastate and collect calls made by prisoners, including—

(A) the costs of operating inmate telephone services;

(B) the general cost to prison telephone service providers of providing telephone services to the Federal prisons;

(C) the revenue obtained from inmate telephone systems;

(D) how the revenue from these systems is used by the Bureau of Prisons; and

(E) options for lowering telephone costs to inmates and their families, while still maintaining sufficient security.

(2) A study of selected State and Federal efforts to prevent the smuggling of cell phones and other wireless devices into prisons, including efforts that selected State and Federal authorities are making to minimize trafficking of cell phones by guards and other prison officials and recommendations to reduce the number of cell phones that are trafficked into prisons.

(3) A study of cell phone use by inmates in selected State and Federal prisons, including—

(A) the quantity of cell phones confiscated by authorities in selected State and Federal prisons; and

(B) the reported impact, if any, of (1) inmate cell phone use on the overall security of prisons and (2) connections to criminal activity from within prisons.

SEC. 4. COMPLIANCE WITH 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 Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Cell Phone Contraband Act of 2010 will address an ongoing problem of cell phones being smuggled into prisons by visitors and prison guards. Prison inmate cell phone accessibility has resulted in offenders facilitating and committing crimes with the use of the cell phones. Gangs have also become far more organized because members in prison have cell phone access.

S. 1749 amends Federal law to make cell phones and similar devices contraband that Federal prisoners are prohibited from possessing. Some have argued that cell phone smuggling is a direct reaction to the outrageous costs inmates and their families pay for telephone calls while a person is incarcerated. Prisons and jails require that inmates call their families collect or pay for calls with their prison accounts. And, indeed, phone companies charge much more for calls from prisons than

they charge for calls made from outside prison. For example, one organization found that a 15-minute collect call made from San Quentin Prison to Oakland, both in California, would cost $5; whereas, the same collect call made from outside the prison would be about $2.55. That's for a collect call. It would be even cheaper if a reliable way were established for inmates to pay for their own calls.

S. 1749 requires the GAO to study the issue of exorbitant prison telephone rates and the gulf between those rates as the first step to finally bringing those rates down to reasonable levels so that inmates and their families have a much easier time staying in touch. In addition, the study will look at State and Federal efforts to prevent smuggling of cell phones into prisons and jails.

Although we should not allow prisoners to have access to cell phones while incarcerated, it is appropriate to provide them with telephone service at reasonable rates in order for them to maintain ties with their families and children.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The use of illegal cell phones by prisoners is on the rise. In California, for example, news stories report that the number of cell phones confiscated in prisons doubled from 2007 to 2008. In 2008, over 2,800 cell phones were found in California, but more than 2,800 were found just in the first 6 months of 2009. The Alabama Department of Corrections found more than 3,000 cell phones in 2009. In fact, there were more cell phones than any other type of contraband found in all of Alabama prisons.

Other State prison systems are experiencing the same increase in the number of contraband cell phones. As a result, many States are considering legislation that specifically prohibits prisoners from possessing cell phones in State prisons.

S. 1749 takes a step in the same direction at the Federal level. S. 1749, the Cell Phone Contraband Act of 2010, does two things. First, the bill makes it a crime for Federal prisoners to possess cell phones. Second, the bill directs the GAO to study the cost and use of landlines and smuggled cell phones in Federal and selected State prisons and jails.

This legislation is timely. Inmates use smuggled cell phones to coordinate drug deals on the outside, also, gang violence and other crimes, all committed outside the prison by use of smuggled cell phones to coordinate this activity that are used in the prison system.

Last year, an inmate in Maryland was accused of using a cell phone to arrange a murder of a witness who had testified against him at a trial. And in 2008, a condemned murderer on death row in my home State of Texas used a smuggled cell phone to threaten a State senator. That State senator happened to be the chairman of the Criminal Justice Committee in the State senate. Since that time, at least nine death row inmates in Texas were found to be in possession of contraband cell phones.

I don't personally think that inmates should have such open access to cell phones at all in State prisons.

To get more data on this issue, S. 1749 directs the General Accountability Office, or the GAO, to study the costs and revenues associated with the operation of landline telephones in the prison system. The study will examine select State and Federal efforts to prevent the smuggling of cell phones and other wireless devices into prisons, including efforts made to minimize trafficking of cell phones by prison guards, who are the number one source of getting cell phones in the penitentiary, and also other officials.

News stories report that prison guards are a major means in which cell phones are smuggled into prison, and prisoners pay anywhere from $300 for a normal cell phone and up to $1,000 for the smartphone. A prison guard in California made $100,000 just dealing in cell phones in the penitentiary.

It's my hope and expectation that the GAO study will help Congress and the States in the effort to combat the smuggling of cell phones into penitentiaries.

I support S. 1749. I'm also a cosponsor of another piece of legislation dealing with this specific issue, H.R. 560, the Safe Prisons Communications Act of 2009. This was introduced by my colleague from the Woodlands, Texas, area, KEVIN BRADY. This bill would allow the State or the Federal Bureau of Prisons to petition the FCC to permit them to use devices that jam cell phone signals within the prison boundary. Prisoners would then have no use for a smuggled cell phone as they would not work within the prison confinement. Along with making cell phone possession a crime, I believe Congress should also look at Mr. BRADY's bill, H.R. 560, as a way to prevent the use of cell phones in the penitentiary.

I urge all Members to support S. 1749.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, no one disagrees prisoners shouldn't have cell phones. Prisons ban them already. But some prisoners have a habit of getting around the rules—even if it's a federal crime. And it's a dangerous problem. In Texas, we've had cases where prisoners on death row made threatening calls to victims, prosecutors and their families.

Senator FEINSTEIN's bill takes a baby step—but little more. We need to give our prison officials a more reliable weapon. The answer is allowing them to use devices that jam the cell signals—making it impossible for the phones to even work.

We have the technology to do this and do it in a way that doesn't interfere with legitimate use—such as for communities that live nearby.

I've introduced legislation, H.R. 560, the Safe Prisons Communications Act, that would create a process whereby a State or prison could petition the FCC to allow them to use the jamming devices, which are currently prohibited. This bill would save lives, and give our prisons the tools they need to really combat this problem.

I ask my House colleagues to support bringing my legislation to the floor.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Cell Phone Contraband Act.

The illegal use of wireless phones in prisons is a serious problem. Smuggled cell phones are used by prisoners to maintain connections with their criminal enterprises beyond prison walls and even to commit crimes from within prison.

A recent Washington Post article reported the following incidents:

A drug dealer behind bars in Maryland used a phone to arrange to have a witness assassinated outside his home last summer.

In Kansas, a convicted killer sneaked out of prison after planning the 2006 escape using a cell phone smuggled by an accomplice. The following year, two inmates escaped another Kansas prison with the help of a former guard and a smuggled cell phone.

California prison officials confiscated about 2,800 cell phones statewide in 2008, double the number discovered the year before.

The Cell Phone Contraband Act makes it a crime for Federal prisoners to possess cell phones while incarcerated. The bill also directs the GAO to study the cost and use of landlines and smuggled cell phones in Federal and selected State prisons and jails. The study will additionally examine selected State and Federal efforts to prevent the smuggling of cell phones and other wireless devices into prisons, including efforts made to minimize trafficking of cell phones by prison guards and other officials.

This is a commonsense bill to ensure that when criminals are locked up, their ability to harm citizens is completely cut off. This legislation will send a strong signal to those that either smuggle or receive contraband cell phones that they will be held accountable.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1749, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHILD PROTECTION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2010

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1469) to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a permanent background check system, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1469

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 ''Child Protection Improvements Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) In 2006, 61,200,000 adults (a total of 26.7 percent of the population) contributed a total of 8,100,000,000 hours of volunteer service. Of those who volunteer, 27 percent dedicate their service to education or youth programs, or a total of 16,500,000 adults.

(2) Assuming recent incarceration rates remain unchanged, an estimated 6.6 percent of individuals in the United States will serve time in prison for a crime during their lifetime. The Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System of the Federal Bureau of Investigation maintains fingerprints and criminal history records on more than 65,000,000 individuals, many of whom have been arrested or convicted multiple times.

(3) A study released in 2002, found that, of individuals released from prison in 15 States in 1994, an estimated 67.5 percent were rearrested for a felony or serious misdemeanor within 3 years. Three-quarters of those new arrests resulted in convictions or a new prison sentence.

(4) Given the large number of individuals with criminal history records and the vulnerability of the population they work with, human service organizations that work with children need an effective and reliable means of obtaining relevant information about criminal histories in order to determine the suitability of a potential volunteer or employee.

(5) The large majority of Americans (88 percent) favor granting youth-serving organizations access to conviction records for screening volunteers and 59 percent favored allowing youth-serving organizations to consider arrest records when screening volunteers. This was the only use for which a majority of those surveyed favored granting access to arrest records.

(6) Congress has previously attempted to ensure that States make Federal Bureau of Investigation criminal history background checks available to organizations seeking to screen employees and volunteers who work with children, the elderly, and individuals with disabilities, through the National Child Protection Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 5119 et seq.) and the Volunteers for Children Act (Public Law 105–251; 112 Stat. 1885). However, according to a June 2006 report from the Attorney General, these laws ''did not have the intended impact of broadening the availability of NCPA checks.''. A 2007 survey conducted by MENTOR/National Mentoring Partnership found that only 18 States allowed youth mentoring organizations to access nationwide Federal Bureau of Investigation background searches.

(7) Even when accessible, the cost of a criminal history background check can be prohibitively expensive, ranging from $5 to $75 for a State fingerprint check, plus the Federal Bureau of Investigation fee, which ranges from $15.25 to $30.25, depending on the method of processing, for a total of between $21 and $99 for each volunteer or employee.

(8) Delays in processing such checks can also limit their utility. While the Federal Bureau of Investigation processes all civil fingerprint requests in less than 24 hours, State response times vary widely, and can take as long as 42 days.

(9) The Child Safety Pilot Program under section 108 of the PROTECT Act (42 U.S.C. 5119a note) revealed the importance of performing fingerprint-based Federal Bureau of Investigation criminal history background checks. Of 68,000 background checks performed through the pilot program as of May 2009, 6 percent of volunteer applicants were found to have a criminal history of concern, including very serious offenses such as sexual abuse of minors, assault, child cruelty, murder, and serious drug offenses.

(10) In an analysis performed on the volunteers screened by the Child Safety Pilot Program, it was found that over 41 percent of the individuals with criminal histories had committed an offense in a State other than the State in which they were applying to volunteer, meaning that a State-only search would not have found relevant criminal results. In addition, even though volunteers knew a background check was being performed, over 50 percent of the individuals found to have a criminal history falsely indicated on their application form that they did not have a criminal history.

(11) The Child Safety Pilot Program also demonstrates that timely and affordable background checks are possible, as background checks under that program are completed within 3 to 5 business days at a cost of $18.

SEC. 3. BACKGROUND CHECKS.

The National Child Protection Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 5119 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 5 as section 6; and

(2) by inserting after section 4 the following:

''SEC. 5. PROGRAM FOR NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR CHILD-SERVING ORGANIZATIONS.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'background check designee' means the entity or organization, if any, designated by or entering an agreement with the Attorney General under subsection (b)(3)(A) to carry out or assist in carrying out the duties described in subsection (c);

''(2) the term 'child' means an individual who is less than 18 years of age;

''(3) the term 'covered entity' means a business or organization, whether public, private, for-profit, nonprofit, or voluntary that provides care, care placement, supervision, treatment, education, training, instruction, or recreation to children, including a business or organization that licenses, certifies, or coordinates individuals or organizations to provide care, care placement, supervision, treatment, education, training, instruction, or recreation to children;

''(4) the term 'covered individual' means an individual—

''(A) who has, seeks to have, or may have unsupervised access to a child served by a covered entity; and

''(B) who—

''(i) is employed by or volunteers with, or seeks to be employed by or volunteer with, a covered entity; or

''(ii) owns or operates, or seeks to own or operate, a covered entity;

''(5) the term 'criminal history review designee' means an entity or organization, if any, designated by or entering an agreement with the Attorney General under subsection (b)(3)(B) to carry out or assist in carrying out the criminal history review program;

''(6) the term 'criminal history review program' means the program established under subsection (b)(1)(B);

''(7) the term 'identification document' has the meaning given that term in section 1028 of title 18, United States Code;

''(8) the term 'participating entity' means a covered entity that is—

''(A) located in a State that does not have a qualified State program; and

''(B) approved under subsection (f) to receive nationwide background checks in accordance with subsection (c) and participate in the criminal history review program;

''(9) the term 'qualified State program' means a program of a State authorized agency that the Attorney General determines is meeting the standards identified in subsection (b)(2) to ensure that a wide range of youth-serving organizations have affordable and timely access to nationwide background checks;

''(10) the term 'open arrest' means an arrest relating to which charges may still be brought, taking into consideration the applicable statute of limitations;

''(11) the term 'pending charge' means a criminal charge that has not been resolved through conviction, acquittal, dismissal, plea bargain, or any other means;

''(12) the term 'State' means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau; and

''(13) the term 'State authorized agency' means a division or office of a State designated by that State to report, receive, or disseminate criminal history information.

''(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Child Protection Improvements Act of 2010, the Attorney General shall—

''(A) establish policies and procedures to carry out the duties described in subsection (c); and

''(B) establish a criminal history review program in accordance with subsection (d).

''(2) ASSESSMENTS.—The Attorney General shall conduct—

''(A) an annual assessment of each State authorized agency to determine whether the agency operates a qualified State program, including a review of whether the State authorized agency—

''(i) has designated a wide range of covered entities as eligible to submit State criminal background check requests and nationwide background check requests to the State authorized agency;

''(ii) charges a covered entity not more than a total of $25 and the fee charged by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a nationwide background check; and

''(iii) returns requests for State criminal background checks and nationwide background checks to a covered entity not later than 10 business days after the date on which the request was made; and

''(B) in addition to an annual assessment under subparagraph (A), an assessment described in that subparagraph of a State authorized agency if—

''(i) a State authorized agency that does not have a qualified State program requests such an assessment; or

''(ii) the Attorney General receives reports from covered entities indicating that a State authorized agency that has a qualified State program no longer meets the standards described in subparagraph (A).

''(3) DESIGNEES.—The Attorney General may—

''(A) designate one or more Federal government agencies or enter into an agreement with any other entity or organization, or entities or organizations to carry out or assist in carrying out the duties described in subsection (c); and

''(B) designate a Federal government agency or enter into an agreement with 1 or more Federal, State, or local government agencies to carry out or assist in carrying out the criminal history review program.

''(c) ACCESS TO NATIONWIDE BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

''(1) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to streamline the process of obtaining nationwide background checks, provide effective customer service, and facilitate widespread access to nationwide background checks by participating entities.

''(2) DUTIES.—The Attorney General or the background check designee shall—

''(A) handle inquiries from covered entities and inform covered entities about how to request nationwide background checks—

''(i) for a covered entity located in a State with a qualified State program, by referring the covered entity to the State authorized agency; and

''(ii) for a covered entity located in a State without a qualified State program, by providing information on the requirements to become a participating entity;

''(B) provide participating entities with access to nationwide background checks on covered individuals in accordance with this section;

''(C) receive paper and electronic requests for nationwide background checks on covered individuals from participating entities;

''(D) to the extent practicable, negotiate an agreement with each State authorized agency under which—

''(i) that State authorized agency shall conduct a State criminal background check within the time periods specified in subsection (e) in response to a request from the Attorney General or the background check designee and provide criminal history records to the Attorney General or the criminal history review designee; and

''(ii) a participating entity may elect to obtain a State criminal background check, in addition to a nationwide background check, through 1 unified request to the Attorney General or the background check designee;

''(E) convert all paper fingerprint cards into an electronic form and securely transmit all fingerprints electronically to the national criminal history background check system and, if appropriate, the State authorized agencies;

''(F) collect a fee to conduct the nationwide background check, and, if appropriate, a State criminal background check, and remit fees to the Attorney General or the criminal history review designee, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and, if appropriate, the State authorized agencies; and

''(G) coordinate with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, participating State authorized agencies, and the Attorney General or the criminal history review designee to ensure that background check requests are being completed within the time periods specified in subsection (e).

''(3) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—A request for a nationwide background check by a participating entity shall include—

''(A) the fingerprints of the covered individual, in paper or electronic form;

''(B) a photocopy of a valid identification document; and

''(C) a statement completed and signed by the covered individual that—

''(i) sets out the covered individual's name, address, and date of birth, as those items of information appear on a valid identification document, and demographic characteristics defined at subsection (j)(2)(A);

''(ii) notifies the covered individual that the Attorney General and, if appropriate, a State authorized agency may perform a criminal history background check and that the signature of the covered individual on the statement constitutes an acknowledgment that such a check may be conducted;

''(iii) notifies the covered individual that the signature of the covered individual constitutes consent to participate in the criminal history review program, under which the participating entity may be informed if the criminal history records of the covered individual reveal a criminal history that warrants special concern or further inquiry;

''(iv) notifies the covered individual that the covered individual shall be provided with a copy of the criminal history records of the covered individual and shall have 10 business days to review the records, challenge the accuracy or completeness of any information in the records, or withdraw consent to participate in the criminal history review program before any information about the criminal history of the covered individual is provided to the participating entity; and

''(v) notifies the covered individual that prior to and after the completion of the background check, the participating entity may choose to deny the covered individual access to children.

''(4) FEES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General or the background check designee may collect a fee to defray the costs of carrying out the duties described in this subsection, the costs of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and State and local agencies in resolving the accuracy of criminal history records of covered individuals, and the duties of the criminal history review designee under this section—

''(i) for a nationwide background check and criminal history review, in an amount not to exceed the lesser of—

''(I) the sum of—

''(aa) the actual cost to the Attorney General or the background check designee of conducting a nationwide background check; and

''(bb) the actual cost to the Attorney General or the criminal history review designee of conducting a criminal history review under this section; or

''(II) to the extent practicable, no greater than $25 for a covered individual who volunteers with a covered entity except that where practicable the fee may be waived by the Attorney General upon a showing of substantial hardship; and

''(ii) for a State criminal background check described in paragraph (2)(D), in the amount specified in the agreement with the applicable State authorized agency, not to exceed $25.

''(B) PROHIBITION ON FEES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A participating entity may not charge another entity or individual a surcharge to access a background check conducted under this section.

''(ii) VIOLATION.—The Attorney General shall bar any participating entity that the Attorney General determines violated clause (i) from submitting background checks under this section.

''(d) CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW PROGRAM.—

''(1) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the criminal history review program is to provide participating entities with reliable and accurate information regarding whether a covered individual has been convicted of, or has an open arrest or pending charges for, a crime that may bear upon the fitness of the covered individual to have responsibility for the safety and well-being of the children in their care.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Attorney General or the criminal history review designee shall—

''(A) establish procedures to securely receive criminal history records from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, if necessary, and from State authorized agencies, if appropriate;

''(B) after receiving a criminal history record from the Federal Bureau of Investigation transmit to the covered individual—

''(i) the criminal history records;

''(ii) a detailed notification of the rights of the covered individual under subsection (g); and

''(iii) information about how to contact the Attorney General or criminal history review designee for the purpose of challenging the accuracy or completeness of any information in the criminal history record or to withdraw consent to participate in the criminal history review program;

''(C) if the covered individual informs the Attorney General or criminal history review designee that the covered individual intends to challenge the accuracy or completeness of any information in the criminal history record, assist the covered individual in contacting the appropriate persons or offices within the Federal Bureau of Investigation or State authorized agency;

''(D) make determinations regarding whether the criminal history records received in response to a criminal history background check conducted under this section indicate that the covered individual has a criminal history that may bear on the covered individual's fitness to provide care to children, based solely on the criteria described in paragraph (3);

''(E) unless the covered individual has withdrawn consent to participate in the criminal history review program, convey to the participating entity that submitted the request for a nationwide background check—

''(i) which of the 3 categorizations described in paragraph (3) criminal conviction of special concern identified, further inquiry recommended, or no criminal records of special concern identified apply to the covered individual;

''(ii) information and guidance relating to the appropriate use of criminal history information when making decisions regarding hiring employees and using volunteers;

''(iii) if a criminal history that meets the criteria set forth in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (3) is found, a recommendation to the participating entity to consult with the covered individual in order to obtain more information about the criminal history of the covered individual, and a list of factors to consider in assessing the significance of that criminal history, including—

''(I) the nature, gravity, and circumstances of the offense, including whether the individual was convicted of the offense;

''(II) the period of time that has elapsed since the date of the offense or end of a period of incarceration or supervised release;

''(III) the nature of the position held or sought; and

''(IV) any evidence of rehabilitation; and

''(iv) instructions and guidance that, in evaluating the considerations described in clause (iii), the participating entity should consult the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Policy Statement on the Issue of Conviction Records under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act or any successor thereto issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission;

''(F) if a covered individual has withdrawn consent to participate in the criminal history review program, inform the participating entity that consent has been withdrawn;

''(G) work with the Attorney General or the background check designee and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to develop processes and procedures to ensure that criminal history background check requests are completed within the time periods specified in subsection (e); and

''(H) serve as a national resource center to provide guidance and assistance to participating entities on how to interpret criminal history information, the possible restrictions that apply when making hiring decisions

based on criminal histories, and other related information.

''(3) CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW CRITERIA.—The Attorney General or the criminal history review designee shall, in determining when a criminal history record indicates that a covered individual has a criminal history that may bear on the fitness of the covered individual to provide care to children—

''(A) assign a categorization of criminal conviction of special concern identified if a covered individual is found to have a conviction that would prevent the individual from being approved as a foster or adoptive parent under section 471(a)(20)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(20)(A));

''(B) assign a categorization of further inquiry recommended if a covered individual is found to have—

''(i) a conviction for a serious misdemeanor, committed against a child, involving the same type of conduct prohibited by a felony described in section 471(a)(20)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(20)(A));

''(ii) a conviction for a serious misdemeanor, not committed against a child, involving the same type of conduct prohibited by a felony described in section 471(a)(20)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(20)(A)) unless 5 years has elapsed since the later of the date of conviction and the date of release of the person from imprisonment for that conviction;

''(iii) an open arrest or pending charge for a felony described in, or a serious misdemeanor involving the same type of conduct prohibited by a felony described in, section 471(a)(20)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(20)(A)); and

''(C) assign a categorization of no criminal records of special concern identified for a covered individual that does not meet the criteria described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

''(e) TIMING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless exceptional circumstances apply, criminal background checks shall be completed according to the time frame under this subsection. The Attorney General or the background check designee shall work with the criminal history review designee and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to ensure that the time limits under this subsection are being achieved.

''(2) APPLICATION PROCESSING.—The Attorney General or the background check designee shall electronically submit a national background check request to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and, if appropriate, the participating State authorized agency not later than 2 business days after the date on which a request for a national background check is received by the Attorney General or the background check designee.

''(3) CONDUCT OF BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The Federal Bureau of Investigation and, if appropriate, a State authorized agency shall provide criminal history records to the Attorney General or the criminal history review designee not later than 2 business days after the date on which the Federal Bureau of Investigation or State authorized agency, as the case may be, receives a request for a nationwide background check from the Attorney General or the background check designee.

''(4) PROVISION OF RECORDS TO COVERED INDIVIDUALS AND OPPORTUNITY TO CHALLENGE.—When the Attorney General or the criminal history review designee finds that a covered individual's criminal history records fall with the categorizations described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (d)(3), the Attorney General or criminal history review designee shall provide the covered individual with the criminal history records of the covered individual and a detailed notification of the rights of the covered individual under subsection (g) not later than 1 business day after the date on which the Attorney General or criminal history review designee receives a criminal history record from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and, if necessary, resolves any potentially incomplete information in accordance with subsection (d)(2)(B). The covered individual shall have 10 business days from the date sent to challenge the accuracy or completeness of any information in the criminal history record or to withdraw consent to participate in the criminal history review program.

''(5) CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEWS.—Unless the Federal Bureau of Investigation certifies that further time is required to resolve a challenge brought by a covered individual, the Attorney General or the criminal history review designee shall convey to the participating entity the information set forth in subparagraph (F) or (G) of subsection (d)(2), as appropriate, 10 business days after providing the covered individuals with the criminal history records of the covered individual and a notification of their rights under subsection (g).

''(f) PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General or the background check designee shall determine whether an entity is a covered entity and whether that covered entity should be approved as a participating entity, based on—

''(A) whether the entity is located in a State that has a qualified State program; and

''(B) the consultation conducted under paragraph (2).

''(2) CONSULTATION.—In determining how many covered entities to approve as participating entities, the Attorney General or the background check designee shall consult quarterly with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the criminal history review designee to determine the volume of requests for national background checks that can be completed, based on the capacity of the criminal history review program and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the availability of resources, and the demonstrated need for national background checks in order to protect children.

''(3) PREFERENCE FOR NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—In determining whether a covered entity should be approved as a participating entity under paragraph (1), the Attorney General or the background check designee shall give preference to any organization participating in the Child Safety Pilot Program under section 108(a)(3) of the PROTECT Act (42 U.S.C. 5119a note) on the date of enactment of the Child Protection Improvements Act of 2010 and to any other nonprofit organizations.

''(g) RIGHT OF COVERED INDIVIDUALS TO CHALLENGE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF RECORDS.—A covered individual who is the subject of a nationwide background check under this section may challenge the accuracy and completeness of the criminal history records in the criminal history report as provided in subsection (d)(2)(D), without submitting a separate set of fingerprints or an additional fee.

''(h) DUTIES OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.—

''(1) RESPONSE TO A REQUEST FOR CRIMINAL BACKGROUND RECORDS.—Upon request by the Attorney General or background check designee, the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall conduct a nationwide background check and provide any criminal history records to the Attorney General or criminal history review designee.

''(2) RESOLUTION OF CHALLENGES.—If a covered individual challenges the accuracy or completeness of any information in the criminal history record of the covered individual, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in consultation with the agency that contributed to the record, shall—

''(A) investigate the challenge with relevant departments and agencies of the Federal Government and State and local governments;

''(B) promptly make a determination regarding the accuracy and completeness of the challenged information; and

''(C) correct any inaccurate or incomplete records.

''(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2014 such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

''(2) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that in fiscal year 2011, and each fiscal year thereafter, the fees collected by the Attorney General or the background check designee should be sufficient to carry out the duties of the Attorney General or the background check designee under this section and to help support the criminal history review program.

''(j) COLLECTION OF DATA AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the establishment of the program created under subsection (b), and annually thereafter, the Attorney General shall prepare and submit to Congress and make available to the public a report on the programs and procedures established under this Act.

''(2) COLLECTION OF DATA.—

''(A) DEFINITION OF DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS.—In this paragraph, the term 'demographic characteristics' includes information pertaining to race, color, ancestry, national origin, age, sex, and marital status.

''(B) COMPILING.—Beginning within 90 days after the establishment of the program under subsection (b), the Attorney General shall compile data regarding—

''(i) the number and types of participating entities;

''(ii) the fees charged to participating entities under this section;

''(iii) the time interval between nationwide background check submissions and responses under this section;

''(iv) the fiscal impact of this section on State authorized agencies;

''(v) the number and demographic characteristics of covered individuals submitting a statement described in subsection (c)(3)(A)(iii) as part of a request for a nationwide background check;

''(vi) the number and demographic characteristics of covered individuals determined to have a criminal history;

''(vii) the number, type (including the identity of the offense and whether the offense was committed while the covered individual was a juvenile or adult), and frequency of offenses, and length of the period between the date of the offense and the date of the nationwide background check for any covered individuals found to have a criminal history under this section;

''(viii) the procedures available for covered individuals to challenge the accuracy and completeness of criminal history records under this section;

''(ix) the number and results of challenges to the accuracy and completeness of criminal history records under this section;

''(x) the number and types of corrections of erroneous criminal history records based on a challenge under this section; and

''(xi) the number and types of inquiries for assistance on interpreting a criminal history received by the criminal history review program.

''(C) AGGREGATING DATA.—The Attorney General shall—

''(i) aggregate the data collected under this paragraph by State and city; and

''(ii) aggregate the data collected under clauses (v), (vi), and (vii) of subparagraph (B) by race, color, ancestry, national origin, age, sex, and marital status.

''(D) REPORTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Child Protection Improvements Act of 2010, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General shall prepare and submit to Congress a report concerning the data compiled and aggregated under this paragraph.

''(ii) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under clause (i) shall contain—

''(I) the data compiled and aggregated under this paragraph, organized in such a way as to provide a comprehensive analysis of the programs and procedures established under this section;

''(II) information regarding and analysis of—

''(aa) the programs and procedures established under this section; and

''(bb) the extent such programs and procedures have helped screen individuals who may pose a risk to children; and

''(III) information regarding and analysis of whether and to what extent the programs and procedures established under this section are having a disparate impact on individuals based on race, color, ancestry, national origin, age, sex, or marital status.

''(iii) RECOMMENDATIONS.—A report submitted under clause (i) may contain recommendations to Congress on possible legislative improvements to this section.

''(iv) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—Upon the request of any member of Congress, the Attorney General shall make available any of the data compiled or aggregated under this paragraph. The Attorney General shall not make available any data that identifies specific individuals.

''(k) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) FAILURE TO CONDUCT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS.—No participating entity shall be liable in an action for damages solely for failure to conduct a criminal background check on a covered individual.

''(B) FAILURE TO TAKE ADVERSE ACTION AGAINST COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—No participating entity shall be liable in an action for damages solely for a failure to take action adverse to a covered individual upon receiving any notice of criminal history from the Attorney General or the criminal history review designee under subsection (d)(2)(F).

''(2) RELIANCE.—A participating entity that reasonably relies on criminal history records received in response to a background check under this section shall not be liable in an action for damages based on the inaccuracy or incompleteness of that information.

''(3) CRIMINAL HISTORY REVIEW PROGRAM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C) the background check designee and the criminal history review designee, including a director, officer, employee, or agent of the background check designee, or the criminal history review designee, shall not be liable in an action for damages relating to the performance of the responsibilities and functions of the background check designee and the criminal history review designee under this section.

''(B) INTENTIONAL, RECKLESS, OR OTHER MISCONDUCT.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply in an action if the background check designee, or the criminal history review designee, or a director, officer, employee, or agent of the background check designee, or the criminal history review designee, engaged in intentional misconduct or acted, or failed to act, with actual malice, with reckless disregard to a substantial risk of causing injury without legal justification, or for a purpose unrelated to the performance of responsibilities or functions under this section.

''(C) ORDINARY BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an act or omission relating to an ordinary business activity, such as an activity involving general administration or operations, the use of motor vehicles, or personnel management.

''(4) CIVIL CLAIMS OF DAMAGES.—Nothing in this subsection shall apply in actions for damages based upon title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or the Fair Credit Report Act.

''(l) PRIVACY OF INFORMATION.—

''(1) PROHIBITION ON UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OR USE OF CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS.—Except for a covered individual, any entity or individual authorized to receive or transmit fingerprints or criminal history records under this Act—

''(A) shall use the fingerprints, criminal history records, or information in the criminal history records only for the purposes specifically set forth in this Act;

''(B) shall allow access to the fingerprints, criminal history records, or information in the criminal history records only to those employees of the entity, and only on such terms, as are necessary to fulfill the purposes set forth in this Act;

''(C) shall not disclose the fingerprints, criminal history records, or information in the criminal history records, except as specifically authorized under this Act;

''(D) shall keep a written record of each authorized disclosure of the fingerprints, criminal history records, or the information in the criminal history records; and

''(E) shall maintain adequate security measures to ensure the confidentiality of the fingerprints, the criminal history records, and the information in the criminal history records.

''(2) COMPLIANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall promulgate regulations to ensure the enforcement of the nondisclosure requirements under paragraph (1) and to provide for appropriate sanctions in the case of violations of the requirements.

''(B) PARTICIPATING ENTITIES AND DESIGNEES.—The participation in any program under this section by an entity or organization that enters into an agreement with the Attorney General to carry out the duties described in subsection (c) or to carry out the criminal history review program shall be conditioned on the person—

''(i) establishing procedures to ensure compliance with, and respond to any violations of, paragraph (1); and

''(ii) maintaining substantial compliance with paragraph (1).

''(3) DESTRUCTION OF RECORDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Attorney General, the background check designee, and the criminal history review designee shall destroy any fingerprints, either in paper or electronic form, or criminal history record received for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act after any transaction based on the fingerprints or criminal history record is completed, and shall not maintain the fingerprints, the criminal history records, or the information in the criminal history record in any form. This paragraph shall not apply to the retention of fingerprints by the FBI, upon consent of the covered individual or in accordance with State or Federal procedures, for the purpose of providing fingerprint verification or subsequent hit notification services, or for the retention of criminal history record information which updates the criminal history record.

''(B) REPEAT APPLICANTS.—A covered individual may sign a release permitting the Attorney General or background check designee to retain the fingerprints of the covered individual for a period not to exceed 5 years, for the sole purpose of participating in the criminal history review program on a subsequent occasion.''.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF CHILD SAFETY PILOT.

Section 108(a)(3)(A) of the PROTECT Act (42 U.S.C. 5119a note) is amended—

(1) by striking ''92-month''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: ''The Child Safety Pilot Program under this paragraph shall terminate on the date that the program for national criminal history background checks for child-serving organizations established under the Child Protection Improvements Act of 2010 is operating and able to enroll any organization using the Child Safety Pilot Program.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1469, the Child Protection Improvements Act of 2009, will permanently authorize the National Child Safety Program.

Passed in 2003 as part of the PROTECT Act, the National Child Safety Pilot Program assists organizations in checking criminal records of volunteers before placing them as mentors with children. Every year, millions of Americans generously give their time and energy to volunteer and mentor children across the country. While most of these volunteers and mentors are only interested in being good role models to children, it is important that we are able to identify those who seek to do harm.

The National Child Safety Pilot Program has enabled youth-serving organizations to access the FBI's national fingerprint-based background check system since 2003. By providing access to the more comprehensive data in the FBI's database, rather than just the in-State background check that would otherwise be available, the program has helped to prevent child predators and sex offenders from getting access to children through legitimate mentoring programs.

□ 1920

Notably, 6 percent of checks have come back showing serious criminal records.

In a study of the pilot program, it was found that over 41 percent of the individuals with criminal histories had committed an offense in a State other than the State in which they were applying to be a volunteer. In these cases,

a State-based search would not have provided a complete picture of the person's criminal record.

Over 50 percent of the individuals found to have a criminal history had falsely indicated on their application form that they did not have a criminal history, even when the volunteers knew a background check was going to be performed.

This is a noncontroversial fee-based program that has successfully provided invaluable information to mentoring organizations at no cost to taxpayers. It makes sense to now make the program permanent.

I want to thank my colleague from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for his hard work on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, children are our greatest resource in this country. As citizens, as legislators, as parents and grandparents, it's our job to keep them safe, to be vigilant about protecting these children from those who wish to do them harm.

The Child Protection Improvements Act of 2010 goes a long way toward ensuring that our children are not harmed by those that they are told to trust. Specifically, this bill extends the Child Safety Pilot Program which provides a background check for volunteer organizations that work with children. The bill also creates a mechanism to replace the pilot program with a permanent background check system that will enroll any organization using the Child Safety Pilot Program.

Originally created in 2003 under the PROTECT Act, the Child Safety Pilot Program has been a proven and effective resource for protecting America's children. Of almost 90,000 background checks performed through the pilot program, 6 percent of volunteer applicants were found to have a criminal history of some concern. These included serious offenses such as sexual abuse of minors, assault, child cruelty, drug offenses, and even homicide.

Since inception of the Child Safety Pilot Program, over 42 percent of those with criminal histories had convictions in a State other than the State in which they were applying to volunteer. If the volunteer group had performed a search of only State records, many relevant criminal convictions would not have been identified. Access to the national criminal database is crucial to ensuring thorough background checks.

During a study of over 1,600 applicants, even though volunteers knew that they would be subjected to a background check, 50 percent or more of them lied on their applications about having a criminal history and, in fact, did have a record that contained criterion offenses. Of the applicants with criminal records, 22 percent had a different name reflected on their record than the one used when they had to volunteer.

Through the pilot program, nonprofit organizations that provide youth-focused care may request criminal history background checks from the FBI on applicants for volunteer or employee positions that entail working with children. The bill builds on the pilot program and would allow other child-serving organizations to better screen volunteers or employees.

Volunteer and other child-serving organizations across the country are working hard to provide safe learning and growing environments for our children. That means hiring professional and responsible employees without a criminal history. H.R. 1469 provides a permanent program that will help these groups do just that.

H.R. 1469 is supported by the Boys and Girls Clubs of America; the YMCA; the Salvation Army; Big Brothers, Big Sisters of America; and Volunteers of America, as well as many other important organizations.

Many Members of this body are parents and grandparents first and Members of Congress second, and this legislation is critical to keeping America's children safe from predators and other criminals. If one less child becomes a victim of crime because of this program, then we have succeeded.

Mr. Speaker, with all the sophisticated information we have, if we are able to find out the criminal history of individuals, this act will allow us to do so.

I urge all my colleagues to join in supporting this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) a former prosecutor and the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank Chairman SCOTT for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1469, the Child Protection Improvements Act. I first introduced this legislation in 2007 with my colleague MIKE ROGERS of Michigan. The Child Protection Improvements Act would ensure that any mentoring organization or child-serving nonprofit will be able to obtain an affordable, fast, and accurate background check of a potential volunteer.

About 25 years ago, I began as a volunteer with Big Brothers, Big Sisters. Big Brothers paired me with an extraordinary young man named David. I've always said that I've learned as much or more from David as he ever learned from me. The experience also helped me understand the huge amount of trust we put in volunteers at organizations all around the country. In the vast majority of cases, the trust is well placed; but, unfortunately, there are exceptions.

For that reason, in 2003, Congress created the Child Safety Pilot Program to demonstrate the feasibility of allowing youth-serving nonprofits to access FBI background checks. The FBI maintains a database of criminal histories from every State in the Nation searchable by fingerprint. An FBI search is the gold standard background check, as it cannot be evaded by using a fake name and it will find convictions from every State. I believe the gold standard is what we should strive for when it comes to protecting children who are put in potentially a vulnerable situation.

Since 2003, almost 90,000 background checks have been performed through the pilot. In 94 percent of the cases, the background check returns no serious criminal history. However, in 6 percent of the cases, a record of some kind was found, in some cases an extensive record which the applicant attempted to conceal. In 23 percent of those cases, the applicant gave a name other than the one in their criminal history. Applicants were found with convictions for everything from murder to child abuse to sexual assault; and frequently those convictions were from out of State so that only an FBI background check would have found them.

We have demonstrated that background checks for nonprofits working with children can be conducted quickly, affordably, and accurately. Three times since 2003, Congress has acted to extend the pilot so that thousands of community organizations all over the country don't lose access to background checks for their volunteers. It's time to create a permanent system, one that will protect children while ensuring the civil rights and privacy of volunteers.

Again, I want to thank Chairman CONYERS, one of the original cosponsors; Chairman SCOTT, the chairman of the subcommittee; my colleague, MIKE ROGERS; and all other Members who have contributed to this effort and urge the Members to vote ''yes.''

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman SCOTT and Chairman CONYERS and also the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for sponsoring this legislation and also want to thank Mr. SCHIFF for not just this piece of legislation but other pieces of legislation in his relentless effort as a Member of Congress to make sure that the greatest resource in our country, children, are protected from child predators.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to, again, thank the gentleman from California for his leadership on this issue.

I ask my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1469, 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. SCOTT of Virginia. 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.

□ 1930

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

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

FEDS SUING ARIZONA FOR DOING A JOB THE FEDS WON'T DO

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Justice Department is suing Arizona for enforcing Federal laws that are already on the books. Other States and counties already have enforcement laws like Arizona's.

Prince William County in Virginia has laws almost identical to the new Arizona Senate Bill 1070 enforcement law. Police are allowed to check legal status at any time. Police are also required to check immigration status if anyone is arrested for anything, including DUI or public drunkenness.

According to Corey Stewart, the county board chairman, there has been a 37 percent drop in violent crime in the first 2 years of enforcement of this law. Overall, crime in Prince William County, Virginia, is at a 15-year low. Criminal aliens have fled that part of Virginia and gone somewhere elsewhere the laws are not enforced. Stewart says there has not been one substantiated claim of racial profiling.

Also, the State of Rhode Island enforces Federal immigration law by executive order, like the sanctuary cities, only in reverse. The Governor said his law enforcement officers must enforce this Federal law.

There are more States that follow suit. In Missouri, if police want to see your ID papers to prove legal status, they are free to ask. Sanctuary cities are illegal in Missouri and they enforce the E-Verify system for employers. That's the free system set up by the Federal Government where all employers can check someone's immigration status. In Missouri, you have to be legal to get a driver's license and there is no in-State tuition for illegals at State junior colleges.

So why the double standard at the Justice Department and suing Arizona? Why are the Feds picking on Arizona and not these other States?

On the other hand, there are two laws that expressly forbid States from having sanctuary cities. The laws are found in title 8, section 1373 and title 8, section 1644 of the United States code.

These statutes say cities may not have policy that prohibits peace officers from communicating with the Federal Government about a person's immigration status. But there are cities across the country with policies banning their police from calling the Federal Government to report even criminal illegals.

In San Francisco, one recent case turned tragic. In 2008, there were three members of a family that were gunned down by Salvadoran illegals. Edwin Ramos is a member of the MS–13 narcoterrorist gang, and he is on trial for gunning down one of the members of this family. Two young sons of that family were also gunned down, Matthew and Michael were their names.

They were all in a car driving home from a family barbecue after church. They were not gang members, they were just citizens. They were in the wrong place at the wrong time, and Ramos, their accused killer, had been previously arrested three times.

San Francisco police knew he was an illegal alien MS–13 gang member. The San Francisco Chronicle reported after the shooting that the city's sanctuary policy was the reason authorities never called the Federal Government. I repeat. The newspaper, the San Francisco Chronicle, reported after the shooting that the city's sanctuary policy was the reason the authorities did not call the Feds.

Instead of being detained and deported, gang member Edwin Ramos was released, and he killed a father and the two young brothers because of the Federal Government's tolerance to sanctuary cities. So the blood is on the hands of those who support the concept of sanctuary cities. There was even an eyewitness to the shooting, and Tony's youngest son, who survived the hail of bullets, was that witness.

Is the Justice Department suing San Francisco to stop this sort of irresponsible action? No, of course not.

Instead, the Justice Department is using taxpayer dollars to sue the State of Arizona for enforcing Federal laws. Arizona is not creating any new laws, they are merely enforcing the Federal law under concurrent jurisdiction.

The sanctuary cities pose a greater danger to American cities because they give a sanctuary to all illegals. They shield criminal aliens from being detained and deported by the Federal Government, and sanctuary cities, in my opinion, operate in violation of the Federal Government law prohibiting such. But because of politics, the administration is suing Arizona for upholding the law and refuses to sue sanctuary cities for violating Federal law.

We hear the rhetoric that illegals do jobs Americans won't do. Now we have an actual situation where Arizona is getting sued for doing a job the American government won't do—protecting the security of the country and enforcing the law.

And that's just the way it is.

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

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

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

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

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

(Mrs. HALVORSON 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 gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN 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 gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY 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 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 gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan 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 Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

AMERICA'S ECONOMY IS STRUGGLING

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, America's economy is struggling. Despite all of the spending and promises out of Washington, a lot of average Americans, more than 15 million, are wondering where are the jobs, because they don't have one.

This Democrat Congress and this White House promised a lot to these workers and to the American taxpayer if they would just give them a blank check, if they could just write money like there was no tomorrow, that they, Washington, would know best how to get this economy back on track.

Unfortunately, the reality of the past 16 months since the stimulus bill passed has unfortunately been much less than what was promised.

The Obama administration likes to tout right now, they call this ''the summer of recovery,'' but you don't see them touting. Because what their original promises were for that $862 billion—more than a trillion dollars, when you add the interest to it, the taxpayers will actually have to pay back. The reality is that the Obama administration, the Democrats in Washington, failed on all three key promises to the American people about its economy.

They said our first promise is if you will pass this stimulus, the unemployment rate would remain below 8 percent. They said nonfarm payroll employment, that's most workers, would increase to 137.6 million by the end of this year. And then finally they said if you pass our stimulus bill, 90 percent of payroll jobs created would be in the private sector.

Well, let's look at the reality. It's been 16 months, a lot of the stimulus has been spent, not all, but a lot of it. So 16 months later, what do we see?

The Obama forecast was supposed to be at this point, almost 7.5 percent. Today it's actually 9.5 percent. That's a little lower than it's been. The reason it's lower: 650,000 Americans last month just gave up, gave up looking for work, gave up hope looking for work.

So that employment rate went down, not because the economy is getting better, but people have given up hope that they will get a job, 16 months after this magical stimulus bill was passed, so the actual versus the forecast is very sad.

□ 1940

Second promise, that the stimulus would raise employment, jobs in America, 137 million. This is where we're at right here, as stagnant as can be. In fact, right now, congressional Democrats and the White House, they are 7 million jobs short of where they promised they would be by the end of the year, 7 million jobs short. The economy has never created 7 million jobs in 6 months before. Short on promise number two, failed by a wide margin.

And here I think is the reason. I think this sums up why the stimulus failed, why so many Americans are disappointed with the Obama administration. I think the last poll was 13 percent of Americans believe the stimulus helped them in any way, 90 percent of Americans believe this economy is in bad shape, and almost three-fourths don't believe it's going to get better any time soon. So, so much for restoring consumer confidence in America's economy. And this is the real reason why, promise number three.

Remember, promise number one, below 8 percent, didn't come close; promise number two, we would have 137 million jobs by the end of this year, 7 million short. This is promise number three, that 90 percent of all the new jobs created by the stimulus would come from the private sector, not from government. They would come from small businesses back home along Main Street, the same small business and private sector jobs that have always brought America out of a deep recession.

Well, here's the actuality: Since the stimulus passed 16 months ago, hundreds of billions of dollars of money spent and wasted in America, guess what's happened? The only sector that has grown—the Federal Government. The Federal Government has added 400,000 government workers. How about the private sector? How about our small businesses in every State across America? Lost almost 3.3 million jobs. Federal Government workers grew. State government came down a little, but they pumped a lot of stimulus money into more government workers. The private sector, the businesses that bring us out of the recession, lost 3.3 million jobs. That's why this economy is so subpar.

America is blessed. We are, I think, genetically predisposed to bouncing back from tough economic times. We hate to be in recession. But not this time. This recession, unfortunately, is continuing, not from a statistical sense, but from a jobs sense. It is one-third as strong a recovery as the Reagan recovery, and we can talk about that in a minute. But here's the reason why.

Washington has poured all this money into government workers and wasteful stimulus spending and they expect the economy to just jump-start. As they said, it will jump-start and consumer confidence will grow. The opposite has happened. Consumers, families are holding on to their money. They're frightened by the dangerous levels of debt in this country. They're frightened by $13 trillion of national debt America owes in publicly held debt. And businesses are frightened these days.

As one of the Secretaries of Labor here in Washington said: Businesses aren't adding jobs because they're waiting to see what government can do for them; businesses aren't adding jobs because they're frightened by what government will do to them. They see an environment in Washington, proposals that dramatically increase taxes, increase regulation, increase their health care costs, increase their energy costs, that broaden government, expand regulation into almost every nook and cranny of this economy. And they look at that and they say, No, you know, we're going to delay rehiring people we laid off, hiring new ones. We're going to delay that critical investment decision, that expansion decision, the decision to buy that new piece of equipment because we don't want to be punished by Washington for adding jobs. We don't want to be punished if we go out and hire that new worker or buy that new piece of equipment. And that uncertainty, unfortunately, is an anchor around our economic recession. And that uncertainty means that American businesses are holding on to almost $2 trillion of cash, $2 trillion, normally enough to, again, start bringing us out of this recession. They're not willing to do that.

They're frightened by this White House. They're frightened by Washington, D.C. They look at what's happening in Congress and these wild proposals, extreme, ideologically driven agendas, and they're saying, We're going to play it safe and stand pat with their money. Consumers are doing it because of the debt, businesses because of these terrible antibusiness, antijob,

growth-killing proposals coming out of Washington, D.C.

We've seen this before. We've seen this before. Economists refer to this phenomenon as ''regime uncertainty.'' What I would call it is a rational expectation. Families know America is so deep in debt, someone's got to pay it back. You can't tax the wealthy just to pay that back. You can double everyone's taxes in America. Double them this year, we would still be running a deficit.

You can't tax away this problem. But businesses and families are worried that's exactly what's going to happen. Middle class, small businesses will end up shouldering a bigger and bigger burden of government. That means less money in their paycheck. They know that. Rationally, they expect it, so they're holding back. Businesses are doing the same.

We saw this before as President Franklin Roosevelt's contradictory and rapidly shifting economic policies delayed recovery from the Great Depression. The U.S. was the last country to recover from the Great Depression.

Today, unfortunately, this White House, this Washington is following the same formula of spending, of uncertainty, of poor governance, poor decisions, and at times, as we saw in the gulf, sheer incompetence. But again, businesses look at what they see out of the White House—higher taxes, new laws, the entrepreneurs who are frightened to hire. That's why—back to this chart. That's why the Federal Government is the only sector that has grown. And whenever there are government jobs, they only last as long as that money keeps coming out of your paycheck. But in the private sector, when a business creates a job, when a local company hires a worker, buys that new piece of manufacturing equipment, those economic benefits multiply across the community. But unfortunately, private sector in America lost over 3 million jobs.

Don't take my word for it. The National Federation of Independent Businesses recently surveyed a number of their small business owners, and here's what they said: U.S. economy faces hurricane-force headwinds and the government is at the center of the storm, making an economic recovery very difficult. This is small businesses.

By the way, I am Congressman KEVIN BRADY. I represent the Eighth District of Texas. It's a great area—11 counties from the Louisiana border through east Texas and down through Montgomery County and the Woodlands. I'm the fourth senior Republican on the Ways and Means Committee, the ranking Republican on the Trade Subcommittee, and the ranking House Republican on the Joint Economic Committee.

So we've been studying these businesses and these economic numbers for some time. And what the NFIB, the small independent businesses has said, in addition, Either policymakers have no idea how to help the economy or they are intentionally committing it to unsustainable expenditure growth and deficits so large there will be no alternative but to raise taxes, a slow suicide for a dynamic economy. Just what I said, the National Federation of Independent Businesses has confirmed that it is the hurricane-force winds coming out of Washington, DC, that's holding this economy back.

They go on to say this: With an unemployment rate of nearly 10 percent, the President travels the country touting the health care bill that few like, selling wealth redistribution and the need for more taxes. What should ordinary citizens and small business owners expect from all this? A growing and more dynamic economy? Not likely. Taxing success is a terrible path to growth and real investment. And adding to the misery and pessimism, massive government deficits threaten future capital availability for the private sector.

So our independent businesses along Main Street say just what those of us who have been in business before say: It is Washington that's holding back this economic recovery. It's the White House that's holding back this economic recovery with this very extreme agenda.

I'm going to yield in a moment to another Texan, one of our more studious members of the Joint Economic Committee, from Texas, Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS, but I want to take this quote from the Business Roundtable, because, while the NFIB represents tens of thousands of independent businesses, Business Roundtable represents businesses from every sector in America who are selling here in the United States, competing around the world to sell American as well.

And here's what the Business Roundtable just said: Many regulations and legislation, both existing and proposed, exacerbate the uncertainty created by today's volatile economic environment. Virtually every new regulation has an impact on recovery, competitiveness, and job creation. Often that impact is negative. On an individual basis, most businesses can cope with each new regulation, but the collective impact on the economy is enormous and often harmful. And with the massive new health care law—this is from the Business Roundtable—with the massive new health care law and financial reform legislation looming, companies are more worried than ever about the impact new regulations and legislation will have on their operations and their bottom line. Not knowing what to expect from these pending regulations, businesses are acting cautiously to forestall any negative impact. These actions are squelching economic growth and job creation as companies are forced to freeze investment and hiring until they understand how they will be affected by these new mandates.

□ 1950

So, despite hundreds of billions of dollars of spending and despite all this government intervention and expansion of government, the American economy is stalled because businesses—those job creators who bring us out of recessions—are frightened by Washington and these policies. They don't want to be pushed. They are holding onto almost $2 trillion of cash, and that capital is what would fuel our economic recovery. So Washington and the White House is the single largest obstacle to America's getting back on its economic feet.

Joining me tonight is a Congressman from Texas who serves on the Energy and Commerce Committee. He is one of the leading Republicans there, but he also serves with me on the Joint Economic Committee. He focuses not just on health care but on businesses along Main Street.

I would yield to the honorable Congressman from Texas, from the Fort Worth area, Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Of course, the gentleman is correct. You know, I believe in the American economy. I believe in the ability of the American people to recover this economy. I don't think that the United States House of Representatives, the Senate and the White House combined can keep this economy down forever, but they can give it a good shot at keeping it down longer than it needs to be; and, we all know, because of the prolonged effect of joblessness, the economy is having a tougher time recovering.

The gentleman said it so well as to the reason small- and medium-sized businesses are reluctant to add jobs right now, and I know you see the same thing in your district that I'm seeing in my district. Some things look like they're picking up a little bit—parking lots are a little fuller—but when you talk to the small business people and ask them, Are you doing a little bit better this year? they answer, Yeah, maybe a little bit.

Do you think you might add a job soon? Might you be able to take someone else into your business?

Well, I might, but I don't know what you're going to do to me in this health care bill. I still haven't figured it out. I have no idea what this financial regulatory scheme that you've passed is going to do to me. I sure can't afford the tax increases that you're going to be delivering at the end of this year. So, no, I don't think I can add a job and that, if you further do something with energy prices, I know that the future is just too uncertain, so I'll just stand pat right now. I'm doing okay, but I'm not going to be adding any jobs.

Well, that may be one or two jobs at a single business at a strip mall shopping center; but extrapolated across the larger economy, those are the jobs that should be fueling our recovery, and the activities here in Washington, DC, are what are having the dampening effect on that.

Now, today's Wall Street Journal had kind of an interesting lead editorial on

the editorial page, appropriately titled, ''Stimulating Unemployment.'' It's kind of a novel approach as to how you might attack a problem of the economy.

According to the Wall Street Journal today, they talked about how Presidents typically invite Americans to appear at Rose Garden press conferences to trumpet a policy success; but yesterday, we saw what may have been a first. President Obama introduced three Americans—an autoworker, a fitness center employee and a woman in real estate—who have been out of work for so long that they underscore the failure of his entire economic program.

Going on, they say, But Mr. Obama was nonetheless obliged to concede that 18 months after his $862 billion stimulus there are still five job seekers for every job opening and that 2.5 million Americans will soon run out of unemployment benefits. Only last week, Vice President JOE BIDEN was hailing the stimulus for saving or creating 3 million jobs. This week, the White House says we need even more stimulus in the form of jobless checks to make up for the jobs his original stimulus spending did not create.

Here is an interesting issue. Of course, we hear over and over and over again how it's the Republicans who are obstructing the extension of unemployment insurance benefits; but realistically, there is still money left in that stimulus bill. Since the stimulus has been such a failure in creating jobs and since the money is available to pay for those unemployment benefits, that seems like a reasonable suggestion. I get calls in the office all day long that, yes, that is a reasonable suggestion. Why don't we proceed with that? Instead, we continue to pass bills where this money is just simply going to be added to the deficit.

If the money weren't just sitting there, languishing in the stimulus bill, then maybe you could see their point; but realistically, the money is there. It should be used to offset the extension of unemployment benefits because one thing that we do know is that there is a consequence for borrowing these vast sums of money. We know that expanding the deficit to the $1.4 trillion or $1.6 trillion that we are going to see this year is ultimately money which is going to have to be borrowed; and because that money will ultimately have to be borrowed, it could raise the interest rate and could, subsequently, have an effect on inflation.

So why not do the sensible thing and spend the money that you have already allocated in the stimulus bill, which isn't doing anyone any good anyway? If you need to extend unemployment insurance, that would be the correct place to do it.

I have some other points that I'd like to share, but I'll yield back to the gentleman and hear his thoughts on that.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Well, I'd like to follow up on your point about unemployment benefits.

The Republicans support helping people when they're down on their luck. There is no question about it. There has been extension after extension. Our point and our principle on this whole issue has been don't make matters worse for people by adding to the debt, by adding to the uncertainty about the economy, by frightening more consumers into saving more of their money. You pay for this bill.

Our point was, White House, congressional Democrats, you haven't even spent one half of that stimulus money yet. You know, some of it has been allocated, but you still have nearly half of it left.

Rather than waste it on what you've wasted it on, I want to talk for a second about our just creating government jobs. Why don't we pay for the unemployment benefits with that money? Let's start just stimulating private sector jobs. Again, we've lost more than 3 million since the stimulus took effect.

Dr. BURGESS, you know, people back home look at some of the wildly exaggerated claims from the stimulus. Do you remember all of the phantom congressional districts? This White House actually made up districts that don't exist today and credited them with certain job creations. Some of the examples of job creation were just wild—$1 million for each pair of boots. That it created jobs is crazy. We can look at some of them, you know, from the stimulus money:

$71,000 to the University of Wake Forest, of taxpayer funds, to study the effects of cocaine addiction on monkeys. The University of New York at Buffalo received $390,000 in stimulus funds to conduct a study on the relationship between drinking malt liquor beer and using marijuana. One hundred people were paid $45 a day or will be paid $45 a day for 3 weeks by taxpayers to drink malt liquor to compare it with marijuana. Arizona State University received $500,000 to study the genetic difference between queen and worker ants. There was $3 million awarded for a turtle-crossing in Florida. There was $50,000 granted for a hand puppet.

In the Midwest, Bloomington, Indiana, received $40,000 for 10 solar-powered trash compactors, which reminds me that New York City received stimulus funds for a homeless program, and they said, Well, we didn't ask for this money. We don't have a homeless problem. The response from Washington was, Well, get creative.

I don't know, does that mean get creative in creating homeless people?

With the stimulus dollars, Florida, for example, used $8 million of their funds to pay off a backlog of people who had already completed work for the State. So they used it to pay their bills, creating zero net jobs. The National Science Foundation gave funding to North Carolina University for a dance draw, which involved students' attaching wireless mice to their chests and wrists and dancing to form abstract geometric shapes on a computer.

So, when the President stands at the White House and says that we need help for the unemployed, Republicans agree. We want to stop wasting stimulus money.

Help people who actually need help. Stop playing politics with them. Is money for mice, studying malt liquor beer and the hand puppets more important than helping people down on their luck? We don't think so.

□ 2000

We also don't think adding to this terrible deficit and making it tougher for consumers to have confidence in their country again helps either. I just wanted to expand on that point because I think it's a critical one for people watching tonight who really are wondering if Congress is functioning at all or listening at all. I honestly don't think this Congress is.

I yield back to you, Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I was just going to make the point—The Wall Street Journal editorial today talks about the five applicants for every job that is available. And you know, we had in our committee today in Energy and Commerce, we had yet another hearing on the oil spill down in the Gulf of Mexico. And once again, it came up about the issue of the Secretary of Interior proposing a moratorium on drilling in the Gulf of Mexico.

Well, here we kind of reverse the situation. Here we can kill five jobs for the price of one. For every job that we destroy on the drilling rigs in the Gulf of Mexico, five jobs that are also directly related to that activity in the gulf, five jobs are lost. So the moratorium in the Gulf of Mexico in a very real way is going to affect families all up and down the gulf, families that have already been hurt by this spill, already been hurt by the fact that the Federal Government did not exercise its due diligence and oversight in leasing that well to BP in the first place.

BP, a foreign oil company that has one of the worst records as far as safety to be able to drill a well like this, with all kinds of passes and waivers on all of the NEPA regulations, wasn't required to put out a spill plan before they did this drilling.

Well, now the poor people in the gulf, they've lost their shrimping, they've lost their fishing, they've lost their tourism, and now they're going to lose what's left of their economy because of the imposition of this moratorium. At a time when we should be tasked with creating jobs, a time when we should be getting out of the way of the private sector and let the productive sector of the American society do what it does best, and that's grow and prosper and create jobs. Instead, we're putting additional impediments up there that are going to make it even more difficult for an area of the United States that's been hard hit by hurricanes, and now hard hit by this gulf oil spill.

And we are all grateful that the spill appears to be contained at the present

time, but we all know this is not over. The cleanup is not over. The well is not yet shut in. They're facing some tough problems down there. And then we add to the problem by a moratorium that's ill-advised. The President's own panel said there is no reason to do this. And yet the Secretary of the Interior just pushes ahead, and would not even provide us today with any of the data that was used, any of the risk data that was used to say that there must be a moratorium, or any of the economic data that was available to him, and presumably to the President, about what the effects of this moratorium would be.

So here we are in the face of the worst recession, we got an area of the country that's really hurting, and let's see if we can't hurt 'em a little worse. It just makes no sense. I yield back to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. You raise great points. I would like to follow it up. I don't think this White House or Washington has a clue as to how damaging this drilling moratorium has been just on average American workers who are tied not just to the gulf, but energy production offshore that spreads out. I saw a study the other day, nearly all 50 States, nearly every congressional district risks job losses as a result of this drilling moratorium.

We're already seeing companies who are redeploying their rigs to Egypt, moving their investments out of the United States, to Brazil, West Africa, the Middle East. And those rigs won't be coming back any time soon. Typical rig in the gulf in deep water has 1,500 workers tied to it, a thousand or more vendors. When they leave the gulf they don't come back for years.

So we already have businesses laying off workers, moving equipment, infrastructure outside the United States, already cutting their capital budget for future investment in the United States. And it doesn't take long before you have our energy infrastructure and headquarters leaving the United States as well. There are literally tens of thousands of workers tied directly to the gulf, more than 170,000 at immediate risk of this.

And yet two thoughts: One, Monday the President was in front of the White House talking about playing politics with people's jobs. Playing politics with people's jobs. That's exactly what his drilling moratorium is doing along the Gulf of Mexico.

And I find it frustrating, today I picked up—or actually went online and read The Houston Chronicle. And there it said the President is coming down to Texas, to Houston August 9 to raise money for his party. And I read that, realizing that we have had a standing invitation by letter to the President asking him to come down to Houston to meet face-to-face with these energy workers, the ones whose jobs he is killing right now, and explain to them his reasoning.

Listen to these American workers, Democrat, Republican, independent, it doesn't matter, they are all ages, all ethnic categories, all income categories. They just want to work. And his moratorium is destroying their livelihood. We are still waiting for an answer for that invitation. But apparently he doesn't have time to talk to our workers or to sit down face-to-face with them because he's got to raise campaign cash.

So we said today, we said Mr. President, can you give us an hour to meet with these workers? Can you give us 15 minutes? You know, do you have time at all for workers in Texas along the gulf who now they see their hopes of their small business, of putting their kids through college, of keeping their home dashed because of a poorly thought out drilling moratorium that is taking an environmental disaster in the gulf and creating an economic disaster for a lot of innocent families who had nothing to do with that spill.

I know you sense that in Dallas-Fort Worth, as one business from Dallas told me. He said, what small business can survive without 6 months of revenue? That's a great question, because the answer is not many. Not many at all. Maybe the big guys can. But they're going to be laying people off, they're not going to be buying from vendors. The damage is going to be wholesale.

With that, I know you feel that pain in Dallas-Fort Worth, and I guess we are just frustrated that—I am at least—that the President won't at least listen to reason, come down and face our energy workers. Just have the courage to sit down with them. Give us an hour out of your busy campaign fundraising and tell them your reason.

I yield to you, Dr. BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. Well, and it does get to your point of playing politics with people's jobs. I just want to say a couple of other things about the predominant Democratic agenda items that have been pushed through this House of Representatives largely on—well, in fact almost entirely on—party line votes. In fact, the only thing that has been bipartisan about these bills has been the opposition. The health care bill, financial regulatory bill, cap-and-trade, probably more Democratic votes against, and made it a truly bipartisan opposition, and very few Republican votes in favor.

But Vice President BIDEN over the weekend, in talking on an interview on one of the Sunday shows, said, ''Look, these are gigantic packages to deal with the problem we inherited. The vast majority of the American people and a lot of people really involved don't even know what's inside the packages.'' I assume he's talking about people involved in, like, conference committees and people involved in congressional committees who actually wrote this legislation. Going back to quote then, ''People don't know a lot of what's going on in the Recovery Act. Understandably, because this has been so much stuff that's been flowing our way.''

Well, Mr. Vice President, with all due respect, this is the problem. Because people don't know what's in this stuff, because no one bothered to take the time to bring along even public opinion while this stuff was done, as a consequence you've got people who are fearful of what is contained within this health care bill. We are now 3 months into it. The rules and regulations are being written in secret by the Department of Health and Human Services.

And this new CMS, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, director that nobody knows, the most important man in the country that no one ever heard of, Donald Berwick, it's no wonder that people are of necessity concerned. They're concerned for their own survival because they don't know what the implications are for these big things that we've already passed. And yes, Mr. Vice President, people are confused by the stimulus bill because, as Mr. BRADY pointed out, there's so much stuff in there that was absolutely unnecessary, had nothing to do with stimulating the economy.

I remember one morning in our Joint Economic Committee where it was revealed that there were so many jobs created in Arizona's Ninth Congressional District. Well, that was news to everyone because Arizona's Ninth Congressional District hasn't even been created yet. It may in the reapportionment after the census, but right now it doesn't exist. They stop at number eight. So is it any wonder that people have lost faith with their government's ability to do the things necessary to help this economy recover?

□ 2010

It has certainly been educational to sit on that Joint Economic Committee to hear the testimony like we heard last week, all the happy talk coming from the administration that things are great, it's the recovery summer. I don't think so. Have you been out beyond the confines of Washington, DC to look at what's happening to real people and real people's lives?

I know the gentleman has a number of facts and charts that he wants to share with us, so I will leave it to him at this point, but I did want to come and share with you some of the thoughts I had on this very important topic that I am so grateful that you brought up tonight.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I thank you, Congressman BURGESS, for joining us tonight on trying to get the economy going, and you are so right. This recovery is so subpar. Most Americans don't realize. I talked earlier about—we are predisposed, excited about bouncing out of recessions as fast as we can, but not this time.

We took a look at recessions the country has gone through since the Great Depression, and the one that's closest to it, that had the most damage, happened in the early 1980s. And if you compare how President Obama's performance was—is today versus

President Reagan's in 1982, 1983, it's pretty stunning.

The Reagan recovery, which had a higher unemployment rate to begin with, and if you look at three key areas, in the first three quarters after the recession ended under President Reagan, his economy grew twice as fast as the Obama recovery. If you look at the number of jobs created, it isn't even close. The first year of the Reagan recovery, the United States added 3 million jobs. We've actually lost them under President Obama. And look at this chart. You can see what the job numbers are. Reagan continues to increase. Obama, even under the best scenario right now, it is a very slow, subpar, very stagnant type of economic recovery. And similarly, the unemployment rate fell by more than 2 points under President Reagan, while it's increased under President Obama.

You ask what is the difference, and it's what Congressman BURGESS talked about, two things. President Obama's decided Washington would create jobs. Washington knew best. They didn't put an economic stimulus together; they put a political stimulus together. And what it's produced is government jobs and no economic recovery.

It's also balanced with—offset higher tax increases, higher energy costs, the fear of new health care costs, new regulations, taxes everywhere. So job creators aren't adding jobs.

The Reagan recovery is just the opposite. He created certainty for this country. They lowered taxes. They spurred investment. They told businesses, if you create jobs, you can keep them. You won't be punished; you'll be rewarded. And what did the private sector do? It created jobs. It created jobs in America.

Now what we're facing is a country at a time when we have 50 million workers, almost 50 million workers looking for jobs, many of them who, almost half, have been out of work for more than 6 months. That's the longest since they started keeping numbers.

Those with a high school education struggle with, gosh, it's almost 16, 17 percent unemployment. Certain ethnic categories have much, much higher unemployment rates than others, and it's because this President and this Congress, when faced with the choice between lowering taxes and creating small business jobs or spending, raising taxes, and creating government jobs, they chose the latter.

And so America's recovery has stalled. It is subpar. It offers little hope to most people. It certainly hasn't, as the President claimed, jump-started the economy or restored consumer confidence. Just the opposite.

We talk about taxes. We talked earlier about families so worried about this debt that this country has gotten just a staggering amount of debt under President Obama. In fact, when Republicans lost control of Congress, the annual debt to that year was about $160 million. Too high, in my view, and I think too high in most Americans' views. Now, within 3 years, that debt is almost eight times, almost nine times higher at $1.4 trillion. The Republicans' debts of a year are now the Democrats' debts of a month. Each and every month we're adding that equivalent, and that debt has exploded.

And the cost, a great example. Right now, America's debt is more than 60 percent of the size of our economy. That's in the yellow warning category. If we continue to move this direction, we will be at a hundred percent of the economy by the end of this decade. And it will skyrocket to an incredible, almost 10 times the size of our entire economy, everything we make and produce in America, by the year 2084 if we stay on this path.

And that debt has real cost. It means we have a bigger government for families and workers to drag around on their back. Younger people will pay more out of their paycheck to haul, drag this economy around. It creates an anchor on America's prosperity. In fact, most economists tell us that when a country's debt gets to about 90 percent of the size of their economy of everything that they produce and create, when the debt gets to 90 percent, it drags down your economy substantially by about 1 percentage point. That doesn't sound like a lot, but what that means is, instead of America growing at 3 percent a year—good, steady, strong 3 percent a year—we grow at a more anemic 2 percent a year. So you really lose a third of your economic prosperity. It puts you in the category of Europe, which has had this Big Government mentality. They've had this anchor around their economy, and it's cost them.

I took a look at the five most troubled countries in Europe. We've all been following Greece's problem with their debt, but also what they call the PIIGS, and it stands really for Portugal, Italy, Ireland, Greece, and Spain—the five most troubled European countries. If you look at their gross debt, the United States is right in the middle of them, of the five most troubled countries in Europe. If you look at the budget deficit as a percent of our economy, the United States ranks third worst as well. Third worst in gross debt, third worst in budget deficit, and we are on a bullet headed their direction.

We're not necessarily in the same shape as Greece today, but we're on the trajectory, we're on the path. That's why we need to focus on education, America. Make sure people can say these things. We're on the path to calamity, financially, unless we change our ways.

One thing I want to point to that Congressman BURGESS talked about, people know taxes are coming. What's frightened a lot of job creators and I think a lot of just average families—certainly in Texas, in southeast Texas and east Texas that I represent—families tell me spending is out of control and it scares them. Small businesses, they look at all of these programs that House Democrats try to pass each week. They say that won't create jobs or customers. That just frightens people more. They know they're going to end up being taxed for it.

And you look at there's taxes, proposed increased taxes on health care, Cadillac health care plans, on income for Americans, on capital gains, on dividends, on death taxes. There's all the private health insurance plans, pharmaceutical, medical device taxes, the cap-and-trade legislation, which is just a tax on all of the energy you use in your home and in your vehicle. They're talking about now a VAT tax, a value-added tax, which would come on top of what we have today. The value-added tax, which has worked in European countries, added on top of everything we have, it's the politician's perfect tax. It's an ideal tax. It's hidden from the public. It sounds small, and people pay for it in everything they buy. It's hidden. It's a hidden tax. Politicians can play with it any way they choose, and the public rarely knows.

And people look at that and they think the Bush tax cuts, which was so helpful for our economy and our middle class, the average Texas family would have to pay $3,000 more a year if those tax cuts go away, $3,000 more every year. I know in Washington that doesn't sound like a big deal, but for most families across America, that's a lot of money, especially right now. That's all their utility bills for the year, probably throw in this cable bill as well.

I took a look at a study I saw the other day about how out-of-control spending burdens our youth. We all know how much our debt has increased over the last 3 years since Democrats took control of Congress, but just look at two things.

□ 2020

Just look at the impact of the 2008 and 2009 bailouts and stimulus. According to economist Dr. Edward Stringham of Trinity College, just the costs from those two events will cost the average 22-year-old coming out of college this year $145,000 over their working life. That's $280 a month, equivalent of a second car payment. That's the impact spending has on people, and that's just two spending bills. That's not the trillion and a half dollars of debt from last year and the year before that continue to pile up; and, again, we're $13 trillion of spending and getting higher.

I know the excuse in Washington is that it's Bush's fault. Everything is Bush's fault. America's not going all the way in the World Cup was Bush's fault, I think some people believe in Washington. But if you look at where the jobs have traded in America, you can see here is when Republicans fully controlled Congress and added in their tenure 6.6 million jobs. Since Speaker

PELOSI took the gavel, what we've seen is a loss of over 6 million jobs. So almost every job Republicans created, Democrats have destroyed, and the reason this is going to get even worse is because this White House and this Congress is the most job-killing, anti-business, anti-growth Congress perhaps in the history of the United States.

We see this not just in tax increases and cap-and-trade and health care costs but wild provisions coming out of the House and, of course, now the drilling moratorium that is beginning to destroy jobs and lives and small businesses in the Gulf of Mexico. What's, I guess, perhaps most saddening is that along the gulf coast, many families in Louisiana and Alabama and Mississippi who are bearing the brunt of BP's oil spill and bearing the brunt of this administration's failure to contain the spill, they're the ones who are begging this President not to continue this drilling moratorium, allow our workers to go back to work because they know, as bad as the environmental damage has been, the drilling moratorium damage on their jobs and livelihood will add even more misery to their lives. We can't allow that to happen.

Mr. President, I would ask you again, come down to Houston, meet with our energy workers, see whose lives and jobs you're destroying. Meet with our independent businesses. Meet with our mid-sized businesses. Meet with the companies that are out there in the gulf today wanting to go back to work, who don't want their rigs to go to other countries, who don't want the jobs to go to other countries, the equipment to go to other countries, our capital to go to other countries, and eventually our energy infrastructure to go around the rest of the world to the detriment of U.S. energy workers in America.

Mr. President, while you're fund-raising in Houston, give us an hour to meet with our workers. Give us 15 minutes if you're so busy fund-raising you can't spare the time for our workers, to sit down with them. We won't have press there. You pick the workers if you choose. Although, if I were you, I would ask the average Americans who are facing a job loss, so you can listen outside the Beltway, no Tele-Prompters, no big speeches, just listen to our energy workers and perhaps you will see just how damaging this drilling moratorium is and will be for America.

What you will hear is that they are already suffering and people are being laid off. Businesses are contemplating not being able to survive and filing bankruptcy.

What you will see is that energy prices will go up as a result of your moratorium because the Gulf of Mexico produces so much of the energy we use in America.

What you will hear is that we are giving more power and more energy strength to countries outside the United States, some of whom can't stand anything that America stands for, and that we'll face an energy shortage in 2011, 2012 if this drilling moratorium continues.

You will hear from shallow well operators who have drilled down in the Gulf of Mexico without an incident, but now what they find is they can't get a permit to continue working so they're facing layoffs of their workers and their financial struggles.

In the deep water, which has drilled 14,000 wells around the world safely, but for the BP incident, you will see that one rig is already leaving for Egypt, others are planning to leave and won't be back anytime soon, years perhaps, 1 year, 2 years, 3 years. In the meantime what do our workers do? What do those small businesses do? What do the people who do manufacturing, who do oil field services and supplies throughout the country, who reach literally into every State and almost every congressional district in America, what do those businesses do?

Mr. President, we're not asking much. We're asking you to help get this economy back on track. Take off the table the drilling moratorium, end it today. Take off the table cap-and-trade and the high energy prices that it will create. Take off the table the new regulations, the new taxes. Agree to extend the Bush tax cuts. Don't raise taxes on capital and dividend investment. Lower them to get this economy going. Reassure consumers that we have a path to balance the budget. Reassure businesses they won't be punished for hiring that new worker, bringing back that old worker or hiring that new one, buying that new piece of equipment. Listen to the businesses around you who are telling you that you are the problem, this Washington Congress is the problem, because of the uncertainty, because of the taxes, because of, again, the extreme ideological agenda that is holding our economy back.

Mr. President, if you want to turn this chart around, if you want to—and we'll help Democrats in Congress. We'll help you lower taxes. We'll help you take these items off the table, if you will listen to our small businesses, listen to our energy workers, listen to our families, because right now most people in America believe this Washington is so arrogant, this Congress isn't listening, that they seem to know what's best for them, that they go any route, don't read any bill, rush massive measures through without any knowledge of what their impact is, and we learn months later that they're nothing like they were promised.

So average families are listening tonight. Workers are desperate for jobs. Yet they see a Congress off on cap-and-trade and all sorts of schemes instead of encouraging the job creators to create more jobs.

America cannot survive this job-killing agenda much longer. As strong as we are, as resilient as we are, as quick as we are to bounce back from recessions, it's not happening this time, and Washington is the obstacle.

Look in the mirror, congressional Democrats. President Obama, respectfully, look in the mirror; and if you're serious about changing this economy, if you really want to answer where are the jobs, we'll help you create those jobs where they belong, not in the government but along Main Street in every State and every community in America.

By the way, it isn't enough anymore—the world has changed—it's not enough to just buy American. We have to sell American. We have to sell our products and services all throughout the world. But when we try to do that, what we find is a lot of countries have an ''America need not apply'' sign. Mr. President, you're not doing enough to tear down those signs. Give us a chance to sell American goods and services. When we get a chance to compete, we win; we create jobs; we sell America successfully.

But, unfortunately, this Congress for 3 years has taken off the table any opportunity to go out and compete; and while we've voluntarily benched ourselves, the Democrats in Congress have stopped trade, while the President took a time-out, now starting to step back I think a little more so, but while we voluntarily benched ourselves, other countries—China, Europe, Canada and others—are stepping right around us, cutting agreements that create jobs and sell their products. So U.S. farmers, U.S. businesses, U.S. manufacturers, U.S. service companies, U.S. workers find themselves at a disadvantage because this White House, this Congress are more interested in special interests than in the interests of our workers, of our economy, of our jobs.

So, tonight, I would say respectfully to our Speaker of the House, the majority leader of the Senate, to President Obama: if you want an answer and a partner in creating jobs, Republicans are here. We have solutions and we're ready to fight for jobs, but we've got to tackle the debt. We've got to create incentives to create jobs.

□ 2030

We have got to stop frightening consumers, frightening workers. If we do that, America is capable of bouncing back and getting this economy on the right path again.

Mr. President, work with us. Get America strong again.

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

FAILED POLICIES OF PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. SCHAUER. Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to be here to address the House of Representatives, to address the people of America, especially to address

the people of Michigan. No State has suffered more under the failed policies of the previous administration than the people of Michigan.

We are very resilient people, and I will say, for my colleagues to understand, and for everyone watching, the people of Michigan and Michigan's economy, never came out of the last economic recession.

This, and as a first-term Member of Congress, I remember being sworn in just about a year and a half ago, and it was that time, this was January of 2009, that we learned that our economy had been in recession for a full year, for a full year.

So my freshman colleagues and I, regardless of what side of the aisle they come from, all walked in to a year into the deepest economic recession since the Great Depression. The closest thing I can remember was when I was in college in the early 1980s, not being able to find a job, and it was very, very difficult at that time. But that's the story of many in Michigan. It has hit my family just like practically every family in America.

So what I am here to talk about this evening, and I will be joined by some of my Democratic colleagues, is really where are we in America with our economy? What is the policy direction that we should be going in? What is the choice for America?

This is the body, this is the people's House, where we discuss and debate these choices, and the American people hear what my Republican colleagues say and there isn't necessarily a complete partisan difference, I don't want my constituents to feel that, because I always look for that common ground.

But I think the choice is very clear: Does America and our economy, our fragile economy, that is recovering, continue to move forward and dig out of this economic hole, this economic mess that we are in, or do we go backwards?

I would like to share a quote, and I am hoping that people can see it, and this is a statement that one of my Republican colleagues made, one of the Republican leaders. He was on one of the Sunday morning talk shows. I don't get to watch these very often. I guess some of my constituents and the American people do, but this is one of the national shows, ''Meet the Press,'' this Sunday, July 18.

The host of the show said ''I think what a lot of people want to know is if Republicans do get back into power, what are they going to do?'' And I think the American people deserve to know that, because we have a new President that has helped us move in a new direction, we have a Congress that I am a part of, that the Democrats control, that is working to move us in a new direction.

But Congressman PETE SESSIONS of Texas said, here is his quote, ''We need to go back to the exact same agenda.''

Well, that is the choice. Do we, as the House of Representatives, as a Congress, go back to those exact same policies that created this economic catastrophe, or do we move in a new direction, do we continue in the direction that we are going in?

Now, I want to be clear that as a Member from Michigan, where our unemployment rate is still slightly over 13 percent, in my district in south central Michigan it's slightly under the State average, but we are gradually digging out of this hole. Or do we want to go back to the policies that created this economic catastrophe? These are very, very important questions, and what I have been working on, my Democratic colleagues and I have been working on, is addressing the problems that created this economic catastrophe, and it is a catastrophe.

I will tell you a personal story. My son-in-law, a journeyman electrician, a trade that, you know, should guarantee you employability for sure for life, with intermittent unemployment, I understand, that's the nature of that business, he was unemployed for the better part of a year. He is married to our oldest daughter, who is a nurse. They had a baby. She was on maternity leave, and our son-in-law, Paul, living in Ypsilanti, just outside of Ann Arbor just east of my district, was laid off from the steel mill where he had been employed for some time, for the better part of a year. Unfortunately, that's the story that's the result of economic policies that this Congress inherited.

But why did this happen? Unfortunately, there was an ideology under the former administration that said, you know, we need to let the marketplace regulate itself.

Well, I remember about a month or so before the last election, even Alan Greenspan, the former Federal Reserve Chairman, said, I was wrong. I thought Wall Street, I thought the markets could regulate themselves. We saw the meltdown that resulted from that, a gambling mentality on Wall Street that played a cruel game that affected millions of families, and it was a game of heads I win, tails you lose, gambling irresponsibly with the retirement savings of the American people.

So this week, this week, the President will sign a landmark Wall Street reform bill that will crack down on the big banks, that will protect consumers, and this is perhaps the biggest consumer protection legislation in decades, and it will bring greater economic security to families and small businesses across our country.

And my wife and I own a small business. She runs a business, it's her business, she employs three people. She is thinking about employing another person, probably part-time. That's the story of America, and it's businesses that went bankrupt during this Wall Street meltdown and families that lost their homes, but this Wall Street reform bill puts in place the strongest consumer protections in history, with an independent watchdog whose sole purpose is to enforce those protections and look out for the American consumer.

So, let's go back to what Alan Greenspan said. He said that I thought the markets, I thought Wall Street could regulate itself. I was wrong.

□ 2040

Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle somehow are trying to convince the American people that this legislation is somehow, to use their words, another ''bailout.'' Well, we saw the bailout that resulted from the Republican philosophy of deregulation. We saw the almost complete meltdown of our economy, and we saw the results of that and this mentality. And it's a similar approach to protecting the environment that has resulted in this catastrophic oil spill, the BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. But the reforms in this Wall Street reform bill will protect consumers when they take out a mortgage or sign up for a credit card. It will prevent the kind of shadowy deals that led to this crisis and will never again put taxpayers on the hook for Wall Street's mistakes.

Now, let's talk about this bailout. And I want to be clear to my constituents at home, I said when I was running for office I never would have supported that bailout. And when I had to vote, and a number of us took this position, voted against the second part of this bailout, but the problem with the bailout was that it put more money in the hands of the big banks that actually caused the economic collapse in the first place. Those big Wall Street banks refused to lend to small manufacturers, tool and dye shops, machine shops, auto suppliers, those businesses that I work with every day in my district that are diversifying into renewable energy technology, life sciences technology, defense technology, and so many ways to create jobs. But these big banks even that were bailed out wouldn't lend to them.

So under this Wall Street reform legislation, the American people, the taxpayer will never be stuck with a tab again, never under any Democratic legislation that finally passed the Senate, and I will commend some of my Republican colleagues in the Senate that saw that that was the right thing to do for the American people.

Despite the benefits the American people will enjoy from these reforms, the Republican leader in the House is already calling for its repeal. So even before the President has signed this bill, which he will do this week, the Republican leader in the House of Representatives has called for its repeal. But let's be clear, America cannot afford to go backwards to the days when our financial laws were written by the corporate lobbyists. And the fact of the matter is that corporate lobbyists, the Wall Street banks and their lobbyists were huddling with Republican leadership as the House was taking up this legislation, actually trying to kill this legislation, devising a plan, coming up

with language trying to fool the American people that this historic Wall Street reform legislation was another bailout when it couldn't be anything further from the truth. Failure to act would doom us to repeat the same kind of economic catastrophe that the failed policies of the Bush administration created in the first place.

So to move forward, we not only need to demand greater accountability from Wall Street. We need to help those people who are struggling on Main Street, those folks who are facing the loss of their home, the loss of their business, looking for capital, for basic loans to expand their businesses. That's why the President and Democrats in the House of Representatives are fighting to provide emergency relief to American workers who have been laid off in this recession due to no fault of their own.

It is tragic that millions of workers—and 23,000 in my district alone in south central Michigan—are facing losing their unemployment benefits by the end of this year. And talk about a failed ideology, even JOHN MCCAIN's own economist told us—us collectively, the American people, Members of Congress—that for every dollar of unemployment insurance—and it is insurance. It is a form of insurance, unemployment insurance. For every dollar of unemployment insurance that is provided to a family of a laid off worker, there is $1.61 in economic impact.

So not only were the Republicans holding hostage families who are losing their unemployment benefits in a tough economy, in a recession caused by the failed policies of the Bush administration, but they were also holding our economy hostage, where these unemployment benefits of about—it's less than the wages that people were earning, but those dollars were actually being put into local grocery stores, local gas stations, local businesses. And for every dollar of unemployment benefits, there was $1.61 of economic impact. But those emergency benefits for American workers are in jeopardy because those same Republicans who didn't have any problem spending hundreds of billions of dollars on tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans are now saying we shouldn't offer relief to middle class families who really need help.

So we have an economic storm, and the choice is a very clear one: Do we rebuild our economic foundation for a stronger future or do we return to the failed policies of the previous administration?

Let's have a little history lesson here. When I came to office a year and a half ago, when Barack Obama came to office a year and a half ago, our economy was losing an average of 750,000 jobs each month; 750,000 jobs each month were being lost in this economy. During the last 5 months of the Bush administration, our economy lost an average of almost 640,000 jobs. In the last 5 months, we have added an average of 174,000 jobs a month. So let's do the comparison.

Now, I don't want to give anyone in my district or in my State in Michigan the idea that we are anywhere where we need to be from an economic standpoint. Nationally, the unemployment rate is still 9.5 percent. We are digging out of this hole. We've got a long way to go. But if you look at during the last 5 months of the Bush administration, our economy lost an average of almost 640,000 jobs. In the last 5 months, our Nation's economy has added an average of almost 174,000 jobs. So if my math is right, that's a swing of almost 800,000 jobs, almost 800,000 jobs a month net increase.

Let's talk about our Nation's economic health as a whole. During the last quarter of the Bush administration, the economy shrunk by over 5 percent, almost 5.5. Almost 5.5 percent our economy was shrinking. Hello. I think we really need to take stock—and I heard it earlier today in the House of Representatives, my Republican colleagues, their mantra is, ''Where are the jobs?'' Well, I don't know if they were asking that question in January of 2009, or 1 year prior to that when the recession began or when the economy collapsed because of Wall Street's behavior. So where was the hue and cry when our economy was shrinking by almost 5.5 percent and we were losing, on average, 640,000 jobs a month?

Now, during the last three quarters, so the last 9 months, there has been economic growth. The most recent economic growth is 2.7 percent. It's not enough, it's not nearly enough, but we are seeing the economy gradually beginning to rebound.

□ 2050

But the question is: Which path do we take?

The choice is very clear to me. What I have seen in my own district in south central Michigan—and we have seen it all over the State—is a transformation of our economy.

Now, what I have told the President of the United States personally and have told some of his chief economic advisers is that our recovery has one hand tied behind our back. One of the biggest reasons is that the big Wall Street banks have refused to lend to businesses, to manufacturers. A lot of these are small automotive suppliers, suppliers in the aviation and aerospace industries and the defense industry.

I told a story on the House floor about a bank in my district—Citizens Bank. I'll mention it again—that had had a relationship for many years with a company in my district, RTD Manufacturing. This company won an Army contract. It won an Army contract to build a bracket to go on a mine resistant vehicle, an MRAP, in Afghanistan, to protect our warfighters. This bank would not make the loan. Their loan officer said that they would be fired if they made a loan to a Michigan manufacturer. This was a bank that was bailed out by the taxpayers.

So our recovery would be much further along if these banks that were bailed out by the taxpayer due to failed economic policies would actually use that money and invest it in businesses that were hanging on and had the potential to grow. Yet what I am seeing in my district are businesses just like RTD Manufacturing, which are working hard, which are diversifying from—in this case, they were 100 percent automotive and had begun doing work for the Department of Defense to protect our warfighters.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act is having an impact in my district and all around our State. The American people may know that President Obama was in Holland, Michigan, which is about an hour and a half from where I live in Battle Creek. He was at the groundbreaking for a new battery plant for the automotive industry—400 new jobs in addition to all of the construction jobs that are being created for this new technology.

Now, that's not the only battery plant in Michigan that has been jump-started by American Recovery and Reinvestment Act dollars. There is a company in my district, in Battle Creek, that is called Toda America. It received $35 billion in American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds to attract the private investment to locate this battery facility there. This could have gone anywhere in the world.

Because of a proactive policy to invest in clean and renewable energy technology, in this case for the automobile industry, I think the question we have to ask is: Are we going to continue to manufacture here in America, or are we going to be buying everything from South Korea, from China, from Japan, from all of our global competitors?

You know, we have put a stake in the ground in Michigan—and there are stories like this all over the country—that we will make things here. In this case, as a result of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, we are making batteries for vehicles of the future. We are making technology for our warfighters.

I want to tell you another great story about a wind energy cluster that didn't just happen by accident. It happened, in part, because of policies that the Michigan legislature adopted, some of which were put in place when I was still in the legislature there. It happened with investment through the Department of Energy to help wind energy companies.

There is a new company in Eaton Rapids, Michigan, called Astraeus, which is developing the best technology—the best technology in the world—to develop windmill blades and windmill turbine components, and they have actually attracted—this is a great story. You know, we often don't hear this from colleagues on the other side of the aisle because they don't want to

acknowledge some of the successes of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

There is a company based in Finland that has a U.S. subsidiary. It is called URV USA, which is a foundry. We used to have foundries all over my State and all over the country. This company, URV USA, whose parent company is in Finland, is locating a foundry in Eaton Rapids, Michigan, to manufacture some of the heavy components for windmill turbines.

So we have a cluster of wind energy companies locating in this town of about 2,500 people, south of Lansing, that will be the home for thousands of jobs, for thousands of renewable energy jobs; and these companies there are positioning themselves to actually export this technology. So it is not just about beating the competition from China, but it is about being able to build it faster, more cheaply and to be able to export that technology.

So, when my Republican colleagues ask, Where are the jobs? the choice is: what policies do we put forward here, and do we continue with policies that are creating jobs, that are transforming our economy or do we go backwards to what Congressman SESSIONS says—that we need to go back to the exact same agenda? This is the agenda that nearly bankrupted the United States of America, that drained the retirement funds of millions of senior citizens, that made the dream of retirement slip away for many Americans, and that really left us with an economy completely on its knees.

The industrial sector talked about that. It is very much a part of Michigan's past, a part of Michigan's present and, I hope, a part of Michigan's future. Total industrial production in America has increased 8.2 percent during the past year. That is the largest 12-month gain since 1998. I need to repeat that because, you know, what you hear from folks on the other side of the aisle would make you think that the economic challenges we face magically began in January of 2009.

Total industrial production—making things, making things in America—has increased 8.2 percent during the past year, which is the largest 12-month gain since 1998. In June, industrial production increased a tenth of a percent. It grew to a 7 percent annual rate in the first quarter to a 6.6 percent rate in the second quarter, and this rapid industrial expansion is consistent with solid growth for our Nation's economy, and that is according to the Federal Reserve. Don't take my word for it. That is according to the Federal Reserve.

□ 2100

Trade, which is an issue that's very important to me. I was recently named to the President's Export Council. So I look forward to fighting for American companies to sell their goods abroad and to tear down trade barriers, like I am working on with China, to make sure that American companies can compete. But nominal exports are up 21 percent from a year ago. In May, nominal exports grew rapidly by $3.5 billion, or 2.4 percent. Year-to-date, exports are up 18 percent for the first 5 months of the last year.

So we've got a big hole to dig out of. Remember, the last 5 months of the Bush administration our economy, our country lost an average of almost 640,000 jobs. Just in the last 5 months we've added an average of 174,000 jobs. There is a swing. We have a long way to go.

Initial unemployment insurance claims fell by 29,000 in the week that ended July 10. Too many people are unemployed. I will not be satisfied until everyone who is looking for a job has a job. Spending in core retail sales rose by two-tenths of 1 percent in June. Small business owner economic confidence increased by 2.6 percent during the second quarter. This is the largest 3-month increase since last July. So there are signs of progress.

I think the question, again, is do we move forward or do we go back to the exact same agenda? That is the choice. I'm not willing to go back. Too many people in my district are hurting. And too many families are hurting. And candidly, many people have lost hope. But we must continue to move forward and we must put the American people over any political agenda. You know, this is not the time to put the next election before the American people. The American people must come first. Their ability to have opportunities for jobs in new economic sectors is what the Democrats stand for and we will continue fighting for.

I also want to talk a little bit more about manufacturing, and particularly about Buy American provisions. I am looking forward to having a very vigorous debate in the House of Representatives, candidly, about whose side we are on. And we must be on the side of the American people. I have been pushing in every way possible that we expand and strengthen Buy American provisions.

I just received a letter from the Vice President of the United States in response to a very real situation that a company in my district faces, a company called Full Spectrum Solutions. They make high-tech, energy-efficient lighting. And they have been more and more making their light fixtures in America from suppliers all over my State and all over the Midwest. And they have been bidding on energy-efficient lighting contracts with municipalities. They received American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds.

Unfortunately, some of their competitors—and there are Buy American provisions. I was asked by a reporter today, Why are Buy American provisions important? Here's the point. American Recovery and Reinvestment Act dollars are your tax dollars. So I think the American people expect a little common sense out of their government, which unfortunately there's not enough of. But they expect that their tax dollars be used to create jobs here in America, not jobs in China.

And so there is a Buy American provision in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. What Full Spectrum Solutions found was some of their competitors were actually taking light fixtures made in China and putting a label on these light fixtures that says ''Made in the USA'' to defraud the government, defraud the taxpayers, and hurt American companies and cost us American jobs.

So I worked with Mike Nevins, the CEO of Full Spectrum Solutions, and went down every path to find relief for this company. I went to the Department of Energy, Department of Commerce, Customs and Border Protection, the U.S. Attorney's office. No relief. No mechanism for relief for complaints of competitors cheating and mislabeling their products as made in America.

So I wrote the Vice President about 3 weeks ago, and I received a very, very specific response that is creating a new hotline within the Department of Energy for complaints about companies that are mislabeling their products as made in the USA, a means to investigate these complaints, and a notice to all grant recipients of these American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds to be aware that there are some companies, unfortunately some American companies, that are defrauding the taxpayers and cheating and using our tax dollars to buy goods made in China rather than goods made in America.

So I received this very specific response, and it underscored just what we should be fighting for. We need to be fighting for American workers, American companies, and strengthen these Buy American provisions. I look forward to taking up legislation, Democratic-sponsored, hopefully bipartisan, but I know there are Democratic bills that I cosponsored as a part of the House Bipartisan Trade Working Group that will strengthen Buy American provisions.

I talked about a week ago about another fair trade bill with China. We are letting China eat the lunches of American workers. We are letting them do it. China, when they joined the World Trade Organization in 2001, never signed the government procurement agreement. This is the agreement that sets the terms for companies in one country to bid on and compete for government contracts with other countries.

Well, China, they know what they're doing. Just like they know what they're doing when they manipulate their currency. Just like they know what they're doing when they steal our patents, our intellectual property. Just like they know what they're doing when they subsidize their companies, tilting the playing field in their favor. And so what they've done for the last 9 years is they have blocked our companies from doing business with their

government, while for some reason, I haven't been able to figure out yet, it's because there's no good reason, we're allowing Chinese companies to bid on and win contracts with our Federal Government paid for by your tax dollars. I don't think the American people have in mind that we use their tax dollars to create jobs in China rather than jobs in America.

So my bill, H.R. 5312, is very simple. It's a reciprocal trade bill. It truly is a fair trade bill. It says to China that their companies can do the same dollar amount of business with our government as our companies can do with their government.

Now, I flew when I came to Washington from my home in Battle Creek, Michigan, yesterday. There was a Ford Motor Company engineer on the plane. And we talked about this issue. I talk about this issue everywhere I go. And I said, ''Do you manufacture in China?'' He says, ''Yeah, we manufacture in China.'' And I said, ''You are not able to do business with the government in China, right, for any of their vehicle purchases or motor pools, whatever it might be?'' And he said, ''No, you know, now that you mention it, we're not able to do that.'' So I said, ''Well, you know, China can do business with our government even though they're blocking our companies from doing business with their government?'' Even, here is the point of the Ford conversation, even when they're manufacturing in China. So our companies are investing there, they're making their products there.

□ 2110

Include, even with that, China's policy. They know what they're doing. They didn't sign this government procurement agreement 9 years ago when they joined the World Trade Organization, and they are playing us for fools.

You know, according to the Economic Policy Institute, in Michigan, we have lost 68,000 jobs due to China's unfair trade policies since 2001. In Michigan, in my district—I represent seven counties in south central Michigan—2,700 jobs. That's the size of a medium-sized village within my district, wiped out completely, because of China's unfair trade.

So I want to stop in a moment. I want to yield to an outstanding leader, Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ from Florida, to talk about our economy. I have been talking about the choice. I've been talking about the choice. Do we move forward and dig out of this economic hole that was caused by the failed economic policies of the Bush administration? And one of our Republican colleagues on one of the national press shows on Sunday says, when asked—they often don't like to talk about policy. They don't like to do that. When they were asked to talk about Medicare, their solution was to voucherize Medicare. Even though they don't like the term that is really true about their position on Social Security, they want to privatize Social Security. They don't like to talk about policy ideas. But when they were asked if Republicans get back into power what are you going to do, PETE SESSIONS says, We need to go back to the exact same agenda.

We cannot go backwards. We must go forward, and we must continue to fight for the American people. We must continue to fight for the American workers. We must continue to fight for manufacturing, for making things in this country. And I talked earlier about great progress that's being made in renewable energy, battery technology, wind energy technology, life sciences technology, the Chevy Volt. The Chevy Volt will be the first battery electric car, will roll off the assembly line in October in Hamtramck, Michigan. We are making things.

And if we don't have the kind of policy foresight that Democrats in this House of Representatives have been putting forward and will continue to put forward aggressively, we will go backwards.

So we've got a long way to go. I am not satisfied. I said I will not be satisfied until every unemployed worker in my district that's looking for a job has a job, until seniors again feel secure with the promise of Social Security. You know, these are the basic values that I hold, and this is the fight that I signed up for.

So it's been a pleasure to talk a little bit about Michigan, a little bit about my home, a little bit about what's going on. I even talked a little bit about my family and my son-in-law that was unemployed for the better part of a year and, unfortunately, I don't think I finished that story. The good news is they're still in Michigan. They moved to the beautiful Upper Peninsula. It's where my wife, Christine, is from, from the Upper Peninsula. They got a job there. They bought a house.

But too many families can't tell that story. And we are fighting for the American people.

It is my pleasure to yield to my colleague, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ from south Florida, to talk about this choice.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much. And my colleague from Michigan, MARK SCHAUER, who's been holding down the fort here and who cares so passionately and so deeply about his district, about the people that he represents in Michigan, you have fought so hard to make sure that they have a voice because Americans are struggling, and you know that Americans are struggling. You're in the midst of an economic crisis in Michigan, as we all have been coming out of, and you're absolutely right when you talk about the fact that we have a choice.

I mean, Americans in November are going to have a choice. We can go back to the agenda of the Republicans, which now is right there in blue and white, and where they clearly have said, making no bones about it, that they would take us back to the exact same agenda that they pursued before, which included focusing on tax cuts exclusively for the wealthiest Americans, not caring in the least about working families or the middle class or having an agenda that did anything for anyone in a working family or the middle class, focusing on making sure that we could only spend time worrying about the well-being of major corporations and leaving working families to twist in the wind. Or we can choose to continue to move in the new direction the Democrats have taken the country under President Obama's leadership, under the leadership of the Democrats here in the House and the Senate when we took the majority back in 2006 and ended the culture of corruption that literally hung over this capital under Republican leadership. We ended the focus exclusively on the wealthy and focused on trying to turn things around.

President Obama on his first day in office inherited an economy where we were bleeding 700,000-plus jobs a month. And I'm not sure if Mr. SCHAUER talked about this, but we have now fast-forwarded a year and a half later and the economy is adding about 100,000 to 125,000 jobs a month.

And if you look at manufacturing—and I know that's a particularly important area for Michigan. American workers are so proud and have always been so proud of the fact that we in America make things. We are the ones that make sure that machines run, that the manufacturing that is the proud tradition of the United States of America should continue. We have had 11 straight months of growth in the manufacturing sector under President Obama's leadership, under the policies, the economic decisionmaking that we've made since he took office, and that's incredibly important for Americans to understand. Because even though we have a long way to go, we've begun to turn the corner. We've begun to turn things around, and we need to continue to push hard to make sure that we can invest in infrastructure and balance those investments with tax cuts targeted to middle class and working families.

Last year, in the Recovery Act, the economic stimulus that has been talked about so much in the last year, we invested $787 billion to make sure that we could create those jobs and invest in shovel-ready projects that were ready to go so that we could get people back to work who literally were left twisting in the wind after the Bush administration drove us into a ditch. And now you have the same people, the same people who drove us into the ditch in the first place are asking to get the keys back so that they can return to the exact same agenda that they pursued during the time that they were in charge. Why Americans would give them back the keys when they got

us into this mess in the first place is beyond me, but that is what they are aggressively pursuing, nonetheless.

This morning, a number of us on the House floor had an opportunity to talk about the approach of Social Security's birthday. We're approaching the 75th anniversary of Social Security, 75 years of making sure that Social Security provides the safety nets to Americans who are in their retirement years, making sure that they have something to fall back on, and making sure that they have the ability to make ends meet each and every day.

And as Mr. SCHAUER so rightfully put it, under the exact same agenda that the Republicans pursued then, we would return to an effort—and they readily admit this, that we would return to their effort, which was first proposed by President Bush, to privatize Social Security.

□ 2120

What privatizing Social Security means is allowing people to invest their Social Security in the stock market. Now, if you watched the volatility of the stock market over the last number of years, I shudder to think about how the seniors in my district, my seniors in south Florida, I shudder to think how they would be able to make ends meet over the last few years if their Social Security investments evaporated into oblivion after the stock market downturn. We had stock market downturn, then it went back up, then it went back down again. The stock market is not the place for funds that are there and designed to be a safety net. In my home State, 53 percent of seniors without Social Security would be living in poverty, and that's just simply unacceptable. If that's the agenda that the Republicans want to take us back to, then Americans need to know that that's the direction that they would go.

I want to focus on some other comments because we should make sure that people know exactly what's being said on the other side so that when they make a decision on which direction they want to go, when they make a decision on which candidate for Congress, which Members they choose to have represent them, they should know what some of the Republican leadership on the other side has been saying.

If you recall, we had a lot of commentary on the other side about the stimulus, about the economic Recovery Act; and I remember that Mr. CANTOR, their Republican whip, I remember he actually has consistently said that the stimulus has not produced jobs. Now, I'm not sure what planet he's been living on, but one thing that has been very clear is that the economic Recovery Act, the stimulus bill, created millions of jobs. We wouldn't have been able to go from bleeding 700,000-plus jobs a month to adding about 100,000 private sector jobs a month without the investment that was made under the Democratic leadership.

Now, in spite of the fact that Mr. CANTOR has consistently said that the stimulus produced no jobs, that didn't prevent him from hosting a job fair with companies that received $52 million in his community to create jobs from the stimulus. He actually held a job fair at a Virginia high school with a number of private companies that were seeking to hire and who benefited from the funds in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. So he's not the only one that has essentially tried to have it both ways, be opposed to the stimulus, vote against the stimulus, stated it didn't do anything, but then take credit in their community when the checks are being handed out and the celebrations were being had for the jobs that are created in the district by the economic Recovery Act.

And, I mean, I don't want to directly call any of our colleagues hypocritical, but that type of action seems pretty hypocritical to me Mr. TONKO, and I'm really pleased that we're joined this evening by my good friend Mr. TONKO from New York who's joined us every week, week after week, to make sure that we can help America understand and talk to the American people about how this economy has turned around and how we have been able to create jobs, balance investments with tax cutting policy, and I would be happy to yield to the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It's so encouraging to have people see the difference in how we approach reform here in Washington. There are those who will suggest that the 8.2 million jobs lost during the Bush recession were a tremendous blow to this Nation's economy, to working families, to households across this country. There are those who would suggest that the $17.5 trillion worth of household wealth lost in the last 18 months of President Bush's final stage of his Presidency, some of that's been recaptured, recovered, some $6 trillion.

But that painful outcome is sometimes lost. People forget that there were these trillions of dollars lost to the household incomes, that there were 8 million jobs lost in this country. Why would people want to go back to those failed policies?

And, today, we just do a litmus test based on other dynamics. Medicare, the Republicans suggest that we should voucher the system, allow people to have a voucher to go and invest in a private insurance plan.

There are those in the Republican ranks, the leadership, talking about reforming Social Security, raising the age limit, providing savings so that they can pay for the war, wanting to adjust a system that's very much part of the security for our Nation's retirees. To balance a budget on the backs of our hardworking retirees, people who have invested in the system, is telling us what their philosophy is all about. They're not supporting Wall Street reform. Attacking it, demeaning it, that it was an atom bomb used on an ant, totally misrepresents the situation; the fact that they wanted our President to apologize for coming down hard on BP and the oil spill and the failures in the gulf.

So we see that same thinking that brought about the failure of our economy, that brought this Nation's economy to its knees. They want us to go back to those standards? I think what we have here are improvements. There's a road to recovery. It's painfully slow, but it's moving in the right direction. It's a sweep upward after several months of a sweep downward. The V formation, that constant dip down south, southward with the economy, now transitions upward, has told the story, has told the story; and I see it in my district.

I see the capital region of New York responding to an innovation economy, investing in opportunity, in innovation. Advanced Battery Manufacturing, they're to open a new facility in our district that will move to something that now transitions our economy because it will be able not only to store intermittent power; it will also be able to generate electricity and also be used for heavy fleets. This is the way we create jobs. This is the investment of the Recovery Act that invested in Advanced Battery Manufacturing, invested in renewable technologies for energy generation, invested in smart grid, smart thermostats, smart meters.

These were the opportunities that really transition our economy and create a new day for America because we become more self-sufficient in our energy policy, with our energy policy. We allow for generation to be done here by embracing the American intellect. These are the dynamics of reform that were long overdue. They're creating American jobs to produce American power. A tour with the veterans of this country about American power, about how we can create jobs here and not send hundreds of billions of dollars to foreign-nation treasuries and those nations are unfriendly to the U.S. That's the changed thinking, not the failure of the past that drained household incomes by $17 trillion to $18.5 trillion, that lost 8 million jobs.

Do we go back to those failed policies, or do we transition over to what has been the road to recovery, albeit not as fast as we would like, but it's progress, it's movement in the right direction, and it's innovation and it's embracing the American intellect.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you so much, Mr. TONKO, and I just wanted to add a couple of things and then I know Mr. SCHAUER will close us out.

But one of the things that I think is important to note that we also have done—because deficits are really an issue and deficit spending is an issue—we, when we took the majority back, reestablished the PAYGO rules and then enshrined them in statute in this

Congress to make sure that legislation that we pass is paid for, that we don't, like most families have to do, like every family I know, can't spend more than they take in.

The Republicans let those rules which were originally adopted under the Clinton administration and resulted in the record surpluses that President Bush inherited, they let those rules lapse. Well, we reestablished them because when they let those rules lapse, that's when we ended up in a huge deficit situation.

□ 2130

Because of that, we are able to, with the budget that we have adopted, cut the deficit in half over the next number of years and focus on deficit reduction while also making sure that we balance that with investments so that we can get our economy back on track.

That's the difference between us and them, and I hate to say it like that, but, really, there hasn't been a more stark contrast in the choice that Americans have to make in this election, and I look forward to spending some more time on the floor talking with my colleagues about it.

Mr. SCHAUER. I would like to thank my colleagues, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ of Florida, PAUL TONKO of New York. Our time is about up, but I will give you two numbers that summarize the Bush policies: 8 million lost jobs, $14 trillion in wealth lost to American households—8 million, $14 trillion. Trillion.

Now, Americans can do it. We have been through tough times before, but we have always pulled together as a Nation to overcome our challenges. After challenges, Americans return stronger, more determined and more united.

Democrats came together and faced the challenges that we were handed by mismanagement of the Bush Republicans and, together, we are pulling our economy back from the brink of economic ruins.

As Americans, I know we can do it. That's why we are here tonight. I received a couple of texts from folks at home. They are watching. Americans know we can do it. We can turn our economy around and get our economy back on track.

I will yield back. Thank you.

GET THE COUNTRY IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, as always, it is a great honor to speak on this floor where so many have given so much trying to get the country in the right direction.

I do need to address some things that have come up. For one thing, I would like to read an article from The Washington Examiner, June 9, 2010, written by Timothy Carney.

''As BP's Deepwater Horizon oil rig was sinking on April 22, Senator John Kerry, D-Mass, was on the phone with allies in his push for climate legislation, telling them he would soon roll out the Senate climate bill with the support of the utility industry and three oil companies—including BP, according to the Washington Post.

''Kerry never got to have his photo op with BP chief executive Tony Hayward and other regulation-friendly corporate chieftains. Within days, Republican cosponsor Lindsey Graham, R-S.C, repudiated the bill following a spat about immigration, and Democrats went back to the drawing board.

''But the Kerry-BP alliance for an energy bill that included a cap-and-trade scheme for greenhouse gases pokes a hole in a favorite claim of President Obama and his allies in the media—that BP's lobbyists have fought fiercely to be left alone. Lobbying records show that BP is no free-market crusader, but instead a close friend of big government whenever it serves the company's bottom line.''

It goes on to point out that British Petroleum has lobbied for tax hikes, greenhouse gas restraints, for the stimulus bill, the Wall Street bailout and for subsidies for things like oil pipelines, solar panels, natural gas and biofuels.

''Now that BP's oil rig''—this is the article written by Timothy Carney, ''Now that BP's oil rig has caused the biggest environmental disaster in American history, the Left is pulling the same bogus trick it did with Enron and AIG: Whenever a company earns universal ire, declare it the poster boy for the free market.

''As Democrats fight to advance climate change policies, they are resorting to the misleading tactics they used in their health care and finance efforts: posing as the scourges of the special interests and tarring 'reform' opponents as the stooges of big business. Expect BP to be public enemy No. 1 in the climate debate.''

Again, this is the article by Timothy Carney, June 9 of this year.

Carney goes on, ''There's a problem: BP was a founding member of the U.S. Climate Action Partnership (USCAP), a lobby dedicated to passing a cap-and-trade bill. As the Nation's largest producer of natural gas, BP saw many ways to profit from climate legislation, notably by persuading Congress to provide subsidies to coal-fired plants that switched to gas.''

Well, it goes on, it talks more. It mentions that ''BP signed off on Kerry's Senate climate bill, which was hardly a capitalist concoction. One provision BP explicitly backed, according to Congressional Quarterly and other media reports: a higher gas tax. The money would be earmarked for building more highways, thus inducing more driving and more gasoline consumption.

''Elsewhere in the green arena, BP has lobbied for and profited from subsidies for biofuels and solar energy, two products that cannot break even without government support. Lobbying records show the company backing solar subsidies, including Federal funding for solar research. The U.S. Export-Import Bank, a Federal agency, is currently financing a BP solar energy project in Argentina.

''Ex-Im has also put up taxpayer cash to finance construction of the 1,094 Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan pipeline carrying oil from the Caspian Sea to Ceyhan, Turkey—again profiting BP.

''Lobbying records also show BP lobbying on Obama's stimulus bill and Bush's Wall Street bailout. You can guess the oil giant wasn't in league with the Cato Institute or Ron Paul on those.

''BP has more Democratic lobbyists than Republicans. It employs the Podesta Group, cofounded by John Podesta, Obama's transition director and confidant. Other BP troops on K Street include Michael Berman, a former top aid to Vice President Walter Mondale, Steven Champlin, former executive director of the House Democratic Caucus, and Matthew LaRocco, who worked in Bill Clinton's Interior Department and whose father was a Democratic Congressman.''

''Two patterns have emerged during Obama's presidency: (1) Big business increasingly seeks profits through more government, and (2) Obama nonetheless paints opponents of his intervention as industry shills. BP is just the latest example of this tawdry sleight of hand.

''Once a government pet, BP now a capitalist tool.'' Again, this is from The Washington Examiner's lobbying editor, Timothy P. Carney. Interesting.

Some of my friends come to the floor and talk about, make it sound like the Republicans and BP are really tight. You look at the lobbying records for BP, you look at the contribution records for the Wall Street firms that benefited so dramatically from the ridiculous bailout, yes, it was a Republican President, should have known better.

You don't set aside free market principles to save the free market, because if only socialism works in a crisis, we got no business going back to free market in the good times.

□ 2140

But the trouble is it was no free market. In this world in which people are not perfect and you have some greedy people, you have some people that lust for power, you have got to have a government intervention to make sure everyone is playing fairly; not that everyone has equal assets but that people have an equal opportunity. That's what a free market is supposed to be about in this world. In the next, we won't need a government. God will reign. But in this one, we need a government, and it needs not to be a player on the field

and also the referee. We've had enough of that, got that going on in the flood insurance program. We now have been told in this last year and a half that, gee, we need the Federal Government playing in the health care field just to give an option. That's what we heard in the flood insurance program, and now the Federal Government is the only flood insurance program because nobody can compete with a government that gets to run in the red all the time.

So I appreciate my friends trying to lay BP at the feet of the Republicans, but the fact is that the reason, apparently, that it took so long for this administration to finally turn on BP was—they did have to turn on them because they were together, working together on the crap-and-trade bill because BP was right there with them, supporting that crap-and-trade bill. And then you had Senator KERRY, the administration, I mean, BP was their buddy. They were helping them on the stimulus package, of all things. Most of the true free market people that don't want the government taking over everything were not supportive of the stimulus bill because they knew exactly what has happened would happen. That's what people knew, that when the government starts sucking all the capital out of the country for its own uses and its own devices, then the great job creator, small business, private business across the country, cannot get loans.

And I so agree with my friend Mr. SCHAUER when he talks about how difficult it is for people to get loans in this country; it is just so difficult. We've got regulators breathing down their throats requiring them to hold more in reserve than the law requires, requiring them not to lend money to people that have been with them 20 and 30 years as great banking clients, threatening the full vengeance of the Federal Government if they were to make loans that some regulators told them not to make so that people can't get capital. The Federal Government is sucking it up, and it is a terrible, terrible shame.

And I appreciated my friends across the aisle pointing out that, as Mr. SCHAUER said, I think it's 600,000, 700,000 jobs were lost the last 5 months of the Bush administration, and then he went on and pointed out that over the last 5 months the average has been 170,000 jobs a month that have been added. My friend from Florida came in and didn't realize he had said that. Her figure was 125,000 jobs per month. But we won't haggle over 50,000 jobs average per month. We would love to have those jobs. But unfortunately, to get to an average, whether it's 125,000 or 170,000, you have to have things like we did in June. 430,000 jobs created in the month of June. Great news. 431,000, actually. Unfortunately, 411,000 of those were temporary census workers. Oh, yeah, the economy is just booming, isn't it?

It gets so tiresome hearing my friends across the aisle talk about that last year that Bush was in office and the damage he did to the economy. It's deeply troublesome because the fact is, in November of 2006, our Democratic friends took the majority by promising America that Republicans would not control spending but they would. They promised that we will get rid of this ridiculous $100 billion, $200 billion deficit for 1 year of spending by the Republicans who controlled Congress because, as anybody who has had any decent education in this country knows, the President and the executive branch can only spend money that is appropriated by the Congress. So we also know, then, for the last 2 years of the Bush Presidency, every stinking bill that passed only did so because the majority wanted it to pass. There was nothing Republicans could do in 2007 and 2008 to stop any bill in Congress that our friends across the aisle wanted to have passed. We tried. We made points of order, objections when we could see that the rules were not being followed and then would be ruled down from the Chair in order for us to appeal the ruling, which was voted down every single time that we appealed the ruling of the Chair because they had the votes to do so, not because it was a violation of the rule.

So we come to the point a fair analysis has to indicate that if the spending was out of control in 2007 and 2008, obviously it wasn't because of the Bush administration. They can't appropriate anything to themselves. And if the policies of spending caused this great loss of jobs in the fall of 2008, then it was either the responsibility of the majority party, the majority party either caused the massive problems in 2008 to our economy, or the majority party was the most incompetent ever to be in the majority in this House. I don't think they were that incompetent. I think they passed exactly what was intended.

We heard talk about the wonderful health care bill. It got pretty tiresome over the last year and a half hearing friends across the aisle accuse me and others of misrepresenting the real facts. How could we not understand what the bill was about? Well, the truth is, for those of us that read the ridiculous bills that were brought forth that were not about health care but were about the GRE—''government running everything''—we knew problems that were going to be forthcoming. Some of us came to this very podium and other podiums here and talked about what was in the bill because we were reading these provisions that deeply troubled us.

And I note, General Electric is a big backer of this administration, been so excited about the health care bill because they were going to get to have the contract for bringing together all of the health care records in the country, that the Federal Government was going to be the repository, the depository for every health care record in America. The personal, private, biological situations of every person in America would be within the control of the Federal Government.

□ 2150

You know, there are people who have made incredible deals happen, who have made the economy purr, and though they knew they were dying, others didn't know. The Federal Government didn't know, and so they made things happen because their biological lives were their own lives. Their lives were their own business. As a result of the ObamaCare bill that needs desperately to be repealed, if it is not, every man's most private, personal lives will be under the electronic control of the Federal Government.

We have noticed that, when someone stands up against this administration, private information seems to surface from out of nowhere about that person. So anyone who stands up against them is liable to have the full power of the Democratic government come down on them.

We know that in the days preceding the impeachment vote, or the vote to remove President Clinton from office, the White House was found to have over 1,000 FBI files in the White House. In the possession of every one of those files was a felony, meaning years in prison to anyone who possessed them, to anyone who was complicit in having them brought over from the FBI, because they had to be physically brought into the White House. They were, and you had to know there were a lot of people involved. Yet not one person was prosecuted.

They could have certainly made the case against the person who had them. I believe it was 2 years in prison—it could have been 4—and I'm sure there are different ways to charge it so you could lump on different Federal charges, but at least 2,000 years in prison minimum for having those files. Any good prosecutor knows how you work that.

You go to the guy who has the files, and you say, You're looking at 2,000 years in prison. You'll never get out, but you know what? If you'll help us successfully prosecute those who have caused you to get those 1,000 FBI files—because we know you can't do it on your own—and if you help us to know who it was who told you to get these files, who went through these private FBI files—if you help us with all of that, we can work a deal. Maybe you'll do 4 years.

That's the way prosecutions normally work, and you work up the food chain until you find the highest person who was involved in bringing those files to the White House. None of that happened. None of it. For most prosecutors, they would see that as laydown cases that are just so easy. You know, you've got them dead to rights. Now it's just a question of how far up the food chain you get to send people to prison. It didn't happen, and that was with the physical possession of FBI files.

Now we're talking about a private company overseeing this operation. We're talking about the Federal Government's having control over all of these records. I know I've heard people ask, Well, what makes you think that anybody could ever get access to these private medical records of each individual in America?

How could anybody be so naive when you see the kind of things that have already happened in this country and the disclosure of secret information? Do you think that if this Federal Government cannot keep secret the identity of our most secret agents that they will be able to keep secret the medical records of someone who has become an enemy of the reigning party in the White House or in Congress? There are always leaks these days, it seems. There are always leaks.

We've found out, in the past few days, that the government, apparently, is going to require everybody in America to have a body mass index because the Federal Government wants to know how fat everybody in America is, and it doesn't take an Einstein to figure out that, once the Federal Government knows what your body mass index is, then they will be able to make decisions based on that information.

Now, I've been belittled; I've had blogs take all kinds of shots at me; I've had people on the other side of the aisle belittle this comment I'm about to make that I've made over the last year and a half; but, boy, is it turning out that I was right and that the naysayers simply hadn't read the bill and could not see what was going to be allowed unto the Federal Government.

Here is what I would say:

Think about it. The Federal Government has all of your personal medical records. We've been told that the Federal Government has the capability of monitoring every credit card purchase, every debit card purchase that anyone in America makes. We are also told it doesn't do that, but that it has the capability. But once the Federal Government, through tax dollars, is paying for people's health care, then it will proclaim the right to know what you're spending your money on.

For example, if you have too high of a cholesterol rate and if you have too high of a body mass index, then it's quite conceivable at some point that you'll get an email or you'll get a letter from your Federal Government, saying, We noticed your cholesterol was 160, and we noticed that you bought bacon at the grocery store this weekend. Accordingly, since you were on a Federal program, we are going to have to increase the amount that you pay to participate in the Federal ObamaCare program in which you're found.

Well, now, as we hear these things come out, now that we are a few months past the bill's becoming law, things for which I was belittled are now appearing to be quite accurate in their projections.

I heard my friends across the aisle talking about Social Security. If people are going to represent what I believe and what I have pushed for my 5½ years here in Congress, I would wish that they would get it right, because it wasn't. What I pushed with my Republican colleagues the year I got here in 2005, what I continue to push today and what I will continue to push next year, whether or not Republicans are in the majority or not, is this:

Social Security tax dollars should go into the Social Security trust fund. Statements I made back in 2005 are easy to find. I pointed out back then that I had my staff do an experiment, which was to contact the Texas Employment Retirement System, the Galveston retirement system and the Social Security system and to pose this hypothetical:

Suppose somebody had worked for 30 years, averaging $30,000 a year. What would be a person's retirement income per month?

□ 2200

I talked about this in 2005, in 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, this year. I spoke of it recently back home in East Texas. Well, what we got from Social Security was, well, you say average. A lot will depend on how many years, it was at what level, how you ended, all these other factors. So the best we can give you is somewhere between $600 a month and $900 a month. Tragic. Six hundred dollars to $900 a month. After someone has spent a lifetime paying into Social Security that's all you get? My goodness, the prescription drugs can eat that up in a heartbeat. And if you hadn't had your home already paid for, you are in big trouble.

Six hundred dollars a month in your senior years, when you ought to be a glory to your family? No, you become a drag, because this government did not do what it said it would do—put that money in a Social Security trust fund. You look at some societies throughout history, and they point out that when you pay tribute to your seniors because of their wisdom, because of what they've learned through the years, and one society they always made, at any gathering, the oldest person the center of attention. It gave people a reason to continue to live longer, so people there did live longer. It's not what we do here, and it's tragic. We relegate our seniors, who are our greatest source of wisdom and experience and knowledge, to $600 a month for Social Security.

Well, on the other hand, checking with the Texas Employment Retirement System, they came back and said, well, because it's a hypothetical and we don't have the exact years and how much was at the end and all that, the best we can say is somewhere $2,700 to $2,800 per month in retirement income. Wow. Several times the amount you would get from Social Security in the same scenario. What's the difference? The main difference is Social Security, since its inception in the 1930s, has never had a dime go into the Social Security trust fund. I thought it had until I got here. Come to find out this has been going on from the beginning. I thought it was a more recent development, maybe since the Great Society. Not true. Since the 1930s, never a dime of Social Security tax money going into the trust fund.

How about that for a start? That's what I have been advocating. Try to lay a privatizing label on me. I have been advocating this for 5½ years. Put Social Security tax money into the trust fund. Now, we've got people on our side of the aisle too, a tiny minority that say uh-oh, if you were to do that it would make the government own too much in the way of bonds. But some of them also voted for the Wall Street bailout, so apparently they got beyond that concern in the 3 intervening years since they opposed my proposal.

But there are just not a lot of people in the majority, it doesn't appear, who want to put Social Security tax dollars in the Social Security trust fund so that we can ensure that it will be there for years to come and it will draw interest. And we could do so much better by the seniors, who are the Greatest Generation, the seniors who have laid the groundwork, the foundation for this greatest advancement in human history. And now we're treating them so poorly by giving them $600 a month after all they've done because we won't put money in a trust fund so it can grow and they could get more in their senior years so that they don't have to worry whether they'll have to eat or get their drugs. We owe them so much better.

And if my friends in the majority would want to do that we could do it like that. And the President wouldn't have a choice. He'd have to sign it because you would have more than two-thirds in both Houses that would vote for that. What a great day for seniors that would be. What a great day for people moving toward their senior years to know, finally, money's going into the trust fund that will start growing. First time in American history. That's the kind of thing we need to be doing.

Now, we keep hearing about this financial reform bill. It's a financial deform bill, pure and simple. It still continues this ridiculous notion of a systemic risk panel, so that the government gets to pick and choose which companies will live and which will die. Because the way it's set up, that's what's going to happen. We already saw that with Goldman Sachs and AIG, two companies that had historically given contributions four to one to the Democratic Party over Republicans. But boy didn't George W. Bush do them a favor? He let Hank Paulson talk him into bailing out his buddies, all these big Democratic donors, to the tune of billions of dollars when they got their own cart in the ditch.

Some of us realize it's nice when you help somebody get their cart out of the

ditch, but you sure shouldn't let them run over you with it once they do. And that's what's happened. Goldman Sachs had their biggest profiting year in their history. So you can bet they'll be able to donate lots and lots of money this year to keep their friends that have done them the most good in office. And it won't be Republicans.

Another problem in this financial deform act is that it creates a system of bailouts as far into the future as anybody living today can see. When anyone says that a company or a bank is too big to fail, then it is absolutely essential that they be allowed to go through bankruptcy, be declared a failure, reorganized, sell off some of their attractive assets, and reorganize so never again will they be so big that they will pose a risk to our economy. That's not what happened with the Wall Street bailout. It's not what has continued to happen.

And one of the things that has grieved so many of us, that we could not believe that any White House, Republican or Democrat, could appoint a task force, a bunch of czars, and they make decisions about who lives and who dies in the automotive industry. They picked the winners and losers. They take property from people without due process of law. They force dealers, who owe money to the banks for buying the dealerships, into losing their dealership, take it away from them without any due process of law, without a chance to go to the bankruptcy court and say we have an alternative plan. Without a chance to come to the courts and say, you know what, you're not going to sell more cars by having so many less dealers.

They didn't have a chance to come to the bankruptcy courts or to the courts of America and say why in the world would you have some idiot proclaim that in a terrible recession we're going to close down tens of thousands of jobs and put them out of business, put them out of their jobs, put their families out wanting and begging because we felt like it?

□ 2210

We wanted our friends to be in business, didn't want our enemies to be in business. Well, the Founders were scared to death that a government might ever have that kind of power, so they took pains, they fought for, they died for the chance to have a government with not just one House in Congress but two. So if one got too far afield, the other could rein them in, keep them from doing something stupid. And if both of them did something stupid, then the executive branch, the President, could stop them with a simple veto. And if both of them got out of hand, you had a judicial branch, and they could cancel out what the others did.

And if the executive branch gets too far afield and appoints an auto task force that's going to violate the Constitution by taking property without due process of law and they're going to just run roughshod over the laws passed by the Congress that says this is the way bankruptcy proceedings go and you don't violate that, that if an executive branch ran roughshod over both the law and the Constitution, then the Congress would be upset and they would say, Wait a minute. The Congress passed those bankruptcy laws. We don't care if you did get a bankruptcy judge who wants to be reaffirmed as a judge in a few years or be a district judge down the road. We don't care if you got them to sign that bill. We're going to cut off funding for all of these czars, all of these task forces you've appointed who have no accountability to us. We're going to cut off your money. We'll cut off your task force at the knees. We'll cut off your czars at the knees because we're going to defund them.

That power was given to Congress to make sure that you don't let an executive branch appoint a bunch of czars without the consent of the Senate and then make rules and decide who loses their property without any accountability to anybody.

The Founders knew that with people in Congress in numbers in the House and Senate, they would never let the laws they passed be run over in such a fashion. They would stop the executive branch from doing that. But, unfortunately, it didn't happen.

Congress let the executive branch, through the auto task force, disregard the Constitution, disregard the law, disregard creditors' rights in the law, disregard the rights of secured creditors, promote unsecured creditors and make them owners, put secured creditors down to getting pennies and tell the secured creditors, if you say anything about it, you'll have the full force of the Federal Government executive branch come on you and you will be done in business for good. Don't you dare stand in our way. There were threats that we heard were made. And so they couldn't fight. Their only hope was that Congress would protect the power that it was entrusted with to keep the executive branch from running over the Constitution.

Congress let it happen.

But the Founders were so clever. They knew they didn't trust government, so they had this third branch, the court. And of course the Supreme Court was the only court actually created in the Constitution. Every other court in America owes its existence to this body. But the Supreme Court, thank goodness the Founders had the foresight to create that third branch. They'll stop the auto task force from disregarding the Constitution and disregarding the laws passed by Congress. Even though Congress didn't, they will. And God bless Ruth Bader Ginsburg, to her credit, put a 24-hour hold on that whole deal.

But the executive branch scared the Supreme Court sufficiently into thinking that if they extended that 24-hour hold any further, then apparently they made the Supreme Court believe that they would be responsible for the loss of every job related to the auto industry and all of those lost jobs would be on the Supreme Court's head. Why else would they let the Constitution be trampled on in such a fashion? Why else would they allow the laws to be trampled on in such a fashion?

None of the safeguards worked and people lost their businesses.

And then we get this article, July 19, from Bloomberg of all sources, and I'll read: ''The Obama administration's push to accelerate General Motors Co. and Chrysler Group LLC's dealership closings aimed at helping the companies compete may not have been necessary and added to unemployment, a U.S. watchdog said.

''The Treasury Department should have considered whether speeding up the closings was worth the potential loss of tens of thousands of jobs, according to a report released yesterday by Neil Barofsky, special inspector general of the Troubled Asset Relief Program.'' TARP, of course.

The article goes on, ''The U.S. had rejected reorganization plans from the carmakers in March 2009, in part citing a 'slow pace' for GM to scale back its dealer network.

'' 'Such dramatic and accelerated dealership closings may not have been necessary and underscores the need for Treasury to tread very carefully when considering such decisions in the future,' Barofsky concluded.

''The report made prompt congressional criticism of the administration's handling of the automaker bailouts. Lawmakers have already complained about the job losses in their districts from dealership closings and the process by which retailers were selected for shutdowns.

'' 'This sobering report should serve as a wake-up call as to the implications of politically orchestrated bailouts,' Representative Darrell Issa, a California Republican and ranking member on the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, said yesterday in a statement.

''Obama's Treasury Department, which has spent $80.7 billion on auto assistance under the TARP program, criticized the inspector's audit and said without government aid both companies faced failure and possible liquidation.

''The Department's auto task force in early 2009 found Detroit-based GM's plan for closing 1,650 dealers by 2014 too slow, according to Barofsky's report. In response, GM identified 1,454 dealerships to be shut down by October, Barofsky said.

''Auburn Hills, Michigan-based Chrysler, which planned to shut almost 1,200 dealerships by 2014, instead decided to immediately close 789 in bankruptcy after Treasury's urgings, according to the report.

''The Treasury Department, using advice received from industry experts,

had encouraged smaller dealership networks to help the carmakers boost sales and better compete with Japan's Toyota Motor Corp. and Honda Motor Co., according to the report.

''GM, which later moved to trim the closers by about half, said in a statement that events described in the report 'have since been overtaken by a new GM and a stronger dealer network to match,'. The statement added, 'The new GM is also moving forward to improve dealer relations and has already reinstated several hundred.' ''

Reinstated several hundred? After the executive branch forced these people to lose their property without due process of law?

Continuing on with the article.

''General Motors Co. was formed last year out of bankruptcy from the best-performing assets of General Motors Corp. while a group led by Fiat S.p.A. purchased most of the bankrupt Chrysler LLC assets, forming Chrysler Group LLC. Taxpayer aid made the reorganizations possible.''

Not bad enough to put tens of thousands of people out of business and take millions and millions of dollars without due process, we also took taxpayer money. This administration and this majority let it happen.

''Dealer complaints about closures prompted lawmakers, including Senator Jay Rockefeller, a West Virginia Democrat, to ask Barofsky to investigate.

□ 2220

'' 'There is substantial confusion, even among dealers themselves, as to how GM and Chrysler selected dealerships for termination,' Rockefeller, chairman of the Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee, said in a letter to Barofsky.

''The report found that Chrysler, which made decisions on a case-by-case basis, followed the criteria for targeting dealers for termination. GM was inconsistent and retained more than 1,300 dealers who would have been shut based on sales, consumer satisfaction and profitability, according to the report.''

'' 'The fact that Treasury was acting in part as an investor in GM and Chrysler does not insulate Treasury from its responsibility to the broader economy,' Barofsky said. 'Treasury should have taken special care given that the auto team's determinations had the potential to contribute to job losses.' Herbert Allison, assistant Treasury secretary for financial stability''—isn't that a misnomer. Anyway, he ''said in a letter included in the report that the restructuring process 'was not easy' and required 'deep and painful sacrifices' from all parties.

'' 'We strongly disagree with many of your statements, your conclusions and the lessons learned,' Allison told Barofsky.

''President Barack Obama signed a law in December that required the automakers to offer binding arbitration to dealers whose outlets were being closed. GM said in March it planned to reinstate 661 dealers after the company began reevaluating the closing of 1,100 retailers.''

And who's going to pay them back for all the property that was stolen from them by this administration? But I have to add stolen legally because Congress didn't stop them; the Supreme Court didn't stop them. So, accordingly, it must have been legal. They weren't stopped by the people that could have.

Well, back to the article: ''Chrysler said that same month it was offering new franchises to 50 dealers who applied for arbitration, in addition to 36 previous offers or new agreements. Chrysler terminated 789 dealers last year and said in January that 409 had applied for arbitration.''

I tell you what, we've heard from dealers who were some of the most profitable, who were doing well, and this administration took them away from them and got a bankruptcy judge to sign off, to his shame. Should be eternal shame, the damage that judge and those auto task force people caused. Shameless.

And yet when the House and Senate asked for information, notes from their meetings, they said, We're not accountable to you. We're a rogue government, is basically what they, in essence, were saying. We're a rogue government; we're czars. We do what we want. You can't touch us. Only the President who put us in these positions can get rid of us, and he likes what we've done. That's the message in essence.

When I hear my friends across the aisle talk about the importance of PAYGO, I was a Republican that voted for that in the previous term because I supported that, and then I come to find out it was a joke. It didn't mean what they were talking about with PAYGO, because every time there's a big bill, including extending the unemployment benefits, they have no intention of paying for that, just creating an exception over and over. Here it comes with a rule. Well, PAYGO suspended, we're not going to apply here.

Well, what good was it ever passing it in the first place? I learned my lesson. I thought that I could believe my friends across the aisle: yeah, we need to vote for PAYGO. People on this side of the aisle said don't believe them. I said, no, they're pushing this PAYGO bill; I'm going to vote for it. I did, and boy, did I learn. There was no seriousness about following through on that.

And it still blows my mind to hear people say over and over that tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans are wrong. They're right. If you do nothing but have tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, it is wrong, should not happen. But how about when you have a tax break for the people paying taxes? That's fair. When it's an across-the-board tax cut, evenly cut across the board, that's fair.

Unfortunately, we are quickly approaching the point where 50 percent or more of Americans will not pay income tax. Historians have warned about this point, that it is the point of no return. It is the line of demarcation. Once you pass it, you can't get back. Only with a miracle from God can a Nation be saved once a representative government has more than 50 percent of its voters not paying the taxes that run the government. When you get past that point, you're done.

It's one of the reasons I came here. It's one of the reasons I don't sleep much, keep working away, trying to figure out ways to hold this place together until we can have a fair deal for everybody.

Heck, I'm the guy that came up with the tax holiday idea. When the Bush administration and Obama administration were talking about, you know, really trillions of dollars to get the economy going, heck, I found out you're talking about trillions, Federal Reserve, trillions, to get the economy going. $1.21 trillion was all that was expected to be paid in personal income tax for year 2008. That's when it hit me, wow, we'd be a whole lot better off if we just said no income tax for 2008. It'd be a lot cheaper than all these bailout programs, and the American public would get their own money, and they would get to decide what car to buy. They would get out of trouble on their mortgages.

But now, this administration—and they can only do it with this Congress getting it done because Congress passes the money bills. This administration, this majority have spent trillions and trillions of dollars; and we are so obligated, there's no way to have a tax holiday right now. We've got us so deeply in debt we can't do that now. It sure would have spurred the economy a whole lot more cheaply than what we've done.

I want to finish tonight by taking, Mr. Speaker, one back to 1755. We know that there are those, including the President, who have said this is not a Christian Nation, and I will not debate that point whether we are or not now, but I know where we came from.

In 1755, George Washington was in his early 20s, 6-foot, three and a half, at least that's what he was measured when he died. Some books say six-two, six-four, six three and a half at his death, big, strapping guy, full of emotion, powerful man, athletic man. He was riding a horse, leading 100 American militiamen. They were accompanying 1,300 British Red Coats in the French and Indian War. They were heading up to Fort Duquesne in Pennsylvania. And the British generals—there were 82 officers including Washington on horseback.

The British generals had decided to go take the path of least resistance, through the woods, through this low area, sort of a ravine, passing through that area. Well, Washington got concerned they could be walking into an ambush. So he asked the general, Let me send some of the men ahead that

know this area, make sure we're not walking into a trap. He was belittled by the general. You think you know more about military than I do? This was a guy that was described as self-taught, described himself that way, George Washington.

□ 2230

So they didn't send Washington's men. They had to check, they walked into an ambush. The Indians, the French opened up, for 2 hours, firefight.

After 2 hours, over 713 British redcoats were dead, they had gone shoulder to shoulder, back to back. They were getting wiped out. The Americans, none were killed, some were wounded, but they had immediately taken cover.

Washington, at the end of 2 hours, was the only officer still on horseback, still fighting. He had had one shot out from under him, at least one. He is still on horseback fighting. Brave, he is fighting, he is calling out orders, incredible man.

All his men were amazed at this gallant, brave, courageous 20-something year old. After 2 hours, he could see the rest of the British were going to be wiped out if they didn't retreat. They retreated.

Two days later he wrote to his mother and brother, he hadn't met Martha yet. He said, in essence, when we got to a place of safety and camped for the night, I took off my hat, shook out my hair. Bullet fragments flew everywhere, had not a scratch on my head. Took off my jacket, I had bullet holes through and through, had not a scratch on me. Truly, divine providence. God protected me.

Fifteen years later, George Washington, he became a hero out of that, because word spread from all the Americans about how courageous and brave this young man was, big, tall, strong, strapping guy, how brave he was, what a fighter he was. He never lost his head. He kept his cool, kept fighting, calling out orders, just a leader of leaders, a man who was quoted as saying, men unused to restraint must be led; they will not be drove.

Fifteen years later, he was going with a friend, Larry Craig, up through that same area. Dr. Craig was with him when he died, unfortunately, but he was going to show him the area that was so famous where this occurred. They got up there where there were Indians there that wanted to sit down and meet with him. The Indian chief, the lead chief, said, we were in these woods 15 years ago, you and I were here. I ordered my men to fire at you before they fired at anyone else, and they did that. We came all this way to meet the man that God would not let die. It used to be in history books and every American history book until 1910 and began to disappear.

I won't debate whether we are a Christian nation now, but Washington knew what we knew, knew what we were.

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. SCOTT of Virginia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BRIGHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. HALVORSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, 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 27.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, July 22 and 23.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, July 27.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 21, 2010, at 10 a.m.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to Public Law 11–139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of the bill H.R. 5283, the Help HAITI Act of 2010, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 5283, THE HELP HAITI ACT OF 2010, 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

H.R. 5283 would make it easier for certain Haitian children adopted by U.S. citizens to obtain permanent U.S. residence. This legislation would affect a small number of children, and CBO estimates that it would have no significant effect on direct spending by the Department of Homeland Security.

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. 5532, the International Adoption Harmonization Act of 2010, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 5532, THE INTERNATIONAL ADOPTION HARMONIZATION ACT OF 2010, 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

H.R. 5532 would raise the maximum age (from 16 to 18) for foreign children adopted by U.S. citizens to be eligible for permanent U.S. residence. CBO estimates that this legislation would affect very few children and would have no significant effect on direct spending by the Department of Homeland Security or on federal assistance programs.

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. 5566, the Prevention of Interstate Commerce in Animal Crush Videos Act of 2010, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 5566, THE PREVENTION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE IN ANIMAL CRUSH VIDEOS ACT OF 2010, 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

H.R. 5566 would modify the current laws that prohibit the sale of certain videos or other items that depict animal cruelty. Thus, the government might be able to pursue cases that it otherwise would not be able to prosecute. Because those prosecuted and convicted under H.R. 5566 could be subject to criminal fines, the federal government might collect additional amounts if the legislation is enacted. Criminal fines are recorded as revenues, deposited in the Crime Victims Fund, and later spent. CBO estimates that any additional revenues and direct spending would not be significant because of the small number of cases likely to be affected.

Pursuant to Public Law 111–139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of a House amendment to the bill S. 1749, the Cell Phone Contraband Act of 2010, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR THE HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 1749, THE CELL PHONE CONTRABAND ACT OF 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

S. 1749 would prohibit the possession of cell Phones or similar wireless devices by federal prisoners (use of cell phones by prisoners is currently banned in the federal correctional system). Because the bill would establish a new crime, the government might be able to pursue cases that it otherwise would not be able to prosecute. Because those prosecuted and convicted under S. 1749 could be subject to criminal fines, the federal government might collect additional amounts if the legislation is enacted. Criminal fines are recorded as revenues, deposited in the Crime Victims Fund, and later spent. CBO estimates that any additional revenues and direct spending would not be significant because of the small number of cases likely to be affected.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8411. A letter from the Office of Research and Analysis, Chief, PRAB, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Quality Control Provisions of Title IV of Public Law 107-171 [FNS-2009-0045] (RIN: 0584-AD31) received June 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8412. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Ownership or Control by a Foreign Government (DFARS Case 2010-D010) received June 22, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8413. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Payments in Support of Emergencies and Contingency Operations (DFARS Case 2009-D020) received June 22, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8414. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] received June 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8415. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Availability of Information to the Public [DOCKET ID: ED-2008-OM-0011] (RIN: 1880-AA84) received June 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

8416. A letter from the Assistant Deputy Secretary for Safe and Drug-Free Schools, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 84.215F received June 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

8417. A letter from the Acting Director Division of Interpretations and Regulatory Affairs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Child Labor Regulations, Orders and Statements of Interpretation (RIN: 1215-AB57) (RIN: 1235-AA01) received June 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

8418. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments. FM Broadcast Stations, (Culebra, Puerto Rico, Charlotte Amalie, and Christiansted, Virgin Islands) [MB Docket No.: 08-243] (RM-11490) received June 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8419. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-29, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8420. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-33, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8421. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 10-09, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8422. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition and Removal of Certain Persons on the Entity List: Addition of Persons Acting Contrary to the National Security or Foreign Policy Interests of the United States; Removal of Person Based on Removal Request [Docket No.: 100429205-0248-01] (RIN: 0694-AE92) received June 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8423. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations based upon a Systematic Review of the Commerce Control List; Additional Changes [Docket No.: 090126064-0122-01] (RIN: 0694-AE56) received June 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8424. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Encryption Export Controls: Revision of License Exception ENC and Mass Market Eligibility, Submission Procedures, Reporting Requirements, License Application Requirements, and Addition of Note 4 to Category 5, Part 2 [Docket No.: 100309131-0195-02] (RIN: 0694-AE89) received June 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8425. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-071, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8426. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-070, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8427. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-037, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8428. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-062, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8429. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-055, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8430. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-061, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8431. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-065, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8432. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affiars, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-049, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8433. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 10-059, certification of proposed issuance of an export license pursuant to section 36(c)and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8434. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-468 ''Elected Attorney General Referendum Temporary Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8435. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-478 ''Adoption Reform Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8436. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-471 ''Priority Sidewalk Assurance Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8437. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-461 ''Fiscal Year 2010 Balanced Budget Support Temporary Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8438. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-449 ''Georgia Avenue Main Street Authorization Temporary Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8439. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-446 ''Community Impact Statement Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8440. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-445 ''Commercial Driver's License Minimum Age Requirement Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8441. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-470 ''Tenant Organization Petition Standing Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8442. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-472 ''Families Together Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8443. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-479 ''Rental Housing Commission Quorum Temporary Amendment Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8444. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-473 ''Closing of a Public Alley in Square 6172, S.O. 08-7590, Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8445. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-462 ''Fiscal Year 2011 Budget Support Act of 2010''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8446. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Absence and Leave; Definitions of Family member, Immediate relative, and Related Terms (RIN: 3206-AL93) received June 23, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8447. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — General Schedule Locality Pay Areas (RIN: 3206-AL96) received June 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8448. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 0908191244-91427-02] (RIN: 0648-XW47) received June 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8449. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; 2010 Atlantic Bluefish Specifications [Docket No.: 100204079-0199-02] (RIN: 0648-XQ49) received June 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8450. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Amendment 31; Correction [Docket No.: 090225243-0170-03] (RIN: 0648-AX67) received June 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8451. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; Red Snapper Closure [Docket No.: 090508900-91414-02] (RIN: 0648-AX75) received June 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8452. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 feet (18.3 m) Length Overall Using Hook-and-Line or Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 0910131363-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XW55) received June 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8453. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Fishing Restrictions and Observer Requirements in Purse Seine Fisheries for 2009-2011 [Docket No.: 090130104-91027-02] (RIN: 0648-XW12) received June 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8454. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Shark Management Measures; Amendment 3 [Docket No.: 080519678-0217-02] (RIN: 0648-AW65) received June 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8455. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Disaster Assistance Loan Program (RIN: 3245-AF98) received June 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

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. HASTINGS of Florida: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 1537. A 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 providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules. (Rept. 111–552). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROSS (for himself and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 5778. A bill to facilitate the implementation of the Renewable Fuel Standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 5779. A bill to reduce deficits and government spending through the elimination of wasteful agriculture subsidies and programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 5780. A bill to reduce deficits and government spending through the elimination of wasteful energy subsidies and programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Science and Technology, 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. GORDON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. GIFFORDS, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 5781. A bill to authorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. ADLER of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 5782. A bill to implement cost savings within the Department of the Treasury and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and to terminate the Overseas Private Investment Corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 5783. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an excise tax on currency transactions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 5784. A bill to reduce deficits and government spending through the elimination of wasteful defense subsidies and programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 5785. A bill to direct the Mine Safety and Health Administration to provide to mine operators for distribution to miners wallet cards and similar devices containing the phone number of the Administration's national hazard reporting phone number; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, and Ms. BALDWIN):

H.R. 5786. A bill to amend title VI of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safe use of cosmetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, 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. MELANCON:

H.R. 5787. A bill to provide for the refinancing and consolidation of disaster loans under the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 5788. A bill to honor the Nation's fallen miners by requiring improved mine safety practices and compliance in order to prevent future mine accidents; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARNAHAN (for himself and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 5789. A bill to create clean energy jobs and set efficiency standards for small-duct high-velocity air conditioning and heat pump systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. OLSON:

H.R. 5790. A bill to extend the expenditure deadline for the social services block grant funds provided for recovery from Hurricanes Ike and Rita; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. HARE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SCHAUER, and Ms. SUTTON):

H.R. 5791. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to eliminate waivers to Buy America to strengthen the requirement that steel, iron, and manufactured goods used in a capital project are produced in the United States; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HARE, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. KAGEN):

H.R. 5792. A bill to require 100 percent domestic content in green technologies purchased by Federal agencies or by States with Federal funds and in property eligible for the renewable energy production or investment tax credits; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HARE, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KAGEN, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 5793. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to close foreign tax loopholes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 5794. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to establish requirements for the treatment of absentee ballots in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KIND, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 5795. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of voluntary advance care planning consultation under Medicare and Medicaid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 5796. A bill to withdraw Federal funds from States and political subdivisions of States that interfere with enforcement of Federal immigration law; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 5797. A bill to expand export promotion activities with respect to small- and medium-sized manufacturers in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, 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. SALAZAR (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado):

H.R. 5798. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs telehealth clinic in Craig, Colorado, as the "Major William Edward Adams Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 5799. A bill to require the Secretary of the Department of Transportation to conduct a study and develop a national intermodal transportation plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H.R. 5800. A bill to withdraw certain land in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 5801. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the subsidization of Amtrak sleeper class service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 5802. A bill to repeal a provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for funds to a health care facility and rescind funds made available under such section; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. HARMAN (for herself and Mr. MCKEON):

H. Res. 1535. A resolution honoring the members of the Armed Forces from Los Angeles County and their families for their exceptional service and sacrifice protecting the United States while serving in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation New Dawn; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. HOLDEN):

H. Res. 1536. A resolution take a Child to a Park Week; Declaring The Third Week In July as "National Take a Child to a Park Week"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. GIFFORDS, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. KLEIN of Florida):

H. Res. 1538. A resolution condemning the July 11, 2010, terrorist attacks in Kampala, Uganda; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Res. 1539. A resolution expressing solidarity with human rights defenders in the Russian Federation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H. Res. 1540. A resolution supporting the goal of eradicating illicit marijuana cultivation on Federal lands and calling on the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy to develop a coordinated strategy to permanently dismantle Mexican drug trafficking organizations operating on Federal lands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MARKEY of Colorado (for herself and Mr. COURTNEY):

H. Res. 1541. A resolution expressing support for designation of October 7, 2010, as national "Jumpstart's Read for the Record Day"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. PINGREE of Maine:

H. Res. 1542. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that Members' official websites include congressional earmark requests and video presentations for requests submitted to committees; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. POLIS:

H. Res. 1543. A resolution honoring the educational significance of Dr. Jane Goodall's

work on this the 50th anniversary of the beginning of her work in Tanzania, Africa; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself and Mr. SHUSTER):

H. Res. 1544. A resolution reaffirming the strength of the relationship between the United States and the Republic of Georgia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H. Res. 1545. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week beginning on the third Monday in September as ''National Postdoc Appreciation Week''; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 272: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 275: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 336: Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 430: Mr. HARE.
H.R. 503: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 560: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H.R. 571: Mr. BARTON of Texas and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 847: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 932: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 944: Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 1124: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HOLT, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 1189: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1230: Mr. OLVER and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 1362: Mr. NADLER of New York and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1458: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1547: Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 1646: Mr. BARROW, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 1844: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 1924: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 2000: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 2031: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 2103: Mr. SALAZAR and Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 2115: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 2132: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2143: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 2218: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 2324: Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 2365: Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 2406: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 2579: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2594: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 2598: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 2630: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 3024: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 3077: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 3251: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 3267: Mr. WITTMAN and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
H.R. 3274: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 3463: Mr. BRIGHT.
H.R. 3586: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. KAGEN.
H.R. 3656: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 3697: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 3699: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3716: Mr. SKELTON.
H.R. 3729: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BEAN, Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 3742: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 3749: Mr. HILL.
H.R. 3754: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 3787: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
H.R. 3790: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 3858: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 4056: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 4181: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HARE, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 4199: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 4224: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 4347: Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 4403: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4436: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 4480: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 4553: Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 4557: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 4596: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 4599: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 4662: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4693: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Ms. KILROY.
H.R. 4745: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 4753: Mr. SPRATT.
H.R. 4772: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 4788: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. CRITZ.
H.R. 4856: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4888: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 4891: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 4914: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 4933: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 4943: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 4947: Ms. TSONGAS and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 4993: Mr. KANJORSKI.
H.R. 4995: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 5012: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 5015: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 5023: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 5028: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 5032: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 5034: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 5041: Mrs. HALVORSON.
H.R. 5058: Mr. COBLE and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 5081: Ms. CHU, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 5138: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 5141: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MICA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BRIGHT, and Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 5234: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 5268: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 5283: Ms. CLARKE and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 5309: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 5323: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 5348: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 5360: Mr. TEAGUE.
H.R. 5369: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 5418: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 5424: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 5434: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WEINER, Ms. KILROY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BOUCHER and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 5441: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 5449: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 5454: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BACA, Mr. BARROW, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. KRATOVIL, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. SHULER, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
H.R. 5458: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. STARK, and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 5460: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 5461: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.
H.R. 5476: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 5477: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 5522: Ms. NORTON and Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 5554: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 5564: Mr. SHADEGG.
H.R. 5567: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 5575: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 5577: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 5598: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 5625: Mr. LEE of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 5628: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 5636: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 5637: Mr. SHULER.
H.R. 5652: Mr. PETERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 5663: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 5680: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 5690: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 5692: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 5718: Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 5725: Mr. FLEMING.
H.R. 5729: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 5743: Ms. CHU and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 5744: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 5747: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5754: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
H.R. 5760: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 5772: Ms. FALLIN, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. HARPER.
H.J. Res. 42: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H. Con. Res. 274: Ms. JENKINS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. MARSHALL.
H. Con. Res. 281: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 287: Mr. CAO.
H. Con. Res. 292: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H. Con. Res. 296: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. MURPHY of New York.
H. Res. 173: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan and Mr. ALEXANDER.
H. Res. 771: Mr. PETERSON.
H. Res. 982: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H. Res. 1207: Mr. BACA.
H. Res. 1209: Mr. COURTNEY.
H. Res. 1217: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. GIFFORDS.
H. Res. 1251: Mr. TURNER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MURPHY of New York, and Mr. PLATTS.
H. Res. 1267: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H. Res. 1346: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DJOU, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 1365: Mr. GERLACH.
H. Res. 1384: Mr. JONES and Mr. SCHOCK.
H. Res. 1411: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
H. Res. 1420: Mr. DJOU.
H. Res. 1445: Mr. WOLF, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. REHBERG, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. DINGELL.
H. Res. 1449: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. BEAN, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 1456: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 1476: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 1485: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. CAO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COBLE,

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. LATTA, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. HARPER, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 1486: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. SHULER.

H. Res. 1494: Mr. SKELTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. DRIEHAUS.

H. Res. 1498: Mr. MARSHALL.

H. Res. 1511: Mr. SABLAN and Mr. POLIS.

H. Res. 1516: Mr. SABLAN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. BUYER.

H. Res. 1518: Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. STARK, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Ms. LEE of California.

H. Res. 1523: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee and Mr. KIRK.

H. Res. 1527: Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. HOLT.

H. Res. 1529: Mr. MCMAHON and Mr. GRIJALVA.