United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2010 No. 149

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Wednesday, November 17, 2010, at 9:30 a.m.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2010

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 16, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LORETTA SANCHEZ 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.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF STAFF SERGEANT ADAM L. DICKMYER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, today I rise in solemn remembrance of the life of a fallen hero, Staff Sergeant Adam L. Dickmyer who grew up in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. Staff Sergeant Dickmyer was killed while serving his country in Afghanistan on October 28 when insurgents attacked his unit with an improvised explosive device near Kandahar.

Staff Sergeant Dickmyer was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 502nd Infantry Regiment, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, Fort Campbell, Kentucky. From 2003 until 2009, he served at the Tomb of the Unknowns in Arlington National Cemetery. Only 15 percent of those who try out for the honored, precision assignment are chosen, and some consider it the most prestigious duty of the military. Staff Sergeant Dickmyer led the changing of the guards, a ceremony he performed every half-hour with precision. The soldiers carry out their duties 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, no matter the conditions. He was deployed to Afghanistan in June after volunteering to go.

Staff Sergeant Dickmyer graduated from Carver High School where he participated in the award-winning ROTC drill team. This selfless American patriot, who paid the heaviest price for his country, will be remembered forever as a young man who was a leader and loved by many. His tragic death in the line of duty is an irreplaceable loss for his family and friends, his community, and his country.

Today we mourn with those who mourn, and we pay tribute to and honor this soldier and his inspiring life which was cut short while he was serving his country. His country owes him an immeasurable debt of gratitude for his service and his great sacrifice on the battlefield. May God's peace be with Staff Sergeant Dickmyer's family, friends, and all those who continue to mourn his death and remember his life.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND REFORM

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I think that every Member of Congress, and especially Democrats, at this point should welcome the recommendations of the two cochairs of the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform. This is one of the rare, tangible, and comprehensive approaches that have come through the political process to deal with an issue that everyone should be concerned about: how we pay for what America needs amidst growing budget deficits and strains on our entitlement programs.

We must not underestimate the value of two reasonable, credible people, Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson, both with experience on a national scale and an assignment from the President, who have recommended a combination of ways to increase revenue and deal with

Printed on recycled paper.

entitlement spending. Every independent observer feels that such a balance is a critical part of the solution. The question is what the balance should be between revenue increases, budget and benefit cuts, and most critical of all, how we change doing business. The reform and evolution of our government's role is central. Unless we can change the way we do business—Medicare, defense, agriculture—no amount of tax increase or program cuts will get America to where we need to be with our economy and government services.

This is the debate that we Democrats, especially those who are in the center or left of center, should welcome. This is what the majority of the American public and independent observers without an axe to grind believe to be the real issues. This is a debate that certainly has not occurred on the national level, especially during the election, but it should have. I, for one, will resist the efforts to reject out of hand the cochairs' proposals before they have even worked their way through the commission. Instead, I will focus on areas where I think agreement can be built across the political spectrum and, most important, with the American public.

In a period of spiraling deficits and reductions in government services, how high a priority is a mortgage interest deduction on expensive third homes? Do we need to spend billions of dollars protecting West Germany from the Soviet Union when both countries ceased to exist more than two decades ago, and it has been more than half a century since the end of World War II?

Many candidates who ran under the Tea Party banner have argued against the lavish, unnecessary system of agricultural subsidies that are bad for the taxpayers, bad for the environment, and shortchange most of America's small farmers and ranchers. This has been an area where Republicans and Democrats alike have labored for reform; and in some areas, we have been joined by President Obama. Don't we see the potential for a coalition to get this across the finish line?

Yes, by all means, debate the rebuilding and renewing America. This was a great point in the report. There will, for example, be high-speed trains in America in the next 20 years. The question is: Will Americans invest and build them? Or will they be built, financed, and operated by the Chinese? What is the price of our high-speed rail connections managed by foreigners, and we pay them for the privilege? This is why I hope that people across the country, especially Democrats and, in particular, our leaders, move to embrace areas of agreement.

To be sure, there are areas that I find problematic. There are some with which I strongly disagree. But they shouldn't merit rejection of the whole package before we even have the debate. Instead, I welcome the opportunity to discuss, debate, and analyze elements on which we don't see eye to eye. How about some good old-fashioned, if somewhat boring, civic education and discourse? It is, after all, only the future of our Nation that is at stake.

GRANDFATHERING HEALTH PLANS AND 1099 REPORTING MANDATES

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, we are 8 months into the passage of the more than 2,000-page health care bill, and already we are beginning to see some of the problems that the new health care law brings with it.

When Congress passed the massive health care bill, I said that it would lead to millions of Americans losing their current health care plan. I was so concerned about this happening that I offered an amendment to the bill in the Energy and Commerce Committee markup and at the Rules Committee to protect people's health care plans. It was a very simple amendment. It stated, ''Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent or limit individuals from keeping their current health coverage.'' This amendment was voted down in committee, and the Rules Committee prevented it from being offered on the House floor during debate on the health care bill.

□ 1240

Fast forward now 6 months, and the Department of Health and Human Services has just issued the rules that govern grandfathered health care plans. These are health plans that existed before the passage of the ObamaCare and could continue to operate as they have without all the new costly mandates and regulation that the health czar will impose.

Unfortunately, the rule governing grandfathered health plans is so restrictive that most of the current health plans will not qualify. Businesses will be forced to buy new health plans under the control of the Federal health czar.

How many will lose their current health plan? Up to 80 percent of small businesses will be forced to buy new ObamaCare-approved health care plans. Up to 64 percent of large businesses health plans will be forced to buy the new ObamaCare approved health plans.

Now, you may wonder, where do I get these numbers? It's in the regulations. HHS' regulation on grandfathered health plans clearly states that up to 80 percent of small businesses and up to 64 percent of large businesses will simply lose their current plans. They admit that it will force people out of their current health plans.

Health care reform should be about giving consumers more options, more choices, not forcing them out of the plans they currently enjoy.

Yet despite hurting small businesses for having health plans that do meet the high standards set by HHS, just this month the Obama administration recently gave waivers to organization health plans that do not meet the requirements of the health care plan law. These plans failed to meet the law's definition of minimal coverage.

However, the Obama administration provided waivers to up to over 100 organizations, many of them unions, who offered limited benefits health care plans that do not comply with the law. If the law is good, why do you need to provide exemptions from it?

Another problem with ObamaCare is it will require all business-to-business transactions over $600 annually to file a 1099 IRS form. This is a massive burden on small businesses. They will be forced—this will force millions of small businesses to track all their expenditures by vendors and require small businesses to obtain taxpayer information numbers from everyone they do business with.

So, has Congress tried to fix this problem? No. In fact, Democrats have taken it a step further. The recently passed Small Business Act included a provision that would expand the 1099 reporting requirement even further to included expenditures on your rental property. This means that if you spend more than $600 over the course of a year with a handyman for repairs or improvement, you'll need to file a 1099 form.

Imagine, if you work as a general contractor and regularly buy building materials from a hardware store, you'll need to issue the store a 1099 form. If you are a trucker and regularly buy gasoline from the same gas station, you'll need to issue that gas station a 1099 form.

It is simply wrong to require additional burdens on small businesses. Small businesses represent 99 percent of all employment firms. Small businesses employ just over half of all private sector employees and 44 percent of total U.S. private sector payroll. Small businesses have generated 64 percent of the new net jobs over the past 15 years.

Yet despite a massive recession and double digit unemployment, the administration is finding new ways to hurt small businesses and prevent job growth.

Mr. Speaker, the new Republican majority will work to create jobs and not add more regulations and burdensome paperwork and, in fact, rescind these mandates.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUMMINGS) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

Lord God of history, yet ever-present to Your people, as the sunlight is diminished, hot winds of pundits and prophets blow across the land. People complain with increasing volume to one another, but they are not seen crying out to You.

Jeremiah, traditionally the man of tears, has a teaching for people of this information age, how to truly lament. His faith in You is more powerful than any terrorist attack, so he refuses to be negative. The signs of corruption and ruins of former days surround him, but he never allows doubt in You. They are only the consequences of the sinful actions found in the powerful and poor alike.

So believing in the same divine providence which enlightened this Nation's Founders, Jeremiah says:

''Wise men should not boast of their wisdom, nor strong men of their strength, nor rich men of their wealth. If anyone wants to boast, he should boast that he knows and understands Me. He knows My love is constant, and I do only what is kind and just. These are the things that please me. I, the Lord, have spoken.''

Let those who hear the Word of God say: ''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 Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FLEMING 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.

FULL BODY SCANNERS VIOLATE FOURTH AMENDMENT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a trip to the airport these days leaves Americans with embarrassing choices. Law-abiding citizens can bare it all through a peekaboo body scanner—or they can get groped in a pat-down search by a Federal employee. Now that's a real choice.

There is no evidence these new body scanners make us more secure. But there is evidence that former Homeland Security Chief Michael Chertoff made money hawking these full body scanners.

The underwear bomber tried to blow up a plane over Detroit last Christmas. Shortly thereafter, Chertoff went on a media tour promoting the full body scanners. This former Homeland Security chief told everyone we had to have the full body scanners at airports to be safe. Too bad he didn't disclose he was getting paid to sell these intrusive devices. Isn't that lovely?

Meanwhile, the populace is giving up more rights in the name of alleged security. These body scanners are a violation of the Fourth Amendment right against unreasonable searches and seizures. There must be a better way to have security at airports than taking pornographic photographs of our citizens, including children, and then giving apparent kickbacks to political hacks.

And that's just the way it is.

EXTEND ALL TAX CUTS

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, in just a few weeks, the Obama tax hike time bomb, otherwise known as the expiration of the current tax cuts, will explode, resulting in the highest single tax increase in U.S. history.

For some, it is tempting to accept the argument that increasing taxes on upper incomes and small businesses will solve our deficit problems. However, any clear-thinking American knows that confiscating more money from Americans through taxes to feed a rapidly growing government will only lead to a continued death spiral of increased taxes and expanding government. Ultimately, we will have a shrinking private sector and fewer jobs.

Mr. Speaker, on November 2, the American people spoke loudly, and they said that we are in desperate need of reform in the way this government does its business. To that end, let me suggest that instead of making tax cuts temporary and spending permanent, that we make tax cuts permanent and spending temporary. It is time for Congress and the President to put the American people first and extend permanently all of the current tax cuts for families and small businesses in order to make this economy sound for generations to come.

VALUE-ADDED TAX

(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, in May, 154 of my Republican colleagues and I sent a letter to the President's Fiscal Commission asking them to reject a new value-added tax as a way to balance the Federal budget. With top White House advisers like John Podesta and Paul Volcker talking about the need for a VAT tax, there was great concern that the Fiscal Commission would look to this tax as an easy way to raise more revenue. Last week, I was pleased to see that the cochairs released a preliminary report that did not call for a new VAT tax.

The ease with which a VAT tax can raise revenue makes it especially dangerous. The government cannot create jobs, and a VAT tax would only further deplete resources from the private sector, the true center of job growth.

Now we need to have a serious debate in Congress about the best ways to control government spending and let the private sector flourish, grow, and create sustainable jobs.

LAME DUCK SESSION SHOULD INCLUDE AIRLINE SECURITY MEASURES

(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, the top priority of Congress for this lame duck session should be extending the tax cuts for all Americans in order to create jobs and get people back to work. Once this important matter is completed, I strongly encourage Congress to consider ways to protect the privacy of airline passengers while keeping air travel safe and secure.

Air travelers across America have come to expect a certain level of discomfort and anxiety when they fly; and for the most part, these American travelers are good sports and team players in the name of tight security. Recently, though, the patience and privacy of these travelers has been tested at a whole new level with full body scans. These intrusive scans are one such screening method that Congress should examine this year. I support the Aircraft Passenger Whole-Body Imaging Limitations Act, authored by Congressman JASON CHAFFETZ of Utah, to make sure the images lifted from scanners are not stored, transferred, or shared.

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

CONGRESS MUST ACT TO STOP TAX HIKE

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago today, the American people registered a historic rejection of American

liberalism and the agenda of this administration and this Congress. The American people said in deafening terms that they are tired of the borrowing and the spending and the bailouts and the takeovers and the tax increases of the recent past. They voted for change.

That's why it's so remarkable, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress is poised to allow one of the largest tax increases in American history to take effect in January of this year. A historic $3.9 trillion tax increase could take effect, impacting every American, if Congress fails to act. The average tax increase will be more than $1,500 per household. American families will see the marriage penalty reinstated, the child tax credit cut in half, and tax rates on investments and savings and inheritance will all increase.

It is absolutely imperative, if Congress accomplishes nothing else in this lame duck, that we take immediate action to make permanent all of the current tax rates. And let's be clear, this is not a debate over tax cuts. If the tax rates are not preserved permanently, it will result in one of the largest tax increases in history.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting legislation that we will introduce today to make those rates permanent.

□ 1410

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask all Members to heed to the gavel, please.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF LANCE CORPORAL IRVIN CENICEROS

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of America's bravest, Lance Corporal Irvin Ceniceros of Clarksville, Arkansas, who was taken from us while supporting combat missions in Afghanistan.

After graduating high school in 2007, Lance Corporal Ceniceros enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps. Family members say it was the strength and character of the Marines that drew him to serve with the Corps, and his friends and comrades say he was a great machine gunner.

Lance Corporal Ceniceros served with the Marines all across the globe, and less than 2 weeks after arriving in Afghanistan, at the age of 21, he made the ultimate sacrifice for our great Nation.

My prayers and the prayers of the people of Arkansas are with the Ceniceros family. I humbly offer my thanks to Lance Corporal Irvin Ceniceros, a true American hero, for his selfless service to the security and well-being of all Americans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

CONGRATULATING THE TOWN OF TARBORO, NORTH CAROLINA, ON ITS 250TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1475) congratulates the town of Tarboro, North Carolina, on the occasion of its 250th anniversary.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1475

Whereas, in 1759, Joseph Howell deeded 150 acres of land along the Tar River to establish a town;

Whereas the first town commissioners Reverend James Moir, Aquila Suggs, Lawrence Toole, Elisha Battle, and Benjamin Hart laid out a town that included 121 half-acre lots surrounded by 50 acres of town common;

Whereas the North Carolina General Assembly on November 30, 1760, approved the charter of a town called Tarboro along the banks of the Tar River;

Whereas Tarboro is the 11th oldest colonial town in North Carolina;

Whereas Tarboro has the only town common outside of Boston originally chartered with the town;

Whereas President George Washington slept in Tarboro during a visit on his southern tour in 1791;

Whereas Tarboro was home to former United States Congressman George Henry White who was elected to the Congress in 1896 and 1898, and was the last African-American to serve in Congress until World War II;

Whereas Tarboro was home to Henry Lawson Wyatt, the first North Carolina soldier to die in the Civil War;

Whereas Tarboro was home to former Congressman Lawrence H. (L.H.) Fountain who served North Carolina's Second Congressional District from 1953 to 1983;

Whereas Tarboro was home to General Henry ''Hugh'' Shelton who served in the United States Army and served as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from 1997 to 2001;

Whereas Tarboro is home to a 45-block historic district which was created in 1977 by the National Park Service;

Whereas the historic district boasts over 300 structures, from the residential dwellings to historic churches to original 19th century storefronts along Tarboro's Main Street;

Whereas the vibrant downtown is listed on the National Register of Historic Places;

Whereas Tarboro is known for its rich history, low crime rate, and high quality of life;

Whereas Tarboro offers extensive recreation opportunities for youth, adults, and seniors;

Whereas Tarboro is home to the Edgecombe County Veterans' Military Museum, the Tar River Paddle Trail, and the North Carolina Civil War Trail, and is a part of the Historic Albemarle Trail;

Whereas, in 1999, Tarboro was devastated by the flooding from Hurricane Floyd;

Whereas through hard work and unity, Tarboro was able to fully recover from the event to become an even stronger community; and

Whereas Tarboro today is home to approximately 11,000 residents and is known for its diversity and viable industrial base: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulates the town of Tarboro, North Carolina, on the occasion of its 250th anniversary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) 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 may 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 now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to present H. Res. 1475 for consideration. This measure congratulates the town of Tarboro, North Carolina, on its 250th anniversary.

H. Res. 1475 was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, Representative G.K. BUTTERFIELD, on June 24, 2010. The measure was referred to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which ordered it reported favorably by unanimous consent on July 15, 2010. The measure enjoys the support of over 50 Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the North Carolina General Assembly approved the Tarboro town charter 250 years ago this month, November 30, 1760. It is one of the oldest colonial towns in the State. Its downtown is listed in the National Register of Historic Places, and it has the only town common outside of Boston to be originally chartered with the town.

It was home to such notable figures as former United States Congressman George Henry White, who was elected to the Congress in 1896 and 1898. He was the last African American to serve in Congress until World War II.

Tarboro is also the home of General Hugh Shelton, who served in the United States Army and served as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from 1997 to 2001.

Mr. Speaker, let us join together in congratulating the town of Tarboro on reaching this historic milestone. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 1475.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1475.

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 agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1475.

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, 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 BROOKLYN BOTANIC GARDEN ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1428) recognizing Brooklyn Botanic Garden on its 100th anniversary as the preeminent horticultural attraction in the borough of Brooklyn and its longstanding commitment to environmental stewardship and education for the City of New York.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1428

Whereas Brooklyn Botanic Garden opened to the public in 1910;

Whereas the Brooklyn Botanic Garden is a 52-acre urban oasis in the heart of Brooklyn, New York, and features more than 11,000 different kinds of plants from around the world;

Whereas the Brooklyn Botanic Garden is made up of many exquisite and historic specialty gardens, including the Japanese-Hill-and-Pond-Garden, the Children's Garden, the Native Flora Garden, the Cranford Rose Garden, the Alice Recknagel Ireys Fragrance Garden, and the Steinhardt Conservatory;

Whereas more than 730,000 visitors a year enjoy the Brooklyn Botanic Garden;

Whereas the Brooklyn Botanic Garden is host to a world renown Cherry Blossom Festival;

Whereas the Brooklyn Botanic Garden provides premier environmental education for children and adults;

Whereas the Brooklyn Botanic Garden improves public education in Brooklyn through a partnership with the Brooklyn Academy of Science and the Environment High School and has provided valuable training, curriculum development, and field study opportunities that would otherwise not be available;

Whereas the people of Brooklyn enjoy spending time in the beautiful gardens, making it a center for socializing, recreation, and education; and

Whereas the Brooklyn Botanic Garden has become an integral part of the cultural life and economic development of Brooklyn and provides an invaluable service to residents: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes the Brooklyn Botanic Gardens on its 100th anniversary as the preeminent horticultural attraction in the borough of Brooklyn and for its longstanding commitment to environmental stewardship and education for the City of New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) 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 may 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 now yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H. Res. 1428, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the Brooklyn Botanic Garden.

H. Res. 1428 was introduced by our colleague, the gentlewoman from New York, Representative YVETTE CLARKE, on June 9 of 2010. It was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which ordered it reported favorably by unanimous consent on July 28, 2010. The measure enjoys the support of 50 Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Brooklyn Botanic Garden is a top cultural and environmental attraction in New York City, attracting over 730,000 visitors each year. It is a superb example of urban gardening and horticultural display, serving local residents and international visitors alike, and also features a number of educational programs through a partnership with the Brooklyn Academy of Science and the Environment High School.

The Brooklyn Botanic Garden features a number of specialty gardens and collections on its 52 acres, including a collection of cherry trees that allows it to host a world-renowned Cherry Blossom Festival each spring. Its other collections hold over 11,000 different varieties of plants from all over the world, representing an invaluable cultural and scientific resource.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Brooklyn Botanic Garden on its 100th anniversary and for its commitment to education, community service, and environmental stewardship.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1428, recognition of the 100th anniversary of the Brooklyn Botanical Garden.

□ 1420

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield time to the sponsor of the bill, our colleague, Representative YVETTE CLARKE, for such time as she may consume.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Ms. NORTON, for giving me this opportunity to share with everyone how proud I am to rise in support of H. Res. 1428, which recognizes and salutes the Brooklyn Botanic Gardens on the occasion of its 100th anniversary as the preeminent horticultural attraction in the borough of Brooklyn and its longstanding commitment to the environmental stewardship and education for the City of New York.

The Brooklyn Botanic Garden opened its doors to the public in 1910. Today, this 52-acre urban oasis features more than 11,000 different kinds of plants from around the world and specialty gardens, including the Japanese Hill and Pond Garden, the Children's Garden, the Native Flora Garden, the Cranford Rose Garden, the Alice Recknagel Ireys Fragrance Garden, and the Steinhardt Conservatory.

The Brooklyn Botanic Garden is an important part of the Brooklyn community, reaching over 150,000 children every year through various programs on site, in schools, and throughout the community. This garden contributes to the environmental and public education in Brooklyn and throughout the city of New York through partnerships with the Brooklyn Academy of Science and the Environment High School. The Brooklyn Botanic Garden hosts an annual Cherry Blossom Festival and has become an integral part of the cultural life and economic development of the city of New York and provides an invaluable service to its residents.

Today, under the leadership of President Scot Medbury and Board Chairman Frederick Bland, the Brooklyn Botanic Garden thrives in a dense urban setting in the heart of New York's 11th Congressional District and welcomes more than 725,000 visitors annually.

The garden serves more than 150,000 youth annually through a wide range of on-site, in-school, and community-based initiatives. It is a leader in building stronger, healthier communities through programs such as GreenBridge, which involves over 60,000 residents annually in neighborhood greening projects. Through its scientific research, plant conservation projects, and award-winning publications, the garden is a vital source of public awareness and understanding of the essential role plants play in our lives.

While the Brooklyn Botanic Garden has had 100 wonderful years of establishment, I am excited to see what the future holds for this great institution. I am happy to see that it is revitalizing its 52 acres by developing more than 4 acres of new and enhanced gardens for the enjoyment and education of the public, improving facilities to orient and serve visitors, and expanding its community horticulture programs.

The new herb garden opened in the spring of 2010 and is the first of several new and re-imagined gardens to come. The Visitor Center, currently under construction, will be an extraordinary demonstration of what can be achieved through environmentally sensitive design and will help the garden better welcome its growing audience. A series of exciting projects will continue to unfold over the next several years in response to the urgent call for beauty and renewal in urban life and for environmental stewardship at all levels of society.

As a Brooklyn native, for years I have seen how this dynamic institution has educated people of all diverse urban neighborhoods about the importance of enhancing the quality of their surroundings through the cultivation and enjoyment of plants. It has done an outstanding job of bringing public awareness to the importance of sustaining our environment and providing access to the tools and ways in which we can conserve and protect it.

I urge anyone who has the chance to visit the garden and witness firsthand the abundance of breathtaking plant life that resides in the middle of Brooklyn. All of us in Brooklyn appreciate the role that the Brooklyn Botanic Garden plays in our lives, and we look forward to continuing the enjoyment of this beautiful institution. The Brooklyn Botanic Garden is truly a national treasure.

This recognition is well deserved, and I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this very important legislation.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Let me thank the gentlelady for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today for two reasons. First, to offer my support for H.R. 1428, the measure that was offered by the gentlelady from Brooklyn, New York (Ms. CLARKE). That is a resolution recognizing the Brooklyn Botanic Garden on its 100th anniversary. That is a good resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise today in support of H. Res. 1475, which was a resolution that I offered some months ago. Unfortunately, I was not on the floor a few moments ago when this matter was taken up, and I regret that I was not here at that very moment. But I wanted to come to the floor now to offer my strong support for H. Res. 1475, which is a resolution congratulating the town of Tarboro, North Carolina, on the occasion of its 250th anniversary. I introduced this resolution in June of this year, with 54 original cosponsors, including the entire North Carolina House delegation. I thank my North Carolina colleagues for their very strong support.

Most people, Mr. Speaker, may not know about Tarboro, North Carolina, or the tremendous impact the town made on the history of our State and Nation.

On November 30, 1760, the North Carolina General Assembly approved the charter for the town, and Tarboro was born, making it the 11th oldest colonial town in our State. President George Washington visited the town during an historic visit through the South in 1791, choosing to overnight in this small town. Settled as a trading post on the Tar River in the mid 18th century, Tarboro thrived as a river port.

Mr. Speaker, Tarboro was also an early political incubator and produced two Congressmen who both represented the Second Congressional District of North Carolina in this House.

Congressman George H. White was elected to Congress in 1897 and served until 1901. He was the last Reconstruction-era African American from the South to serve in Congress until the 1970s. Rising racial tension made it impossible for George H. White to win a third term in Congress. His final speech before his congressional colleagues right here on this House floor has inspired Americans for over 100 years. He said, and I quote: ''This, Mr. Chairman, is perhaps the Negroes' temporary farewell to the American Congress, but let me say, Phoenix-like, he will rise up someday and come again.'' That statement was made right in this Chamber.

Congressman L.H. Fountain served in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1953 until 1983. He is remembered for being a stalwart advocate for small towns such as Tarboro during his service in the House.

Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staffs, Retired General Hugh Shelton of the United States Army, who served in that position under President Bill Clinton, was born in Tarboro and reared in the neighboring town of Speed, where he continues to live today.

Today, Mr. Speaker, Tarboro is home to some 11,000 residents. They are my constituents. Its ideal location on the banks of the Tar River historically served as a thriving river port and trading post, and today offers extensive fishing, boating, and recreation for people of all ages.

Tarboro's downtown is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, where many original structures are still in use today, including restaurants and theaters and quaint shops, and even the home of Congressman George H. White and the home of Congressman L.H. Fountain. Its town commons joins Boston, Massachusetts, as the only original remaining town common on the East Coast. The town continues to grow and evolve while maintaining its connection to history and originality.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent this town. It is indeed an historic day for the residents of Tarboro, and I sincerely congratulate the town on the occasion of its 250th anniversary. I am pleased that the House is considering this resolution. I urge my colleagues to vote ''aye'' when it is presented for a vote.

Again, I would like to thank the gentlelady and I also would like to thank my friend Mr. BILBRAY from California for their courtesy.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to lend my support for H. Res. 1428, which seeks to recognize Brooklyn Botanic Garden on its 100th anniversary, as the preeminent horticultural attraction in the borough of Brooklyn, and its longstanding commitment to environmental stewardship and education for the City of New York.

Built from a site that functioned as an ash dump in the 1800s, the Brooklyn Botanic Gardens have become a preeminent example of the finest urban gardening, and a model for environmental stewardship.

The Brooklyn Botanic Gardens prides itself on a strong commitment to education, community outreach, and scientific research. Programs like Project Green Reach and the Garden Apprentice Program provide a science-focused educational program for over 2,500 K–12 participants annually from Brooklyn's public Title I schools. The program provides youth with unique, hands-on opportunities for personal growth and career development, through learning about science, ecology, and the environment in their classrooms, in their neighborhoods, and right at the Garden.

Its 52 acres in the heart of Brooklyn, New York serves as a premier environmental education site for New York City's youth, a getaway for the 730,000 annual visitors, and an exquisite recreational spot for New Yorkers.

I commend the Brooklyn Botanic Gardens for its numerous achievements over the last 100 years, and I wish them luck over the next century as it continues to serve the community.

□ 1430

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

Ms. NORTON. 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. 1428.

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, 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.

SERGEANT ROBERT BARRETT POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5758) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2 Government Center in Fall River, Massachusetts, as the ''Sergeant Robert Barrett Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5758

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

SECTION 1. SERGEANT ROBERT BARRETT POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2 Government Center in Fall River, Massachusetts, shall be known and designated as the ''Sergeant Robert Barrett 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 ''Sergeant Robert Barrett Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) 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 may 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. I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5758. This measure designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2 Government Center in Fall River, Massachusetts, as the Sergeant Robert Barrett Post Office Building.

H.R. 5758 was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative BARNEY FRANK, on July 15, 2010. It was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which ordered it reported favorably by unanimous consent on July 28, 2010, and enjoys the support of the entire Massachusetts delegation to the House.

Sergeant Robert Barrett was a member of the 1st Battalion, 101st Field Artillery Regiment of Fall River. He had served as a commanding officer in his high school's junior ROTC and was head of its honor guard.

After graduating, he enlisted in the Army National Guard. He served in the honor guard for a time, including at the inauguration of President Obama, as a member of the Massachusetts National Honor Guard's volunteer regiment.

Sergeant Barrett was stationed as a part of a 15-member embedded training team training an Afghan battalion. While on patrol south of Kabul International Airport, Sergeant Barrett was killed by a suicide bomber in an attack that also injured eight others in his battalion. He was 20 years old.

Sergeant Barrett is survived by has parents, Paul and Carlene Barrett; his older sister Rebecca; and his 2-year-old daughter Sophie Alexandra.

Mr. Speaker, let us now take time to honor the service of Sergeant Barrett through the passage of H.R. 5758, which will designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2 Government Center in Fall River, Massachusetts, in his name. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the passage of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5758 and strongly request support for it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of the legislation, my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman. I should note that I am speaking on behalf of myself and my colleague with whom I share the honor of representing the city of Fall River, Mr. MCGOVERN, who is at a doctor's appointment now. But he fully joins in these sentiments.

First, I want to thank the committee. As the gentlewoman noted, this bill was introduced at the request of the city government of Fall River in July of this year, so this is very prompt action by the committee, and I appreciate both sides moving so quickly.

As the gentlewoman reported, Sergeant Barrett was a 20-year-old patriotic American with a 2-year-old daughter and a loving family. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, because I attended this funeral, as I have tried to attend the funeral of every one of our service people killed in one of our wars, that he was widely respected, admired and in many cases loved by the people of the city of Fall River. There was great sadness in the city when the news came of his death in the service of his country and when the funeral was held. His high school classmates were deeply grieved by the loss of someone they greatly admired.

I was glad to respond when the city very appropriately asked that we name this post office in his honor. It is a central facility. As the address says, it is the Government Center. It is virtually adjacent to the city hall in Fall River. It is at the center of the town, right at the end of one our great bridges, the Braga Bridge, which spans the Taunton River. Anybody who drives from anywhere outside of Massachusetts to Cape Cod will drive along that road and will get to see this post office, and I hope will be reminded of the extraordinary sacrifice that the young father, son and brother made on behalf of this country.

So I want to again express my appreciation to the committee and send again my condolences to Sergeant Barrett's family and friends.

It is a sobering moment, Mr. Speaker. I will say this. I have tried, as I know many Members do, to attend, if it is at all possible, the funeral of those killed in our service. It is sometimes necessary for a Nation to go to war, there is no question about it. There is in the world evil that must be confronted. In Afghanistan, it was an evil that led to the murder of thousands of innocent Americans and hundreds of innocent Africans a few years before at the hands of a murderous thug named Osama bin Laden. But being reminded of the inevitable consequences of going to war, the death of among our best young people and the pain it inflicts on those who survive them, that is a very important part of the education we need to get.

So I will continue. I hope there won't be many more instances, but I will continue whenever I can, if there is a death of someone in the district I represent, to attend, to be reminded that war is both necessary and terrible. We will do it when we have to, but we should always be aware of those consequences.

Again, to those who survive Sergeant Barrett, there is nothing we can do to replace the enormous loss you have suffered with the death of this wonderful young man, but I hope you will know that your country at least understands the depth of that loss and appreciates it.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure, and 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. 5758.

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, 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.

□ 1440

COMMENDING BOB SHEPPARD

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1529) commending Bob Sheppard for his long and respected career as the public-address announcer for the New York Yankees and the New York Giants.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1529

Whereas Bob Sheppard served as the public-address announcer for the New York Yankees from opening day in 1951 through 2007;

Whereas Bob Sheppard served as the public-address announcer for the New York Giants from 1956 through 2005;

Whereas Bob Sheppard announced at 62 World Series games, 2 All-Star Games, and introduced more than 72 Hall of Famers throughout his career, with his often-heard, booming voice eventually earning him the nickname ''The Voice of God'';

Whereas Bob Sheppard utilized his great oratory skills not only in the sports arena, but as the chairman of the speech department at John Adams High School in Queens, New York, and as an adjunct professor of speech at St. John's University;

Whereas Bob Sheppard was honored for his 50 memorable years of service as the announcer at Yankee Stadium with ''Bob Sheppard Day'', celebrated on May 7, 2000, and with a permanent plaque in Monument Park behind Yankee Stadium in the Bronx;

Whereas Bob Sheppard's clear, distinctive voice has set the standard of sports announcing, and has become ingrained in the fans and players as a widely recognized and revered Yankees tradition;

Whereas Bob Sheppard's voice will continue to live on as the recorded introduction of Yankees' shortstop Derek Jeter;

Whereas Bob Sheppard lived for 70 years in Baldwin, New York, and spent 4 years playing in semi-professional football leagues on Long Island, including the Valley Stream Red Raiders and the Hempstead Monitors; and

Whereas Bob Sheppard died on July 11, 2010, at his home in Baldwin, New York, at age 99: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the legacy of Bob Sheppard and his distinctive announcements as a revered tradition not only to the New York Yankees and the New York Giants, but also to the games of baseball and football and the field of sports announcing; and

(2) commends Bob Sheppard for his 52 years of service as a public-address announcer and his long tenure as a speech professor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) 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 may 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 now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am proud to present H. Res. 1529 for consideration. This legislation commends Bob Sheppard for his long and respected career as the public-address announcer for the New York Yankees and the New York Giants. Introduced by my friend and colleague, Representative CAROLYN MCCARTHY of New York, on July 15, 2010, H. Res. 1529 was favorably reported out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee on September 23, 2010. In addition, this legislation enjoys the support of over 50 Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, born on October 20, 1910, in Queens, New York, Bob Sheppard served as the public-address announcer for the New York Yankees from opening day in 1951 through 2007 and was also the PA announcer for the New York Giants from 1956 through 2005. During this period, Mr. Sheppard announced 4,500 Yankees baseball games, including 22 pennant-winning seasons and 13 World Series championships. Additionally, during his half century covering the New York Giants, Mr. Sheppard announced nine conference championships and three NFL championships.

Mr. Sheppard prided himself on being clear, concise, and correct; and his distinctive style earned him the nickname ''the voice of God,'' which was first coined by Yankee Hall-of-Famer Reggie Jackson. Mr. Sheppard's distinctive style has set the standard of sports announcing, and as New York Times writer Richard Goldstein notes, ''In an era of blaring stadium music, of public-address announcers styling themselves as entertainers and cheerleaders, Mr. Sheppard, a man with a passion for poetry and Shakespeare, shunned hyperbole.''

Notably, Mr. Sheppard did not limit his oratory skills to the baseball diamond and the football field. In fact, he also served as chairman of the speech department at the John Adams High School in Queens and as an adjunct professor of speech at St. John's University in the Bronx. For his tireless dedication to his craft, Mr. Sheppard was elected to the St. John's University Sports Hall of Fame, the Long Island Sports Hall of Fame, and the New York Sports Hall of Fame. He also received honorary doctorates from St. John's University and Fordham University and received the St. John's Medal of Honor, the highest award that the university can confer on a graduate, in 2007.

On May 7, 2000, Mr. Sheppard's legacy was enshrined in Yankee Stadium's Monument Park with a plaque that reads: ''Bob Sheppard, the voice of Yankee Stadium. For half a century he has welcomed generations of fans with his trademark greeting, 'Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to Yankee Stadium.' His clear, concise, and correct vocal style has announced the names of hundreds of players—both unfamiliar and legendary—with equal divine reference, making him as synonymous with Yankee Stadium as its copper facade and Monument Park.'' Sadly, on July 11, 2010, Mr. Sheppard passed away at the age of 99 in his home in Baldwin, New York.

Mr. Speaker, let us further honor the life and legacy of Mr. Sheppard through the passage of H. Res. 1529, which recognizes his distinctive style of announcing, influence on the entire field of sports announcing, and also commends him on his 52 years of service as a public-address announcer and speech professor. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 1529.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1529, commending Bob Sheppard in his long and respected career.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the honor of yielding to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) so that she has plenty of time to address this item.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank my colleague. I want to thank Ms. NORTON and again my colleague and I want to thank everybody on the committee.

I do rise today to ask my colleagues to support H. Res. 1529, commending Bob Sheppard for his long and respected career as the public-address announcer for the New York Yankees and the New York Giants. As someone who has spent my whole life in New York, his voice was very, very distinctive not only to New Yorkers but to many, many of my colleagues across the country.

On July 11, 2010, Mr. Sheppard passed away at the age of 99 in his home in Baldwin, which is part of my district, the Fourth Congressional District in New York. Mr. Sheppard was a constant in sports announcing for over 50 years. His distinctive voice was recognized by both players and fans. Each game began with his trademark cadence—as we in New York kind of talk sometimes funny—''Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to Yankee Stadium.''

He performed the role as a public-address announcer at Yankee Stadium from opening day in 1951 through the year 2007, and as the public address announcer for the New York Giants from 1956 through the year 2005. At the age of 62, he announced the World Series games, two All-Star games, and has introduced more than 72 Hall-of-Famers throughout his career. He will always be remembered for his clear, concise, and correct announcements and pronunciations, taking pride in the name of every player he introduced.

Bob Sheppard utilized his great oratory skills not only in the sports arena but, as was mentioned, as the chairman of the speech department at John Adams High School in Queens and as professor of speech at St. John's University. Bob Sheppard was honored for his 50 memorable years of service as the announcer at Yankee Stadium with Bob Sheppard Day, celebrated on May 7, 2000, and with a permanent plaque in Monument Park behind Yankee Stadium in the Bronx. His voice will always continue to live on as the recorded introduction of Yankees' shortstop Derek Jeter.

My resolution serves to recognize the legacy of Bob Sheppard and his distinctive announcing style as a revered tradition not only to the New York Yankees and to the New York Giants, but also, as I said earlier, to the games of baseball and football and the field of

sports announcing. I do want to thank my 52 colleagues, cosponsors of the resolution, including many Members who are fans of other teams. I have to say, though, the majority of us were over a certain age that certainly remembered Bob. Additionally, the resolution commends Mr. Sheppard for his 52 years of service in the field of sports announcing and his dedication to spreading his knowledge and skill through teaching speech at both the high school and the college levels.

Today, we do salute Bob Sheppard. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure, and 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. 1529.

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.

□ 1450

JESSE J. MCCRARY, JR. POST OFFICE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5655) to designate the Little River Branch facility of the United States Postal Service located at 140 NE 84th Street in Miami, Florida, as the ''Jesse J. McCrary, Jr. Post Office.''

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5655

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

SECTION 1. JESSE J. MCCRARY, JR. POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Little River Branch facility of the United States Postal Service located at 140 NE 84th Street in Miami, Florida, shall be known and designated as the ''Jesse J. McCrary, Jr. Post Office''.

(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 ''Jesse J. McCrary, Jr. Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) 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 may 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. I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I present H.R. 5655 for consideration. This measure designates the Little River Branch facility of the United States Postal Service, located at 140 Northeast 84th Street, in Miami, Florida, as the Jesse J. McCrary, Jr. Post Office.

H.R. 5655 was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. KENDRICK MEEK, on June 30, 2010. It was referred to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which ordered it reported favorably by unanimous consent on July 28, 2010. It enjoys the support of the entire Florida delegation to the House.

Jesse J. McCrary, Jr. was the first African American member of the Florida cabinet since the end of Reconstruction, being appointed to that post in 1978. He is also remembered for his work as a civil rights activist, leading lunch counter sit-ins in Tallahassee during his days studying at Florida A&M. Mr. McCrary also had an esteemed legal career, serving as Florida's first African American assistant attorney general in 1967. He was renowned for his knowledge of constitutional law and for his skill at debate and argument.

In 2003, 2 years after Mr. McCrary suffered a disabling stroke, the Florida House passed a resolution honoring him as a ''living legend'' and as a ''preeminent authority on constitutional law who won 10 landmark cases presented before the Florida Supreme Court.'' His colleagues remember him as a dedicated public servant and as a fierce advocate for underserved communities. Sadly, Mr. McCrary died of lung cancer on October 29, 2007.

Mr. Speaker, let us now take time to honor the memory of this great public servant, Jesse J. McCrary, Jr., through the passage of H.R. 5655, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5655, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Florida, Representative KENDRICK MEEK.

(Mr. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. Speaker, Jesse McCrary was an outstanding American, and I believe the chair did a very fine job in outlining his track record of what he was able to accomplish on behalf of not only this country, but of the State of Florida. He was a trailblazer in the first of many areas, a barrister of all barristers in the State of Florida, his memory being one of creating organizations for those who walked the trail that he actually made.

He started at the Wilkie Ferguson Bar Association, which is in south Florida. It is a place for young African American lawyers who join the legal field in the south Florida area. It is a place where they can go and share notes and can talk about experiences. They also receive professional advice from those who came before them.

Jesse McCrary was an American who believed in serving. Even though he was a legal eagle, he took time to talk to people in the public defender's office. He took time to talk to young lawyers in the State attorney's office. He took time to talk to 501(c)(3) lawyers and to share with them the importance of the legal community.

So I am very honored that we are moving this legislation forward to recognize his memory and enshrine it in south Florida, and I know the south Florida community will be forever grateful of the House of Representatives' endorsement of his memory and of his purpose.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, may I again urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

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. 5655.

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.

REDUCING WAITING PERIOD FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SPECIAL ELECTIONS

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5702) to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to reduce the waiting period for holding special elections to fill vacancies in the membership of the Council of the District of Columbia, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5702

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

SECTION 1. TIMING OF SPECIAL ELECTIONS FOR LOCAL OFFICE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) COUNCIL.—

(1) CHAIRMAN.—Section 401(b)(3) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (sec. 1–204.01(b)(3), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking ''one hundred and fourteen days'' and inserting ''seventy days''.

(2) MEMBERS ELECTED FROM WARDS.—Section 401(d)(1) of such Act (sec. 1–204.01(d)(1), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking

''one hundred and fourteen days'' and inserting ''seventy days''.

(3) MEMBERS ELECTED AT LARGE.—Section 401(d)(2) of such Act (sec. 1–204.01(d)(2), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking ''one hundred and fourteen days'' and inserting ''seventy days''.

(b) MAYOR.—Section 421(c)(2) of such Act (sec. 1—204.21(c)(2), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking ''one hundred and fourteen days'' and inserting ''seventy days''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to vacancies occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) 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 may 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. I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5702, which reduces the waiting period for special elections to fill certain vacancies in elected positions in the District of Columbia government from 114 to 70 days. I introduced this measure on July 1, 2010, and the Oversight and Government Reform Committee ordered the bill reported on September 23.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that, I have to apologize, comes before the House. I hope that in the next session of Congress such trivial matters—''trivial'' as far as Congress is concerned but of great moment to the District of Columbia—no longer have to come before you. They come before you because matters involving the structure of the District of Columbia are contained in the charter. Although the bill before you has been passed by the city council, charter bills have to be passed by Congress.

I don't think anybody cares how many days it takes to fill elected positions once a position becomes vacant in a particular city, in this case, the District of Columbia. Of course, the residents of the District of Columbia care mightily. We had two council members who were elected to other positions, and the ward council members' seats were vacant for 114 days. We get to the 70 days because that's what the council wants. I don't think anyone wants to have vacancies go on for very long in a democracy, because that means that these wards would be unrepresented in the D.C. council.

□ 1500

On the other hand, it takes time for people to gear up to run for new seats. So the council, in its wisdom, decided to reduce the time in half, and I don't think anyone in Congress would want to second-guess what a local jurisdiction believes on such a locally based issue. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5702.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the gentlelady from the Federal district's proposal. I think that not only does this fall within the category of article I, section 8, but I think that it also falls into a category that we would be more familiar with, especially those of us in California, where you have over 400 cities that have these type of regulations regulated by the State legislature, not by the city councils, basically limiting how often and when you can move.

I think it's quite appropriate that we review this and have the final say on this, but I think it is appropriate that we modify it as proposed by the gentlelady from the Federal district and make sure we address this thing appropriately. Just as a State legislature would do that for any other city, I think it's appropriate that this body at this time make this modification.

With that, I will again ask for support for the proposal.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and I certainly appreciate his support of the bill. I do want him to know that the Home Rule Act does delegate decisions precisely like this to the D.C. Government. I believe that the State government analogy is inapposite here. I don't think any Member of Congress believes that he or she is in a position to revise in any way what the local government would do in this regard, and I do believe that this kind of matter does clutter the committee calendar. It clutters the calendar of the House of Representatives at a time when we have very serious issues. I should think we would be looking for matters that have no concern for every single Member of this House except me.

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. 5702, 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 amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to reduce the waiting period for holding special elections to fill vacancies in local offices in the District of Columbia.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KINGMAN AND HERITAGE ISLANDS ACT OF 2010

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6278) to amend the National Children's Island Act of 1995 to expand allowable uses for Kingman and Heritage Islands by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6278

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 ''Kingman and Heritage Islands Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL CHILDREN'S ISLAND ACT OF 1995.

(a) EXPANSION OF ALLOWABLE USES FOR KINGMAN AND HERITAGE ISLAND.—The National Children's Island Act of 1995 (sec. 10–1401 et seq., D.C. Official Code) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 7. COMPREHENSIVE AND ANACOSTIA WATERFRONT FRAMEWORK PLANS.

''(a) COMPLIANCE WITH PLANS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, it is not a violation of the terms and conditions of this Act for the District of Columbia to use the lands conveyed and the easements granted under this Act for recreational, environmental, or educational purposes in accordance with the Anacostia Waterfront Framework Plan and the Comprehensive Plan.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the following definitions apply:

''(1) ANACOSTIA WATERFRONT FRAMEWORK PLAN.—The term 'Anacostia Waterfront Framework Plan' means the November 2003 Anacostia Waterfront Framework Plan to redevelop and revitalize the Anacostia waterfront in the District of Columbia, as may be amended from time to time, developed pursuant to a memorandum of understanding dated March 22, 2000, between the General Services Administration, Government of the District of Columbia, Office of Management and Budget, Naval District Washington, Military District Washington, Marine Barracks Washington, Department of Labor, Department of Transportation, National Park Service, Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Protection Agency, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, National Capital Planning Commission, National Arboretum, and Small Business Administration.

''(2) COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.—The term 'Comprehensive Plan' means the Comprehensive Plan of the District of Columbia approved by the Council of the District of Columbia on December 28, 2006, as such plan may be amended or superseded from time to time.''.

(b) MODIFICATION OF REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—Paragraph (1) of section 3(d) of the National Children's Island Act of 1995 (sec. 10–1402(d)(1), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking ''The transfer under subsection (a)'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''Title in the property transferred under subsection (a) and the easements granted under subsection (b) shall revert to the United States upon the expiration of the 60-day period which begins on the date on which the Secretary provides written notice to the District that the Secretary has determined that the District is using any portion of the property for a use other than recreational, environmental, or educational purposes in accordance with National Children's Island, the Anacostia Waterfront Framework Plan, or the Comprehensive Plan. Such notice shall be made in accordance with chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (relating to administrative procedures).'' .

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) 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 may 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 and rise to support H.R. 6278, the Kingman and Heritage Islands Act of 2010. This bill would permit the District of Columbia to use the Kingman and Heritage Islands for recreational, environmental, and educational purposes. I introduced this bill on September 29, 2010.

The bulk of the language in the bill was considered by the Oversight Committee, the full House, and the Senate in another measure, H.R. 2092. However, because of a clerical error in the Senate, minor changes were not included in the bill when it was considered by the Senate. I have introduced H.R. 6278 to ensure the correct language is passed by both Houses. This bill includes the House-passed language in H.R. 2092, and captures the minor changes agreed upon in a bipartisan fashion by the Senate Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee.

The amendment agreed to by the Senate Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee makes it clear that the islands may revert back to the Federal Government in the future if they are not used for the purposes specified in the bill.

I should note that the House Oversight Committee did file a report on H.R. 2092, and that report is an important part of the legislative history of the bill we are considering now.

Mr. Speaker, we are very pleased that this bill has come in time before the House. The original act transferred title of this land on the Anacostia bill, but a prior Congress authorized it for another purpose, and, therefore, since we in the District of Columbia want to use this for environmental, recreational, and educational purposes, it was necessary to come again with a bill.

This is a bill that involves 40 acres of tidal marsh in Kingman Lake, currently being restored by the Army Corps, the District, and local environmental teaching groups. These islands are beautiful little places in the midst of the concrete of a big city. They, for example, have a memorial tree grove dedicated to the three District of Columbia schoolchildren who were on a trip sponsored by the National Geographic on a plane that went down in the September 11 attack on our country. This quaint set of islands has guided trails and interpretive stations.

As far as my own work in the Congress is concerned, Mr. Speaker, the dedication of these islands to environmental, teaching, and recreation purposes complements my own work on the Anacostia River. I am the primary sponsor of the Anacostia River initiative. There's already a 10-year plan of the jurisdictions in this region to restore the Anacostia River so that it is no longer one of the most polluted rivers in America.

To that end, I regard this bill as another manifestation of our determination to return the river to its original state and to allow the use of these small islands for the recreational and environmental purposes of the citizens of the District of Columbia and to all of those who visit our city and would like some relief from the big-city life and will find it right in the midst of what appears to be nothing other than a big-city landscape and will be relieved if they are privileged to visit these islands.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise today in support of H.R. 6278, the Kingman and Heritage Islands Act, and would just ask for support for it.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure, and 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. 6278.

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.

□ 1510

D.C. COURTS AND PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICE ACT OF 2010

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5367) to amend title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, to revise certain administrative authorities of the District of Columbia courts, and to authorize the District of Columbia Public Defender Service to provide professional liability insurance for officers and employees of the Service for claims relating to services furnished within the scope of employment with the Service, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5367

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 ''D.C. Courts and Public Defender Service Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORITIES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS.

(a) PERMITTING JUDICIAL CONFERENCE ON BIENNIAL BASIS; ATTENDANCE OF MAGISTRATE JUDGES.—Section 11–744, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''annually'' and inserting ''biennially or annually'';

(2) in the first sentence, by striking ''active judges'' and inserting ''active judges and magistrate judges'';

(3) in the third sentence, by striking ''Every judge'' and inserting ''Every judge and magistrate judge''; and

(4) in the third sentence, by striking ''Courts of Appeals'' and inserting ''Court of Appeals''.

(b) EMERGENCY AUTHORITY TO TOLL OR DELAY JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS.—

(1) PROCEEDINGS IN SUPERIOR COURT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of Chapter 9 of title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 11–947. Emergency authority to toll or delay proceedings.

''(a) TOLLING OR DELAYING PROCEEDINGS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event of a natural disaster or other emergency situation requiring the closure of Superior Court or a natural disaster or other emergency situation rendering it impracticable for the United States or District of Columbia Government or a class of litigants to comply with deadlines imposed by any Federal or District of Columbia law or rule that applies in the Superior Court, the chief judge of the Superior Court may exercise emergency authority in accordance with this section.

''(2) SCOPE OF AUTHORITY.—(A) The chief judge may enter such order or orders as may be appropriate to delay, toll, or otherwise grant relief from the time deadlines imposed by otherwise applicable laws or rules for such period as may be appropriate for any class of cases pending or thereafter filed in the Superior Court.

''(B) The authority conferred by this section extends to all laws and rules affecting criminal and juvenile proceedings (including, pre-arrest, post-arrest, pretrial, trial, and post-trial procedures) and civil, family, domestic violence, probate and tax proceedings.

''(3) UNAVAILABILITY OF CHIEF JUDGE.—If the chief judge of the Superior Court is absent or disabled, the authority conferred by this section may be exercised by the judge designated under section 11–907(a) or by the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration.

''(4) HABEAS CORPUS UNAFFECTED.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize suspension of the writ of habeas corpus.

''(5) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) the term 'natural disaster' means any natural catastrophe (including any hurricane, tornado, storm, high water, wind-driven water, tidal wave, tsunami, earthquake, volcanic eruption, landslide, mudslide, snowstorm, or drought), or, regardless of cause, any fire, flood, or explosion; and

''(B) the term 'other emergency situation' includes but is not limited to any occasion or instance of terrorism, enemy attack, sabotage, other hostile action, disease, or any manmade cause which results in an imminent threat, severe damage, or injury to life or property, or loss thereof, or results in the destruction of or severe damage to a court house, or impairs the ability to access a courthouse, or the ability to staff the courts.

''(b) CRIMINAL CASES.—In exercising the authority under this section for criminal cases, the chief judge shall consider the ability of the United States or District of Columbia Government to investigate, litigate,

and process defendants during and after the emergency situation, as well as the ability of criminal defendants as a class to prepare their defenses.

''(c) ISSUANCE OF ORDERS.—The United States Attorney for the District of Columbia or the Attorney General for the District of Columbia or the designee of either may request issuance of an order under this section, or the chief judge may act on his or her own motion.

''(d) DURATION OF ORDERS.—An order entered under this section may not toll or extend a time deadline for a period of more than 14 days, except that if the chief judge determines that an emergency situation requires additional extensions of the period during which deadlines are tolled or extended, the chief judge may, with the consent of the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration, enter additional orders under this section in order to further toll or extend such time deadline.

''(e) NOTICE.—Upon issuing an order under this section, the chief judge—

''(1) shall make all reasonable efforts to publicize the order, including, when possible, announcing the order on the District of Columbia Courts web site; and

''(2) shall send notice of the order, including the reasons for the issuance of the order, to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

''(f) REQUIRED REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the expiration of the last extension or tolling of a time period made by the order or orders relating to an emergency situation, the chief judge shall submit a brief report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration describing the orders, including—

''(1) the reasons for issuing the orders;

''(2) the duration of the orders;

''(3) the effects of the orders on litigants; and

''(4) the costs to the court resulting from the orders.

''(g) EXCEPTIONS.—The notice under subsection (e)(2) and the report under subsection (f) are not required in the case of an order that tolls or extends a time deadline for a period of less than 14 days.''.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of chapter 9 of title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to subchapter III the following:

''11–947. Emergency authority to toll or delay proceedings.''.

(2) PROCEEDINGS IN COURT OF APPEALS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of Chapter 7 of title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 11–745. Emergency authority to toll or delay proceedings.

''(a) TOLLING OR DELAYING PROCEEDINGS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event of a natural disaster or other emergency situation requiring the closure of the Court of Appeals or a natural disaster or other emergency situation rendering it impracticable for the United States or District of Columbia Government or a class of litigants to comply with deadlines imposed by any Federal or District of Columbia law or rule that applies in the Court of Appeals, the chief judge of the Court of Appeals may exercise emergency authority in accordance with this section.

''(2) SCOPE OF AUTHORITY.—The chief judge may enter such order or orders as may be appropriate to delay, toll, or otherwise grant relief from the time deadlines imposed by otherwise applicable laws or rules for such period as may be appropriate for any class of cases pending or thereafter filed in the Court of Appeals.

''(3) UNAVAILABILITY OF CHIEF JUDGE.—If the chief judge of the Court of Appeals is absent or disabled, the authority conferred by this section may be exercised by the judge designated under section 11–706(a) or by the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration.

''(4) HABEAS CORPUS UNAFFECTED.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize suspension of the writ of habeas corpus.

''(5) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) the term 'natural disaster' means any natural catastrophe (including any hurricane, tornado, storm, high water, wind-driven water, tidal wave, tsunami, earthquake, volcanic eruption, landslide, mudslide, snowstorm, or drought), or, regardless of cause, any fire, flood, or explosion; and

''(B) the term 'other emergency situation' includes but is not limited to any occasion or instance of terrorism, enemy attack, sabotage, other hostile action, disease, or any manmade cause which results in an imminent threat, severe damage, or injury to life or property, or loss thereof, or results in the destruction of or severe damage to a court house, or impairs the ability to access a courthouse, or the ability to staff the courts.

''(b) ISSUANCE OF ORDERS.—The United States Attorney for the District of Columbia or the Attorney General for the District of Columbia or the designee of either may request issuance of an order under this section, or the chief judge may act on his or her own motion.

''(c) DURATION OF ORDERS.—An order entered under this section may not toll or extend a time deadline for a period of more than 14 days, except that if the chief judge determines that an emergency situation requires additional extensions of the period during which deadlines are tolled or extended, the chief judge may, with the consent of the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration, enter additional orders under this section in order to further toll or extend such time deadline.

''(d) NOTICE.—Upon issuing an order under this section, the chief judge—

''(1) shall make all reasonable efforts to publicize the order, including, when possible, announcing the order on the District of Columbia Courts web site; and

''(2) shall send notice of the order, including the reasons for the issuance of the order, to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

''(e) REQUIRED REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the expiration of the last extension or tolling of a time period made by the order or orders relating to an emergency situation, the chief judge shall submit a brief report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration describing the orders, including—

''(1) the reasons for issuing the orders;

''(2) the duration of the orders;

''(3) the effects of the orders on litigants; and

''(4) the costs to the court resulting from the orders.

''(f) EXCEPTIONS.—The notice under subsection (d)(2) and the report under subsection (e) are not required in the case of an order that tolls or extends a time deadline for a period of less than 14 days.''.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of chapter 7 of title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to subchapter III the following:

''11–745. Emergency authority to toll or delay proceedings.''.

(c) PERMITTING AGREEMENTS TO PROVIDE SERVICES ON A REIMBURSABLE BASIS TO OTHER DISTRICT GOVERNMENT OFFICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 11–1742, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) To prevent duplication and to promote efficiency and economy, the Executive Officer may enter into agreements to provide the Mayor of the District of Columbia with equipment, supplies, and services and credit reimbursements received from the Mayor for such equipment, supplies, and services to the appropriation of the District of Columbia Courts against which they were charged.'' ''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2010 and each succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 3. LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICE.

Section 307 of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 (sec. 2–1607, D.C. Official Code) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) The Service shall, to the extent the Director considers appropriate, provide representation for and hold harmless, or provide liability insurance for, any person who is an employee, member of the Board of Trustees, or officer of the Service for money damages arising out of any claim, proceeding, or case at law relating to the furnishing of representational services or management services or related services under this Act while acting within the scope of that person's office or employment, including but not limited to such claims, proceedings, or cases at law involving employment actions, injury, loss of liberty, property damage, loss of property, or personal injury, or death arising from malpractice or negligence of any such officer or employee.''.

SEC. 4. REDUCTION IN TERM OF SERVICE OF JUDGES ON FAMILY COURT OF THE SUPERIOR COURT.

(a) REDUCTION IN TERM OF SERVICE.—Section 11–908A(c)(1), District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by striking ''5 years'' and inserting ''3 years''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to any individual serving as a judge on the Family Court of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) 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 may 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 now yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 5367, the District of Columbia Courts and Public

Defender Service Act of 2010. I introduced this bill on May 24, 2010, and the Oversight and Government Reform Committee ordered the bill reported on September 23. H.R. 5367 expands the administrative authorities of the District of Columbia Court system and increases the efficiency of the system.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is at the special request of the Article I Courts of the District of Columbia where changes need the consent of Congress in order to be made. These are small but important changes to the court. It wishes the desire to hold its conferences other than on an annual basis, particularly given the fact that the court has access to Web sites and other ways to communicate to judges. Therefore, this bill simply leaves this matter to the discretion of the judiciary.

The bill also has an important section, allowing the court to toll judicial proceedings in the event of an emergency. We know that the District of Columbia is in the cross-hairs of al Qaeda. We also know that we are not immune to natural disasters. While the court has the authority to conduct emergency sessions outside of the District of Columbia, it is imperative that it be able to delay proceedings so that it can reconfigure what to do in the event of an emergency. Similar bills have been introduced here in the Congress regarding the Federal court system, and several States have enacted similar legislation. I do not need to tell Members of this House what it would mean to a court of jurisdiction to be faced with a calendar and then an emergency as to what to do with, for example, commercial transactions or criminal matters. Clearly the court needs discretion to delay, according to the circumstances, such justice as it sees fit.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5367.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 5367, the D.C. Courts and Public Defender Service Act of 2010, and I would ask for support for the bill.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, may I also indicate that this bill gives the public defender of the District of Columbia the right to purchase liability insurance, a right that the Federal public defenders have throughout the United States. The reason the bill is necessary in order to give them this right is that the public defender of the District of Columbia exists in a twilight zone, as it were. It handles local matters, but it is a Federal agency. So we need the imprimatur of this Congress.

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. 5367, 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 amend title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, to revise certain administrative authorities of the District of Columbia courts, to authorize the District of Columbia Public Defender Service to provide professional liability insurance for officers and employees of the Service for claims relating to services furnished within the scope of employment with the Service, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVY CORPSMAN JEFFREY L. WIENER POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3567) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Broadway in Lynbrook, New York, as the ''Navy Corpsman Jeffrey L. Wiener Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3567

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

SECTION 1. NAVY CORPSMAN JEFFREY L. WIENER POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Broadway in Lynbrook, New York, shall be known and designated as the ''Navy Corpsman Jeffrey L. Wiener 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 ''Navy Corpsman Jeffrey L. Wiener Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) 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 may 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 now yield myself such time as I may consume.

On behalf of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I present S. 3567 for consideration. This measure designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Broadway in Lynbrook, New York, as the Navy Corpsman Jeffrey L. Wiener Post Office Building.

S. 3567 was introduced by the gentleman from New York, Senator CHARLES SCHUMER, on July 12, 2010. The measure passed the Senate by unanimous consent on July 30, 2010. After being received by the House, the measure was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform which ordered it reported favorably by unanimous consent on September 23, 2010. The measure enjoys the support of both Senators from New York.

Mr. Speaker, Hospital Corpsman Jeffrey L. Wiener enlisted with the U.S. Navy on May 1, 2003, with the goal of serving as a medic with a Marine infantry company. After undergoing the Navy's basic training, he attended the Marine Corps' Field Medical School at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, where he was trained as a fighting infantryman also tasked with delivering medical attention to infantry wounded in combat.

He arrived in Iraq in late February 2005 and volunteered for duty on the front lines with a Marine assault platoon. Sadly, Corpsman Wiener was killed on May 7, 2005, in an ambush and bombing in Haditha, Iraq. Corpsman Wiener is survived by his wife, Maria, and two daughters, Mikayla Lynn and Theodora Rose.

Corpsman Wiener deserves this tribute not only for his service as a dedicated infantry medic but also for his service as a member and ex-captain of Tally-Ho Engine 3 of the Lynbrook Fire Department. He also served as a medic for the Lynbrook Fire Department as well as the Nassau County Police Department before he enlisted in the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, let us now pay tribute to the life and service of this brave man, Corpsman Jeffrey L. Wiener, through the passage of S. 3567, to designate the Lynbrook, New York, post office building in his honor.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 3567.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1520

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly urge support for Senate bill 3567, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as she may consume to our colleague from New York State, Representative CAROLYN MCCARTHY.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from New York, Senator SCHUMER, for sponsoring this legislation in the Senate. I also want to thank Chairman TOWNS and Ranking Member ISSA for bringing this bill to the floor with my colleagues, Representative NORTON and Representative BILBRAY.

I rise today to ask for support to rename the post office located in my district at 100 Broadway in Lynbrook, New York, in honor of Navy Corpsman Jeffrey L. Wiener.

Mr. Speaker, I know a lot of times we are here renaming post offices. Post offices, whether in an urban setting, whether in a suburban setting, whether

in a rural setting, have been a place where people have always gathered. And I think one of the important things that we can do, especially for our young men and women that serve this country and make the ultimate sacrifice, as one of my constituents did, I think it's important that we remember those that have made that sacrifice.

Corpsman Wiener was killed in Iraq in the year 2005. But throughout his life, he demonstrated a commitment to saving lives, ensuring public safety in his community, and serving his country. Jeffrey Wiener began serving the community of Lynbrook in 1987 at the age of 14 as a volunteer junior fireman. And we know, our junior firemen, basically working in the community, stay with that and become the volunteer firemen which our communities count on. By the year 2000 he had risen to the rank of captain and became an EMT for Nassau County.

In May 2003, in response to the terrorist attacks that happened to New York and to this country on September 11, 2001, Jeffrey chose to serve his country by enlisting in the United States Navy.

On May 7, 2005, Jeffrey gave the ultimate sacrifice when he and three other marines from his unit were killed in an ambush and a bombing in Iraq. It is because of people like Jeffrey and his colleagues that we are able to enjoy the rights and the freedoms that we all hold so dear.

Jeffrey is survived by his wife, Maria, and his two daughters. This legislation honors the legacy, the sacrifice, and the heroism of Navy Corpsman Wiener by renaming the post office located at 100 Broadway in Lynbrook, New York, as the Navy Corpsman Jeffrey L. Wiener Post Office building.

Again, Mr. Speaker, these are very, very little things for the sacrifice that the young men and women across this country do for us on a daily basis. And I think sometimes it becomes very, very easy for people to forget what these sacrifices mean, not only to the family, to the community, but to our country. This is one way, a small way, granted, to honor these lives. I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure, and 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, S. 3567.

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.

CONGRATULATING NATIONAL SPELLING BEE CHAMPION, FINALISTS, AND PARTICIPANTS

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1494) congratulating the champion, finalists, and all other participants in the 83rd Annual Scripps National Spelling Bee, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1494

Whereas the Scripps National Spelling Bee is the largest and longest-running educational promotion in the United States, and is administered by the E.W. Scripps Company of Cincinnati, Ohio;

Whereas the Scripps National Spelling Bee promotes educational excellence by encouraging students to improve their spelling, expand their vocabularies, learn new concepts, and develop a mastery of the English language;

Whereas the 83rd Annual Scripps National Spelling Bee was held in Washington, DC, from June 2 through June 4, 2010;

Whereas 273 spellers from across the United States, American Samoa, the Bahamas, Canada, China, Department of Defense Schools in Europe, Ghana, Guam, Jamaica, Japan, New Zealand, Puerto Rico, South Korea, and the United States Virgin Islands all competed for the title;

Whereas these students had previously qualified for the contest by winning locally sponsored spelling bees and all have shown a strong knowledge of the English language;

Whereas Anamika Veeramani, a 14-year-old resident of North Royalton, Ohio, and an 8th grade student at Incarnate Word Academy, achieved the distinct honor of becoming the 83rd Annual Scripps National Spelling Bee champion;

Whereas Ms. Veeramani, after finishing in 5th place in the 2009 National Spelling Bee, earned her right to compete in 2010 by winning the Plain Dealer Cuyahoga County Scripps Spelling Bee on March 6, 2010, for the second consecutive year;

Whereas Ms. Veeramani won the competition in the 9th round by correctly spelling ''stromuhr'', defined as a tool that measures the speed of blood through an artery;

Whereas Adrian Gunawan of Arlington Heights, Illinois, Elizabeth Platz of Shelbina, Missouri, and Shantanu Srivatsa of West Fargo, North Dakota, are recognized for tying for second place at the 83rd Annual Scripps National Spelling Bee;

Whereas Mr. Gunawan, Ms. Platz, and Mr. Srivatsa advanced to the 8th round of the competition by correctly spelling ''netsuke'', ''gnocchi'', and ''infundibuliform'', respectively;

Whereas Laura Newcombe of Toronto, Canada, Lanson Tang of Potomac, Maryland, Joanna Ye of Carlisle, Pennsylvania, and Andrew Grose of Sheboygan, Wisconsin, are recognized for advancing to the 7th round of the 83rd Annual Scripps National Spelling Bee, thereby tying for 5th place in the competition; and

Whereas all the competitors are deserving of congratulations for their hard work and poise demonstrated in this difficult competition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates all the contestants of the 83rd Annual Scripps National Spelling Bee; and

(2) recognizes the dedication and achievement of competition winner Anamika Veeramani and the other finalists Adrian Gunawan, Elizabeth Platz, Shantanu Srivatsa, Laura Newcombe, Lanson Tang, Joanna Ye, and Andrew Grose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) 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 may 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 now yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H. Res. 1494, a resolution congratulating the champion, finalists, and all other participants in the 83rd annual Scripps National Spelling Bee.

H. Res. 1494 was introduced by our colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio, Representative BETTY SUTTON, on June 30, 2010. It was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which ordered it to be reported favorably by unanimous consent on September 23, 2010. The measure enjoys the support of over 50 Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Scripps National Spelling Bee is a 2-day competition held in May or early June each year here in Washington, D.C. Students from around the country and around the world compete in local and regional spelling bees for a chance to take part in this highly competitive event.

The participants compete for prizes, including scholarships, savings bonds, reference materials and cash; but this and other spelling bees serve the greater purpose of encouraging students to improve their vocabularies, spelling, and appropriate grammar usage. As the largest and longest running educational promotion in the country, the competition gets national coverage on cable and network television, further promoting its educational ideals to millions of viewers.

This year's winner was Anamika Veeramani, an eighth grade student at Incarnate Word Academy in Parma Heights, Ohio, who won the bee with the word ''stromuhr,'' defined as a tool that measures the speed of blood through an artery. And I dare Members of Congress to try to spell the word.

Mr. Speaker, let us now take a moment to congratulate this remarkable young student and all of the other participants in the 83rd annual Scripps National Spelling Bee through the passage of H. Res. 1494. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of H. Res. 1494, and ask for support of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as she may consume to our colleague from Ohio, the sponsor of the bill, Representative BETTY SUTTON.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Anamika Veeramani of North Royalton, Ohio. Anamika is a resident of the 13th Congressional District of Ohio, which I am so honored to represent. Anamika won the 83rd Scripps National Spelling Bee championship on Friday, June 4, 2010, and she brings back to Ohio the first national spelling bee title since 1964.

□ 1530

The Scripps National Spelling Bee is the largest and longest-running educational promotion in the United States and is administered by the E.W. Scripps Company located in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Anamika put in the hard work necessary to achieve this great accomplishment. By working hard, students learn that anything is possible, including spelling difficult and complex words. She won the Plain Dealer Cuyahoga County Scripps Spelling Bee on March 6 for the second year in the row. By winning the spelling bee in northeast Ohio, Anamika advanced to the national competition here in Washington, D.C.

To win the title, Anamika correctly spelled the name of a tool that measures the speed of blood through an artery called ''stromuhr.''

With opportunities like the Scripps National Spelling Bee, children are given the chance to learn and succeed and build the confidence that they need moving forward. By winning the bee, she won $30,000 and a trophy from Scripps, a $5,000 scholarship from Sigma Phi Epsilon Educational Foundation, a $2,500 savings bond from Merriam-Webster, and more than $3,500 worth of reference material from Encyclopedia Britannica and Merriam-Webster.

These winnings will help her reach for her dream of attending college and one day becoming a cardiovascular surgeon, and perhaps she will have a head start on her colleagues, knowing how to clearly say and spell ''stromuhr.'' With the kind of hard work and dedication she showed in this competition, anything is within her reach. I would like to congratulate Anamika on this terrific achievement.

I would also like to recognize all the finalists, Adrian Gunawan, Elizabeth Platz, Shantanu Srivatsa, Laura Newcombe, Lanson Tang, Joanna Ye, and Andrew Grose. And congratulations are due to all the students who participated in the spelling bee.

I want to applaud also all of the teachers, parents, and students for their commitment to this great program.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the participants in the Scripps National Spelling Bee and to particularly congratulate my constituent, Mr. Lanson Tang of Potomac, Maryland, who tied for fifth place in the competition.

The Scripps National Spelling Bee is the nation's oldest educational promotion, now in its 83rd year. Through spelling, students increase their vocabularies and improve English usage, skills that will stay with them throughout their lives.

I congratulate all the participants, especially my constituent, Lanson Tang, a homeschooled student from Potomac, Maryland. Lanson made it to the seventh of nine rounds in the competition, correctly spelling words like ''rhabdomyoma,'' ''obelisk,'' and ''flabellum.'' He has made our community proud. I also want to thank the Fourth Presbyterian School in Potomac for hosting the Montgomery County Regional Spelling Bee for the second year in a row this year.

All of the spellers this year should be proud of their outstanding accomplishments. I urge my colleagues to join me in extending congratulations to these terrific students.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure, and 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. 1494, 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.

TOM KONGSGAARD POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6237) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1351 2nd Street in Napa, California, as the ''Tom Kongsgaard Post Office Building,'' as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6237

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

SECTION 1. TOM KONGSGAARD POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1351 2nd Street in Napa, California, shall be known and designated as the ''Tom Kongsgaard 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 ''Tom Kongsgaard Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) 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 may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. 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. 6237 for consideration. This legislation will designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1351 2nd Street in Napa, California, as the Tom Kongsgaard Post Office Building. Introduced by our colleague Representative MIKE THOMPSON of California on September 28, 2010, H.R. 6237 enjoys the support of the entire California House delegation.

Born on June 3, 1921, in Everett, Washington, a son of Norweigian immigrants, Judge Thomas Kongsgaard began his longstanding commitment to public service by enlisting in the U.S. Navy during World War II. Fighting in the war, Judge Kongsgaard was severely injured, leaving him with a replacement leg. He served in the Pacific theater and at the end of the war was stationed at Mare Island Naval Shipyard.

Judge Kongsgaard began his judicial career as a Napa Superior Court judge, 9 years after receiving his law degree from Stanford University. He served from 1958 to 1984, missing just 1 day of work in his 26 years. Reflecting on his immigrant roots, he was always especially proud to preside at naturalization ceremonies.

Being an avid student of political history and American culture, Judge Kongsgaard organized the Halls of History project inside the courthouse that recounts Napa County's history in words and photographs.

That courthouse was dubbed ''Kongsgaard Square'' by the Board of Supervisors in 1984. A bronze plaque cemented to a basalt boulder that sits in a rose garden on the south side of the courthouse takes note of the jurist's distinguished career. It reads: ''The Board of Supervisors names this block Kongsgaard Square as a token of esteem for his noble services to the citizens of Napa County.''

After retiring, Judge Kongsgaard continued his judicial career as a visiting judge. In 1991, he was appointed by the California Supreme Court to be one of three special masters who recommended a reapportionment plan for the legislature and California Representatives to Congress after the 1990 census.

Although retired, he worked with Judicial Arbitration Mediation Services until the day before he was hospitalized with complications from treatment of leukemia. Regrettably, Judge Kongsgaard died on June 25, 2001, at

the age of 80. He is survived by his daughters, Mary and Martha; son, John; and seven grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, let us honor Judge Thomas Kongsgaard for serving both his country and his community through the passage of this bill to designate the 2nd Street post office in Napa in his honor. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 6237.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6237, which is appropriate, seeing I am one of the 52 original cosponsors to the item, and I strongly urge support for the resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 6237, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlelady from the District supporting the bill.

Let me just point out as an interesting procedural note, for Mr. THOMPSON to bring this before us he had to get 52 cosponsors. The House rules require that everyone in the State sign on. So where Delaware may only need one or Nevada may need only three Members, those of us in California have a very high threshold we have to fulfill to be able to take this, and Mr. THOMPSON took this action.

It is something that we should all consider in the future: Should this judge be required to have 52 Members of the House cosponsor a bill when someone from another State may need only two or three or four or five? So it is an interesting part of our process here. Some people may say that it is unfair, but it happens to be the House rules, and the Congressmen have to live within those rules.

I strongly support the passage of this bill.

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. 6237, 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.

□ 1540

SAM SACCO POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6387) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 337 West Clark Street in Eureka, California, as the ''Sam Sacco Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6387

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

SECTION 1. SAM SACCO POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 337 West Clark Street in Eureka, California, shall be known and designated as the ''Sam Sacco 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 ''Sam Sacco Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) 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 may 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. 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. 6387 for consideration. This legislation will designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 337 West Clark Street in Eureka, California, as the Sam Sacco Post Office Building. Introduced by our colleague, Representative MIKE THOMPSON of California, on September 29, 2010, H.R. 6387 enjoys the support of the entire California House delegation.

Born and raised in Susanville, California, Sam Sacco moved to Eureka, California, in 1956 with his wife Mary Beth and four children: Sam, Jr.; Joe, Jim, and Lisa. For the next 30 years, Mr. Sacco dedicated his life to serving his community as a local business owner and public official.

As a longtime owner of a Farmers Insurance agency in Eureka, Mr. Sacco also attended to the needs of local families with a warmth and generosity that will not be forgotten. In addition, in 1974, Mr. Sacco was afforded the opportunity to further serve the city of Eureka upon his election as mayor. Throughout his mayoral tenure, which began in 1975 and ended in 1979, Mr. Sacco devoted his attention to advocacy on behalf of the city's working families. Notably, for example, Mr. Sacco worked tirelessly to safeguard the interests of hundreds of local timber industry workers during the expansion of Redwood National Park.

Mr. Speaker, Sam Sacco is well regarded as a model citizen and a dedicated public servant, whose compassion for his local community was larger than life. The life of Sam Sacco stands as a testament to his public service, and it is our hope that we can honor this remarkable individual through the passage of this legislation to designate the West Clark Street post office in his honor.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 6387.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6387, and I think it is quite appropriate that we pass this bill.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving as a fellow mayor with Mayor Sam back in the late seventies. We actually served in the League of California Cities together. I just find it interesting that all these years later I stand here on the House floor voting on a post office named after a colleague of mine who, though he lived almost 1,000 miles away, was a fellow mayor in my State at one end, while I was at the southern end.

I would ask that we support H.R. 6387.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask again for support of H.R. 6387.

Seeing that this is our last bill for at least the foreseeable future, I would like to just point out I think there is one thing that all of us have seen, and today probably is a good example, especially those who have been watching.

This process that we have gone through today is one that we have gone back into over the last decade, and a lot of Members have raised the issue, is this the most prudent way of us handling these procedures? I know the gentlelady from the Federal district has raised issues about how to streamline it and expedite the process.

I think these issues of the resolutions and the way we are naming the post offices are ones that need to be reviewed, and hopefully both sides in the new Congress will be willing to look at this and say, look, historically this type of process has been used to buy time for leadership to be able to try to get individuals to vote their way, not necessarily the way the district constituency wanted them to vote.

I think that this is one place that we should be able to have a frank discussion in January. Hopefully we will see this type of process be put in, let's just say the trash heap of history, and we go to a much more expedited process that talks about substance.

I don't think any of us were very happy with what happened in the last few years while we were doing resolutions and naming post offices while there were major budgetary and financial crises going on. I think we can all agree, especially after what we just went through today, let's try to look in January at having a better process

that talks about more substantive issues.

Even though these are important to the individuals involved, the Nation is in a very critical time, and for us to be spending the majority of our time in the last few years actually doing things that the average citizen would say were not critical, I think that this is one time we can get together and say this process needs to be reformed, and hopefully in January we will not be going through a day like we just did.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from the Federal district for working with me today on these items.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman as well, and again I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

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. 6387.

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.

IMPROVING CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6399) to improve certain administrative operations of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6399

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

SECTION 1. CONSOLIDATION OF STAFF POSITIONS.

(a) CONSOLIDATION.—Section 108 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1991 (2 U.S.C. 1849) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 108. The Architect of the Capitol may fix the rate of basic pay for not more than 32 positions at a rate not to exceed the highest total rate of pay for the Senior Executive Service under subchapter VIII of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, for the locality involved.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1203(e) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2003 (2 U.S.C. 1805(e)) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to pay periods beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS TO ACQUIRE BUILDING.

(a) AVAILABILITY.—The amounts described in subsection (b) shall be available to the Architect of the Capitol for the acquisition (through purchase, lease, transfer from another Federal entity, or otherwise) of real property for the use of the Capitol Police.

(b) AMOUNTS DESCRIBED.—The amounts described in this subsection are amounts appropriated to, and remaining available for obligation by, the Architect of the Capitol under the heading ''Architect of the Capitol, Capitol Police Buildings and Grounds'' or under the heading ''Architect of the Capitol, Capitol Police Buildings, Grounds and Security'' in any Act making appropriations for the legislative branch for fiscal years 2007 through 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the measure now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does two things: First, over time Congress has passed five laws creating three categories of senior management positions in the Architect's Office. The five laws specify the number of positions in each category, their functions and compensation. The creation of multiple categories with different pay caps can yield undesirable effects, including the possibility of employees earning more than supervisors. This patchwork hinders the Architect's flexibility to align senior positions equitably across the agency and to make broad organizational changes.

This bill combines the affected positions into one category for administrative purposes capped at a single rate of pay. The Architect requested this sensible provision, which solves the problem that Congress never intended to create.

Second, Mr. Speaker, the bill provides the Architect with the authority to purchase a vehicle maintenance facility for the U.S. Capitol Police. Congress has previously appropriated the money, and there is no additional cost.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I urge support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman BRADY for bringing this bill to the floor. This bill provides the Architect of the Capitol with two administrative remedies in order to provide better management of the Capitol complex.

First, the bill gives the Architect of the Capitol more flexibility in his allocation of senior staff positions. Currently there is an arbitrary limitation in place.

Second, the bill authorizes the Architect of the Capitol to purchase a building that they have been leasing for some time. The building is currently used for United States Capitol Police vehicle maintenance and is also used as USCP headquarters for the hazardous device unit.

This money has already been appropriated, and this resolution provides the appropriate authorization needed from our committee of jurisdiction.

I thank Chairman BRADY for bringing this bill to the floor, and I am pleased to support this resolution.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker I urge an aye vote, 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 (Mrs. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6399.

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.

□ 1550

CONGRATULATING NASA FOR HELPING TO RESCUE CHILEAN MINERS

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1714) congratulating the engineers, scientists, psychologists, and staff of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) for helping to successfully rescue 33 trapped Chilean miners from a collapsed mine near Copiapo, Chile.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1714

Whereas, on August 5, 2010, 33 Chilean miners were trapped by the collapse of a gold and copper mine near Copiapo, Chile;

Whereas, on August 22, 2010, all 33 miners were discovered alive after an intensive 17-day rescue effort;

Whereas, on August 27, 2010, the Chilean government asked the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) to provide technical advice that might be of assistance to the trapped miners;

Whereas NASA's vast knowledge and experience with extreme isolation, analog missions, undersea environments, and space flight uniquely suited the agency to help with this historic rescue;

Whereas sustaining, supporting, and rescuing the trapped miners was an extremely challenging task;

Whereas, on August 30, 2010, NASA employees from the Johnson and Langley Space Centers traveled to Chile to assist with the rescue efforts;

Whereas the NASA team worked closely with the Chilean government, including the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Mining, the Chilean Navy, and the Chilean Space Agency;

Whereas NASA assisted the Chilean government by sharing knowledge acquired during space flight missions for the provision of medical care and psychological support in extreme isolation;

Whereas NASA engineers provided recommendations for the design requirements for the Phoenix capsule used to rescue the miners;

Whereas the Chilean Navy used the Phoenix capsule to bring the miners to the surface nearly 69 days after the mine's initial collapse;

Whereas, on October 13, 2010, all 33 miners were successfully rescued; and

Whereas NASA's help was instrumental in the historic rescue of all 33 miners: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the engineers, scientists, psychologists, and staff of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for helping to successfully rescue 33 trapped Chilean miners from a collapsed mine near Copiapo, Chile; and

(2) recognizes that the experience and knowledge of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has acquired through space flight is beneficial to human life on Earth and was critical to the successful rescue of the Chilean miners.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 1714, the resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to urge my colleagues to support this resolution now under consideration. While we often think of NASA's inspiring achievements in launching humans into space, assembling and operating the international space station, and deploying probes that deliver stunning images of the Earth, our Sun, planetary systems, and the universe, NASA's role in assisting the Chilean Government in the successful rescue of 33 miners trapped underground in northern Chile shows us a different side of NASA's greatness. It shows us the contributions of NASA's skills and technologies to benefiting people back here on Earth—whether here in the United States or around the world.

Based on NASA's extensive experience in working with extreme isolation, analog missions, undersea environments, and spaceflight, the Chilean Government sought guidance from NASA in addressing this task of rescuing 33 miners trapped over 2,000 feet underground—particularly on the nutritional and behavioral health of the trapped miners, which was extremely challenging. A team of NASA personnel from the Johnson Space Center in Texas and the Langley Research Center was assembled, including two medical doctors, a psychologist, and an engineer, who traveled to Chile to support the Chilean Government's rescue efforts. The NASA team worked diligently and tirelessly to provide input and information that could help preserve the health and well-being of the 33 trapped miners during and after their confinement as well as aid in their rescue.

Mr. Speaker, when called to help the Chilean Government, the NASA team responded with unwavering excellence and commitment. This enthusiasm is characteristic of the NASA workforce at the Johnson Center and at each of the other centers. The support of NASA and its team to the Government of Chile and the successful rescue of the 33 trapped miners is just the latest example of NASA's accomplishments in applying space technology, scientific knowledge, and operational and other skills to enrich the lives of Americans and people across the world. Those accomplishments include the use of NASA-developed research and rescue technologies to identify distressed ships and sailors at sea; the use of NASA air and space-based imagery to provide details on the 2010 Gulf of Mexico oil spill; and the application of software developed to process Earth science imagery to the diagnostic interpretation of medical imagery.

The United States' investment in our space program and its workforce has far-reaching benefits for our economy, our national security, our international relations, and our humanity at large. NASA's contribution to the Chilean Government's rescue operation demonstrates the importance of ensuring a robust future for NASA as a multimission agency. NASA continues to provide the United States strong leadership in science, aeronautics, human spaceflight, and exploration, and that preserves and nurtures the world-class talent.

The NASA workforce is the heart of our space program's greatness. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the NASA team and its contributions to the Chilean Government's successful and inspiring rescue mission that brought 33 trapped miners to freedom and safety.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1714, congratulating the engineers, scientists, psychologists, and staff of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration who contributed to the successful rescue of the 33 Chilean miners. NASA employees provided technical advice to the Chilean Government based on the agency's long experience in protecting humans in the hostile environment of space, including recommendations on medical care, nutrition, psychological support, as well as aiding the design of the device used to extract the miners.

As the world watched, Chile's Government turned its full attention to locating the 33 miners following the mine collapse on August 5. Seventeen days later, rescuers located the miners by successfully boring a half mile below the surface to a safe haven where the men had taken shelter. The fact that the drilling operation found its target on the first try in itself is a miracle, but it was also a testament to the skills and collaboration of many men and women working on the surface.

One day after locating the men, Chile's Government contacted NASA asking for technical advice regarding the best approach to ensure the miners were receiving appropriate psychological support and medical care. NASA also offered its advice to Chilean authorities on design requirements for the extraction vehicle. A week later, a five-member team of NASA employees visited Chile and the mine site as part of the agency response, offering their advice and their expertise.

I would like to recognize Dr. Michael Duncan, Dr. Albert Holland, and Dr. James Polk from the Johnson Space Center in the district I represent; Clint Cragg from the Langley Research Center; and Albert Condes from NASA headquarters, for their role in helping this grand rescue effort, just another example of how the world benefits from American human spaceflight.

I would like to thank my fellow colleague, Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, for her hard work in getting this resolution to the floor. I urge all Members to support this resolution.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1714.

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.

□ 1600

SUPPORTING UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH WEEK

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1654) expressing support for designation of the week of October 24, 2010, as ''Undergraduate Research Week,'' as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1654

Whereas close to 600 colleges and universities in the United States and thousands of undergraduate students and faculty pursue

undergraduate research every year, providing research opportunities that will shape the trajectory of students' lives and careers and researchers' and institutions' purpose and contributions to academia and the research enterprise;

Whereas students and faculty engaged in undergraduate research contribute to research across many disciplines, including arts and humanities, biology, chemistry, health sciences, geosciences, mathematics, computer science, physics and astronomy, psychology, and social sciences;

Whereas research at the undergraduate level provides both students and faculty members opportunities for improving and assessing the research environment at their institution, develops critical thinking, creativity, problem solving, and intellectual independence, and promotes an innovation-oriented culture;

Whereas undergraduate research is essential to pushing the Nation's innovation agenda forward by increasing the interest and persistence among young people in the crucial science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) disciplines, and to cultivating the interest of would-be researchers who pursue a new aspiration of graduate education after participating in undergraduate research; and

Whereas the week of April 11, 2011, would be an appropriate week to designate as ''Undergraduate Research Week'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of ''Undergraduate Research Week'';

(2) recognizes the importance of undergraduate research and of providing research opportunities for the Nation's talented youth to cultivate innovative, creative, and enterprising young researchers, in collaboration with dedicated faculty;

(3) encourages institutions of higher education, Federal agencies, businesses, philanthropic entities, and others to support undergraduate research and undergraduate researchers and their faculty mentors;

(4) encourages opportunities, including through existing programs, for females and underrepresented minorities to participate in undergraduate research; and

(5) supports the role undergraduate research can and does play in crucial research that serves the Nation's best economic and security interests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANGEVIN). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 1654 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1654, which supports the designation of the week of April 11, 2011, as ''Undergraduate Research Week.'' The undergraduate students of our Nation's colleges and universities provide important research across many disciplines at over 600 colleges and universities each year.

Undergraduate research occurs in a number of fields, including arts and humanities, biology, chemistry, health sciences, geosciences, mathematics, computer science, physics and astronomy, psychology, social sciences, and many more. Students work with dedicated faculty mentors to produce important studies, findings, and reports that advance research in these fields.

Undergraduate research helps both individual students and the institutions they attend. Student researchers develop critical thinking, analytical skills, and an understanding of research methodology which helps to prepare them for graduate education and their future careers. For institutions of higher education, undergraduate research promotes an innovation-oriented culture, bolsters research capacities, and improves retention rates by engaging students in the campus community.

In my State, the University of Hawaii's system invests heavily in undergraduate research opportunities across its campuses. Recently, I had the opportunity to meet two outstanding students from the University of Hawaii who presented their scientific research posters at a Washington, D.C., awards ceremony. Haunani Kane from UH Manoa and Nakoa Goo from UH Hilo are native Hawaiian students who were award winners in the Louis Stokes Alliances for Minority Participation program.

We know that increasing interest and participation among young people in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics—the STEM disciplines—is crucial for the Nation's future economic competitiveness and for preparing our students for the jobs of tomorrow. Undergraduate research in STEM fields offers students an opportunity to both become interested in careers in these areas and to learn important technical and research skills which prepare them for successful careers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Representative HOLT for bringing this resolution forward.

Once again, I express my support for Undergraduate Research Week, which recognizes all of the important contributions of our undergraduate students to research at our Nation's colleges and universities. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 1654.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1654, expressing support for the designation of the week of April 11, 2011, as ''Undergraduate Research Week.''

Almost 600 colleges and universities in the United States offer opportunities for undergraduate research. Undergraduate research opportunities encourage students to develop critical thinking skills, problem-solving skills, and may intrigue students to pursue research opportunities in their educational and professional futures.

Research at all levels of education encourages innovation and discovery essential to the future of the United States. Undergraduate research in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics disciplines can foster a student's interest in these fields, which are vital to the success of our Nation and of the world today.

Undergraduate Research Week recognizes the importance of undergraduate research. It encourages colleges and universities, businesses and other organizations to recognize the occasion. I support this resolution, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentlelady, and I rise in support of H. Res. 1654. We would like to see the week of April 11, 2011, designated as ''Undergraduate Research Week.''

Mr. Speaker, as a scientist and an educator, I know the value of undergraduate research both for the students and for the research enterprise. Undergraduate researchers formed the backbone of my research program when I was a faculty member at Swarthmore College, and they also contributed valuable work to my research at New York University and at Princeton University. I watched as their hands-on experiences with the process of discovery helped them develop skills that cannot be obtained just in the classroom, and I watched as it heightened their understanding of science and their enthusiasm for research. I might add, they produced excellent research.

Around the country, thousands of students at hundreds of colleges and universities are involved in undergraduate research experiences that will shape the trajectories of their lives and their careers. Yet we would benefit if thousands more were involved.

Recently, the National Academies followed up on their ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm'' report from 2005 with an account this year of America's progress over the previous 5 years. They concluded, in part, if the United States is to remain competitive, we need to preserve an adequate supply of creative, leading-edge, innovative American researchers. Early involvement in the real-world practice of science is very valuable in meeting this goal, and it is equally vital to our economic progress. It produces a scientifically literate society as well.

□ 1610

I commend the students and faculty who are participating in undergraduate research programs across the country and in organizations that support their

work, such as the Council on Undergraduate Research, the Research Corporation, the National Science Foundation and many others. I encourage our colleges, universities, and Federal agencies to continue robust support for these programs, and to work together to develop new opportunities for all interested students to participate in undergraduate research.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, once again, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and especially at this time, at a time when we need to be strengthening and enhancing our STEM education. I think that this is a very important resolution to focus our attention on those issues.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1654, 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.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: ''Expressing support for designation of the week of April 11, 2011, as 'Undergraduate Research Week.' ''

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL PRINCIPALS MONTH

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1652) expressing support for designation of the month of October 2010 as National Principals Month, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1652

Whereas the National Association of Elementary School Principals and the National Association of Secondary School Principals have declared the month of October 2010 as National Principals Month;

Whereas school leaders are expected to be educational visionaries, instructional leaders, assessment experts, disciplinarians, community builders, public relations experts, budget analysts, facility managers, special programs administrators, and guardians of various legal, contractual, and policy mandates and initiatives as well as being entrusted with our young people, our most valuable resource;

Whereas principals set the academic tone for their schools and work collaboratively with teachers to develop and maintain high curriculum standards, develop mission statements, and set performance goals and objectives;

Whereas the vision, dedication, and determination of a school leader provides the mobilizing force behind a school reform effort;

Whereas leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to student achievement, according to research conducted by the Wallace Foundation;

Whereas principal and teacher effectiveness have a significant impact on student achievement, and studies find no examples of success in turnaround schools without effective principal leadership, according to New Leaders for New Schools;

Whereas the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that approximately 1 in 3 education administrators works more than 40 hours a week and often works an additional 15 to 20 hours each week supervising school activities at night and on weekends;

Whereas assistant principals also play a crucial role providing leadership and charting a successful course at a school;

Whereas the NAESP National Distinguished Principals program honors exemplary elementary and middle level public, private, and independent school leaders as well as leaders from the U.S. Department of Defense Schools and the U.S. Department of State Overseas Schools, for outstanding leadership for student learning and the profession;

Whereas the MetLife-NASSP Principal of the Year program began in 1993 as a means to recognize outstanding middle level and high school principals who have succeeded in providing high-quality learning opportunities for students as well as their exemplary contributions to the profession;

Whereas the celebration of National Principals Month would honor elementary, middle level, and high school principals and recognize the importance of school leadership in ensuring that every child has access to a high-quality education; and

Whereas the month of October 2010 would be an appropriate month to designate as National Principals Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors and recognizes the contribution of school principals and assistant principals to the success of students in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools;

(2) supports the designation of National Principals Month; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Principals Month with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of school leadership in ensuring that every child has access to a high-quality education.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 1652 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of House Resolution 1652, celebrating National Principals Month, which was observed this October. With this resolution, we recognize the important roles principals play as leaders in our schools and in ensuring the best educational environment for our Nation's children.

Most of us can recall a principal who made a difference in our lives. He or she was the one who walked down the hall, knew everyone by name and asked about our day. They let us know when we were out of line and smiled with pride at our success.

Over the years, school leadership roles have broadened substantially to include increased emphasis on curriculum development, data analysis, and instructional leadership. They are tasked with complex problems such as facilitating systemic education reform while managing day-to-day school activities. Today, over 100,000 principals are supporting our Nation's students, teachers, and parents every day.

Since 1993, the National Association of Secondary School Principals and MetLife have partnered to applaud outstanding middle level and high school principals for demonstrated success in school leadership with their National Principal of the Year program.

I would like to congratulate 2010 National High School Principal of the Year Wes Taylor and Middle Level Principal of the Year Cathy Carnahan. Mr. Taylor serves as principal of Lowndes High School in Valdosta, Georgia. He has overseen a 13 percent increase in graduation rates at Lowndes High School and across-the-board double-digit increases in pass rates on the Georgia standardized test. Mr. Taylor is well known for his emphasis on personalized classroom instruction which focuses on the strengths and needs of each student, despite a school attendance of nearly 3,000 students. I thank Mr. Taylor for his hard work and dedication to his school and for being the role model he is for high school principals nationwide.

Ms. Cathy Carnahan serves as principal at Duniway Middle School in McMinnville, Oregon. She has served at Duniway since 1993, including as assistant principal, emphasizing an atmosphere of faculty teamwork which has led to increased test scores, decreased referrals, and an impressive student attendance rate of 95 percent or higher. I thank Ms. Carnahan for her dedicated work and exemplary performance, and I congratulate her on her recognition.

Recently, I also had the privilege to meet Hawaii's State Principals of the Year for 2010. Darrel Galera serves as principal of Moanalua High School and won the 2010 Hawaii School Principal of the Year. Under Principal Galera's leadership, Moanalua High School now boasts a graduation rate of over 90 percent, well above the State and national average. Principal Galera is committed to helping his educators excel, and since 2002 he has hosted a statewide professional development conference at Moanalua.

Justin Mew serves as principal of Niu Valley Middle School and won Hawaii's 2010 Middle School Principal of the Year. Under his leadership, Niu Valley became Hawaii's first middle school to offer the advanced International Baccalaureate Middle Years Programme.

Niu Valley also has a strong language immersion program, allowing students to learn Mandarin or Japanese. On a personal note, I also attended Niu Valley Middle School.

Great principals tremendously improve the outcomes of our Nation's youth and play a critical role in a school's success or failure. National Principals Month is an opportunity for us all to recognize this important role and to honor the work of all our Nation's principals.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I express my support for National Principals Month, and I hope this resolution serves as a thank you to our Nation's principals. I want to thank Representative SUSAN DAVIS for bringing this resolution to the floor and urge my colleagues to join me in support of House Resolution 1652.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1652, expressing support for designation of the month of October 2010 as National Principals Month.

Anyone who has visited a successful school or who has watched their children progress through their education knows a good principal is vital to a successful school. A good principal sets the tone for the school and encourages teachers and students alike to do their best each day. Principals are also the people who know the school's needs best as they are in the building talking to the teachers and talking to the students on a regular basis.

Unfortunately, all too often principals are prevented from doing what they need to do in terms of selecting the best teachers for their school. Earlier this year, committee Republicans developed four key principles on education reform. One of those principles, restoring local control, highlights the importance of ensuring principals have the flexibility they need to help their students and teachers succeed in the classroom.

Principals are key to ensuring that every child excels in the classroom. For that reason, I support this resolution and ask my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HIRONO. Once again, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the recognition of all of the hardworking principals throughout our country, and with that, I yield the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1652, 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.

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. 716, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 1475, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 1428, 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.

RECOGNIZING GAIL ABARBANEL AND THE RAPE TREATMENT CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 716) recognizing Gail Abarbanel and the Rape Treatment Center, and for other purposes, 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 Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 569]

YEAS—415

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

NOT VOTING—17

Bean
Boozman
Davis (AL)
Fallin
Gohmert
Kennedy

Matheson
McDermott
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mollohan
Oberstar
Platts
Putnam
Space
Stark
Tanner

□ 1651

Mr. ROE of Tennessee changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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.

CONGRATULATING TARBORO, NORTH CAROLINA, ON ITS 250TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1475) congratulates the town of Tarboro, North Carolina, on the occasion of its 250th anniversary, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 0, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 570]

YEAS—406

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

NOT VOTING—26

Bean
Blumenauer
Boozman
Buyer
Davis (AL)
Fallin
Gutierrez
Kennedy
Kirk
Larson (CT)
Matheson
McCaul
McDermott
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mollohan
Napolitano
Oberstar
Platts
Putnam
Ryan (OH)
Shea-Porter
Space
Stark
Tanner
Taylor

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California) (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1659

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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, Nov. 5, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from the Honorable Todd Rokita, Secretary of State, State of Indiana, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held November 2, 2010, the Honorable Marlin A. Stutzman was elected Representative to Congress for the Third Congressional District, State of Indiana.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

SECRETARY OF STATE,
STATE OF INDIANA,
Nov. 5, 2010.

Lorraine C. Miller,
Office of the Clerk, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Re Special Election in Third Congressional District of Indiana.

DEAR CLERK MILLER: On November 2, 2010, a special election was conducted in the 3rd Congressional District of Indiana to fill the vacancy in that office.

Based on the unofficial results provided by the county election boards of the counties located within that district, The Honorable Marlin A. Stutzman has been elected to fill this vacancy. A spreadsheet showing the unofficial results is attached.

There is no information indicating that the results of this special election will be recounted or contested in any way.

If you have further questions, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

TODD ROKITA,
Secretary of State of Indiana.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE MARLIN A. STUTZMAN, OF INDIANA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana, the Honorable MARLIN A. STUTZMAN, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect STUTZMAN and the members of the Indiana delegation present themselves in the well.

Mr. STUTZMAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 111th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE MARLIN A. STUTZMAN TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

As dean of the Indiana delegation on our side, it is my honor and privilege to introduce our newest Member, MARLIN STUTZMAN. MARLIN is a fourth-generation farmer who grew up on a farm in Howe, Indiana. He is the oldest of four children, all of whom worked on the family farm from a very young age. MARLIN and his father operate Stutzman Farms, and he's also owner of Stutzman Farms Trucking. MARLIN and his wife, Christy, who my wife tells me has a beautiful voice—she said you sang the ''Star-Spangled Banner'' today and it was fantastic, so we're going to have to use her talents down the road.

MARLIN and his wife, Christy, have two children, sons Payton—named after Walter Payton, the great football player—and Preston.

They're very active in the Community Baptist Church and in foreign mission work. MARLIN is a member of the NFIB, the NRA, and the Northeast Indiana Right to Life as well. MARLIN was first elected to the Indiana State House of Representatives in 2002, at the age of 26—I didn't know there was anybody that young—becoming the youngest member of the Indiana legislature. While serving in the Indiana House, MARLIN fought for lower taxes, less regulation, and balanced budgets. He consistently received 90 percent ratings or above from the Chamber of Commerce and other small business associations. In 2008, he won the Small Business Champion Award from the Indiana Chamber of Commerce. In 2008, MARLIN won a seat in the Indiana State Senate.

As dean of the Indiana delegation on the Republican side, it is my distinct honor and privilege to introduce to the House of Representatives Mr. STUTZMAN, but first I would like to yield to the senior Member from Indiana on the Democrat side, Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding and would suggest that Mr. BURTON is the dean of the Indiana delegation, and I would want to show him that respect.

But, MARLIN, I would simply want to add my voice to Mr. BURTON's on behalf of all of the members of the delegation and all of the Members of the House and certainly wish you every success in your endeavor of public service and in serving the people we all try to serve to the best of our ability. Welcome very strongly to the House of Representatives.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It is now my distinct honor to introduce the newest Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, Representative MARLIN STUTZMAN.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Thank you.

Madam Speaker, it is just a tremendous honor to stand here before you today. It has been very, very humbling, I can say that, your kindness to us, the Members that we have met so far. I want to introduce my wife, Christy, who's up in the gallery. She has been my most supportive person. We have done this together as a team, and I can't say enough about her and am so proud of her. My father, Albert, and my mom, Sarah, are both along. My brothers, my sisters, and a lot of other friends and family.

But I just want to say thank you. It is such a humbling experience so far. I am excited and privileged to serve the people in northeast Indiana. We have a wonderful community, and to know that I get to serve with the Indiana delegation is such a high honor. Thank you very much. I am looking forward to serving you in this upcoming Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Indiana, the whole number of the House is 434.

RECOGNIZING BROOKLYN BOTANIC GARDEN ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1428) recognizing Brooklyn Botanic Garden on its 100th anniversary as the preeminent horticultural attraction in the borough of Brooklyn and its longstanding commitment to environmental stewardship and education for the City of New York, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 0, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 571]

YEAS—401

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
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
Djou
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
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
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
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)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
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
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Stutzman
Sullivan
Sutton
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Chaffetz

NOT VOTING—31

Bean
Blunt
Boozman
Cardoza
Davis (AL)
Edwards (TX)
Eshoo
Fallin
Hare
Kennedy
Kirk
Linder
Lummis
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McDermott
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Oberstar
Platts
Putnam
Schock
Schrader
Space
Stark
Stearns
Tanner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1714

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.

CELEBRATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF IMPACT AID

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1641) celebrating September 30, 2010, as the 60th Anniversary of Impact Aid.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1641

Whereas September 30, 2010, marks the 60th anniversary of the date on which President Harry S. Truman signed Public Law 81–874, which enacted the Impact Aid program into law;

Whereas the Impact Aid Program is considered by the community it serves as the ''original'' Federal elementary and secondary education program, and is administered by the Secretary of Education;

Whereas Impact Aid is designed to reimburse local educational agencies for the loss of traditional revenue due to the presence of tax-exempt property or Federal activity;

Whereas Impact Aid payments are allocated directly to local educational agencies in lieu of lost local tax dollars to assist with the basic educational needs of the students and schools;

Whereas nearly 1,000,000 children of our men and women in uniform, children residing on Indian lands, children in low-rent public housing, and children of civilians working or living on Federal land are ''federally connected children'' who are served by local educational agencies that are eligible for Impact Aid payments in 2010;

Whereas in 1951, 1,183 local educational agencies were eligible for a total Impact Aid payment of $29,080,788, and in 2010, 1,484 local educational agencies enrolling over 11,000,000 students will receive $1,276,183,000;

Whereas the original Impact Aid statute (Public Law 81–874) was the vehicle used by Congress in 1965 to pass the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

Whereas Congress has continued to show its support for Impact Aid by reauthorizing the program 15 times during the period between 1950 and 2001;

Whereas the House Impact Aid Coalition was established in 1995 and the Senate Impact Aid Coalition was established in 1996 to formalize and energize the broad, bipartisan support for the Impact Aid Program; and

Whereas the Federal obligation upon which the Impact Aid Program is based today is no different than it was 60 years ago: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes and celebrates the 60th anniversary of the enactment of the Impact Aid program (Public Law 81–874), the original Federal elementary and secondary education program, as ''Impact Aid Recognition Day'';

(2) recognizes the importance of the Impact Aid program (which is currently in title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.)) in ensuring that federally connected children (including children of members of the Armed Forces, children residing on Indian lands, children in low-rent public housing, and children of civilians working or living on Federal land) receive a high-quality public education; and

(3) recommends that federally connected schools and the communities they serve recognize Impact Aid Recognition Day and carry out appropriate activities centered on the Federal Government's obligation to federally connected children and the need for continuing funding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANGEVIN). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 1641 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am the sponsor of House Resolution 1641, celebrating September 30, 2010, as the 60th anniversary of the Impact Aid program. Hawaii schools received $55.5 million in Federal Impact Aid for fiscal years 2008 and 2009, the most recent years for which data is available.

The majority of public school funding in America comes from local property taxes. Unfortunately, in school districts where the Federal Government controls part of the land, districts cannot collect revenue in local property taxes. Hawaii, for example, hosts many large U.S. military bases where thousands of our brave men and women and their families live and work. These bases do not generate property tax revenue to help educate Hawaii's military children and all of our children in Hawaii's schools. In Hawaii, as in other States, our national parks, Federal prisons, Indian lands, and low-rent public housing also decrease the property tax revenue available for schools.

□ 1720

Left uncorrected, our children in federally impacted areas would have less funding for education than their peers in areas with no Federal impact. This is patently unfair.

In 1950, Congress recognized the need to address this inequity and created Impact Aid, the original civil rights education law. Impact Aid reimburses the school districts for the costs of hosting Federal property and educating federally connected children.

Today, just as in 1950, we recognize the Federal obligation to support high-quality education for all children. No matter what type of land you live on, and especially if your family serves our Nation, all our children deserve a high-quality education.

Our Impact Aid community crosses all partisan and geographic divides. We have the military community, Indian land school districts, urban and rural communities, Democratic and Republican districts, districts large and

small. Today Impact Aid payments support over 11 million children in nearly 1,500 school districts.

The need for Federal Impact Aid is especially important now, as Hawaii and school districts nationwide continue to recover from the greatest recession since the 1930s. Impact Aid funds come with few strings attached and help districts support a wide range of vital services, including teacher salaries, tutoring, after-school programs, textbooks, utilities, and other local needs.

Today we celebrate Impact Aid for advancing educational equity and recognize that we still have much to do to give all our children a truly world-class education.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1641, which celebrates September 30 as the 60th anniversary of Impact Aid.

The Impact Aid program, now Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, supports local school districts with concentrations of children who reside on military bases, Indian lands, low-rent housing units, and other Federal properties.

Signed into law in 1950, the program is an invaluable resource for local school districts across the United States that have lands within their boundaries that are owned by the Federal Government or have been removed from the local tax rolls by the Federal Government. These school districts face special challenges. They must provide a quality education to the children living on the Indian and other Federal lands and meet Federal education requirements, while sometimes operating with less local revenue than is available to other school districts, because the Federal property is exempt from local property taxes.

Under the program, most Impact Aid funds are considered general aid to school districts. Most school districts use the funds to pay the salaries of teachers and teachers' aides; purchase textbooks, computers and other equipment; fund after-school programs and remedial tutoring; fund advanced placement classes and special enrichment programs. It is the only Federal program that is administered locally in order to meet the needs of students in the classroom.

In 2010, nearly $1.3 billion will be provided to 1,484 school districts, enrolling more than 1 million federally connected children—children of our men and women in uniform, children residing on Indian lands, children in low-rent housing, and children of civilians working or living on Federal land. The funding will benefit more than 11 million students who are enrolled in these school districts.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 60 years, the Impact Aid program has played an important role in ensuring that all students have access and receive a high-quality public education. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 1641.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1641, celebrating the 60th anniversary of the Impact Aid Education Program. The Federal obligation upon which the Impact Aid Program was founded is no different today than it was at the program's inception. Originally authorized in 1950, and for the last 60 years, Impact Aid has successfully assisted local governments and communities with the substantial and continuing financial burden resulting from federal land ownership.

This year alone, in 1,484 school districts across the country, 15 million children have benefited from the necessary supplemental funding Impact Aid provides. Whether it is the Nespellum, Wellpinit, Inchelium, Medical Lake or one of the many other school districts in my district, the Impact Aid program transcends all bounds and benefits a diverse and equally needy group of children.

Impact Aid is a contract between the Federal government and the local communities, and we must hold up our end of the deal. As states and communities across the county tighten their budgets, it is now more important than ever, that the Federal government fulfill its contractually obligated responsibility to communities on time, every time. On this 60th Anniversary, we have an opportunity to renew our commitment to Impact Aid and renew our drive to reduce the bureaucratic paralysis plaguing an otherwise successful program.

Programs, like Impact Aid, where the Federal government provides the necessary support and empowers local communities to provide invaluable services, without burdensome one-size fits all regulation, should not only be applauded, but imitated. That is why I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting House Resolution 1641, celebrating the 60th anniversary of the Impact Aid Education Program.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, since my first day in Congress, Impact Aid has always been one of my top priorities. My congressional district in the State of Washington is one of the most heavily impacted by large and vital military installations, including Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Naval Undersea Warfare Center Keyport and Submarine Base Bangor, which are either in or near the Sixth Congressional District. Our region proudly hosts thousands of active duty military personnel and their families, who represent a huge economic force in the Pacific Northwest as they contribute substantially to our nation's security. In addition, Washington is also home to 27 federally recognized Native American tribes, many of which I am proud to represent in Congress.

With the many advantages of these large federal installations comes the loss of a substantial amount of land from the local tax base, however. Nevertheless, local school districts are still required to provide an education to children who live on these bases and other federally-connected, tax-exempt properties. Nationwide, this adds up to more than 1 million children, imposing more than $1 billion in additional costs to these districts. This is the reason Congress created the Impact Aid program 60 years ago.

Although the case in favor of federal Impact Aid payments is clear and compelling, it has frequently been a target for reductions as we have debated the federal budget in Congress. Over the years, cuts to Impact Aid funding have been included in the Presidential budgets submitted to Congress, and occasionally in budget Resolutions considered in the House and Senate.

To defend this vital program in the House of Representatives, I joined with a dozen of my Republican and Democratic colleagues in 1995, led by my good friends CHET EDWARDS and Jim Saxton, to form the House Impact Aid Coalition. Together, we have worked hard to support this program through a number of tough budget years, and I am proud that this program continues to be an important source of funding for nearly 1,500 local education agencies across the country.

At the same time we are celebrating the 60th anniversary of the creation of the Impact Aid program, we are beginning another period in which constrained federal budgets will likely threaten to erode the progress we have made, and so the work of our coalition to build support for Impact Aid will be more important than ever. I regret that the Impact Aid Coalition will be losing some of its great champions—Chairman EDWARDS, IKE SKELTON, EARL POMEROY, and PATRICK KENNEDY—all of whom have worked hard for this cause. But in the 112th Congress I am proud that we will still have more than 100 Members who are committed to preserving this program that means so much to children of military families as well as Native American kids.

So on the occasion of this 60th anniversary of the Impact Aid Program, I join my colleagues in reflecting on the success we've had in preserving this program, and I look forward to working with my colleagues in the years ahead to strengthen it.

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

Ms. HIRONO. With that, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution and continue to support Impact Aid, which truly represents equal educational opportunities for our millions of children across our country. Happy 60th anniversary, Impact Aid.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1641.

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.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL FARM TO SCHOOL MONTH

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1655) expressing support for designation of October as ''National Farm to School Month,'' as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1655

Whereas Farm to School programs of varying scale are currently operational in over 9,700 schools in all 50 States;

Whereas Farm to School programs connect schools and local farms in order to serve healthier meals in school cafeterias;

Whereas Farm to School programs often have experiential education components that can lead to permanent improvements in children's diets both in school and at home;

Whereas Farm to School programs facilitate the purchase of local food for school meals;

Whereas Farm to School programs can benefit small and mid-sized agricultural producers by providing access to consistent markets;

Whereas Farm to School programs can be particularly important for beginning or socially disadvantaged farmers as schools provide a consistent and secure customer base;

Whereas Farm to School programs can benefit local economies, for every $1 spent on local foods in schools, $1 to $3 circulate in the local economy;

Whereas one-third of children in the United States are now obese or overweight, and over the past 3 decades, obesity rates have quadrupled in 6- to 11-year-olds and tripled in 12- to 19-year-olds according to the most recent data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Health and Nutrition Examination survey;

Whereas United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) data shows that only 2 percent of children meet the Food Guide Pyramid serving recommendations;

Whereas communities with high levels of poverty have less access to fresh fruits and vegetables than higher-income communities;

Whereas increased consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables is 1 of 6 major strategies to prevent and control obesity, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

Whereas Farm to School programs can increase children's daily intake of fresh fruits and vegetables and studies have demonstrated that children in schools with an active Farm to School program increased their average consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables by 1 or more servings per day;

Whereas Farm to School programs are popular among children and can increase school lunch participation ranging from 3 percent to 16 percent for all meals; and

Whereas the month of October would be an appropriate month to designate as ''National Farm to School Month'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses support for designation of ''National Farm to School Month'';

(2) encourages schools and local education agencies to use local produce in meals; and

(3) encourages schools, farmers and farm groups, local businesses, nonprofit institutions, churches, cities, State governments, and other local groups to raise awareness of Farm to School efforts in their communities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 1655 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of House Resolution 1655, celebrating National Farm to School Month, which was observed in October of this year.

Farm to School programs bring nutritious products from local farms into the cafeterias of schools in our area. The result is healthier meals, improved student nutrition, and a link to first-hand education in agriculture, health, and nutrition. Exceptionally popular with children, Farm to School programs operate in over 9,700 schools in Hawaii and all 50 States. In schools with a Farm to School program, there is a 3 to 16 percent increase in school lunch participation.

Farm to School programs provide better food options for our kids at school. Since 1980, obesity rates in 6-to 11-year-olds have quadrupled, and for 12- to 19-year-olds they have tripled, according to the Centers for Disease Control. Tragically, over one-third of our children are now obese or overweight. Increasing one's consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables is one of six major strategies to prevent and control obesity. Studies have demonstrated that children in schools with an active Farm to School program increased their average consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables by one or more servings per day.

Farm to School programs also have an important educational component. They allow for taste tests, school gardens, composting, and farm tours, which helps children to clearly connect the food that they eat to their body, communities, and environments.

From an economic standpoint, the program helps local family farms and stimulates the local economy even during these difficult times. Farm to School programs help farmers find a local economy for their produce. Local farmers receive 60 to 70 cents per dollar of the sale price under Farm to School, whereas the average intake a farmer receives from traditional distributors is often less than 20 cents per dollar.

Farm to School products which reach the cafeteria are likely less costly to pack and ship and may have a reduced impact on the environment. In Hawaii, our high costs of land and remote geography require us to import over 85 percent of our food. Farm to School programs can have a major impact on providing Hawaii farmers with an institutional market for their produce and reducing transportation costs.

I have had the privilege to visit several of Hawaii's growing number of Farm to School programs to see their impact firsthand. In August, I visited Ka 'Umeke Ka'eo Hawaiian Immersion Charter School on Hawaii Island. The proud fourth- and fifth-grade students showed me the school garden, which is integrated into class lessons. Most memorable was watching the worm composting process, which, by the way, the kids really liked. I again say mahalo for the tour to the students, Director Alapaki Nahale'a of the Hawaii Charter School Network, School Garden Instructor Pua Mendoca, and Nancy Redfeather of the Hawaii Island School Garden Network.

□ 1730

I also visited the school garden at Waimea Middle Public Conversion Charter School in Kona. I would like to thank Dr. Guy Kaulukukui of the Kohala Center for assisting with the visit. Last year I went to a garden party at Aikahi Elementary in Kailua, sponsored by the Kokua Foundation. At the garden party, we weeded and mulched the gardens for the kindergarten, first, and fifth grade classrooms. In Hawaiian, 'aina means ''land'' or ''earth.'' The Kokua Foundation's 'AINA program stands for Actively Integrate Nutrition and Agriculture in Schools. The program works to foster healthy eating habits, improve children's health, and encourage environmental stewardship.

Since its inception in 1996, Farm to School programs nationwide have been making healthy eating a priority in our schools and building strong community connections. For these reasons, we celebrated and honored Farm to School programs this past October. I congratulate the efforts of Farm to School programs in Hawaii and nationwide.

I want to thank Representative HOLT for introducing this resolution and, once again, express my support for House Resolution 1655.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 1655, expressing support for designation of the month of October 2010 as National Farm to School Month. Farm to School programs operate in every State in more than 9,700 schools and support community-based food systems, strengthen family farms, and improve student health. These programs bring fresh fruits and vegetables to students to help ensure they have access to quality food options and get their recommended daily servings of fruits and vegetables. Ultimately, these programs can help in the fight to end childhood obesity.

Farm to School also supports local businesses. Schools involved in Farm to School programs serve as consistent customers to food producers and help support local farmers and the community. In fact, for every $1 spent through the Farm to School program, $1 to $3 is returned to the local community. The Farm to School program benefits both students and local businesses, and I urge my colleagues to support designating October as National Farm to School Month.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Hawaii.

I rise in support of House Resolution 1655 that I introduced to establish October as National Farm to School Month. I want to thank the leading cosponsor, Representative BETTY MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Chairman MILLER for their help in bringing this to the floor today.

It should not be a surprise that I, as a representative of the Garden State, support bringing Jersey tomatoes and sweet corn into schools. But this is not just a local or provincial resolution. Farm to School programs are a key priority for Agriculture Secretary Vilsack, and First Lady Michelle Obama has planted a garden at the White House with the help of local students to symbolize the good nutrition that comes from fresh foods as well as to educate students about where food comes from.

Farm to School programs can help in the fight against childhood obesity and economically support our local farmers. These programs also help address the troubling rate of childhood obesity. Currently, there are 31 million children who eat school meals 5 days a week, 180 days a year. While the National School Lunch Program does a good job feeding these children, the program has the potential to provide fresher and more healthful foods to millions of children in the United States. Farm to School programs fight obesity by increasing children's daily intake of fresh fruits and vegetables. Farm to School programs also benefit small- and mid-sized agricultural producers by providing access to consistent markets, and they're a great stimulus for the local economy. For every dollar spent on local foods in schools, several dollars circulate in the local economy.

While there are presently more than 10,000 Farm to School programs operational in all 50 States, it is but a fraction of the 94,000 public and nonprofit private schools that are operating the National School Lunch Program. Establishing October as National Farm to School Month would increase awareness and provide the recognition that the existing programs have earned.

Farm to School programs exemplify the best use of Federal school lunch dollars, and I am pleased that this legislation that I wrote to provide $40 million in mandatory funding for Farm to School competitive grants is included in the pending reauthorization of the Child Nutrition Act on which we will vote soon.

I would like to take a moment to thank Megan Lott at the Community Food Security Coalition and Beth Feehan, the director of the New Jersey Farm to School Network, for their efforts in support of this resolution. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and to join us in helping to spread and strengthen Farm to School programs across the country.

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

Ms. HIRONO. Once again, I would urge all my colleagues to support this resolution. As I mentioned, one of the fun things that I got to do in Hawaii was to visit these school farm programs, their agriculture programs. They really do work because the kids definitely do begin to eat their vegetables.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 1655, 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.

CONGRATULATING COACH JOE PATERNO

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1715) congratulating Joe Paterno on his 400th win as Penn State Nittany Lions football coach.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1715

Whereas Joe Paterno reached the milestone of 400 wins as head coach on November 6th, 2010;

Whereas Joe Paterno has served the Pennsylvania State University (Penn State) with honor and distinction for 60 years since starting as an assistant coach in 1950;

Whereas in 2009, the graduation rate of Joe Paterno's players was 89 percent, and the graduation success rate was 85 percent—both of which were the greatest among all football teams in the final 2009 Associated Press Top 25 poll;

Whereas the legacy Joe Paterno has left at Penn State reaches far beyond football, as he has personally given millions of dollars to the university and raised hundreds of millions more for the library and need-based scholarships;

Whereas Joe Paterno has been very active in the community as a strong supporter of the Pennsylvania Special Olympics and a national spokesperson for the Charcot-Marie-Tooth Association;

Whereas Joe Paterno has more wins as head coach than any other in NCAA Division 1A FBS history, surpassing legendary coaches Bear Bryant in 2001 and Bobby Bowden in 2008;

Whereas Penn State is one of just seven teams with more than 800 wins in its history, and Joe Paterno has been active with the program for 692 of those games over 60 seasons with an amazing record of 504–181–7 (72.8 percent);

Whereas among Joe Paterno's accolades in 45 years as head coach are two National Championships, seven undefeated seasons, 23 finishes in the top 10 rankings, and three Big Ten Conference Championships since joining the conference in 1993;

Whereas Joe Paterno has 24 bowl game wins and 36 bowl game appearances, both of which are the most of any coach in history; and

Whereas Joe Paterno's continued dedication to his players and emphasis on academic integrity and education has resulted in Penn State fostering 15 Hall of Fame Scholar-Athletes, 34 first-team and 44 overall Academic All-Americans, and 18 NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship winners: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates Joe Paterno for his unparalleled success with both the Penn State football program and the University, resulting in 400 wins as head coach; and

(2) commends Joe Paterno for setting an on- and off-the-field example of honor, success, integrity, and respect for thousands of players, coaches, students, and fans throughout the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 1715 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. HIRONO. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 1715 which congratulates Joe Paterno for his 400th win as head football coach of the Penn State Nittany Lions. Coach Paterno achieved this milestone win on November 6, 2010, when the Lions beat out the Northwestern Wildcats. This victory gave him more career wins than any other coach in NCAA Division I-A history.

For 60 years, Coach Paterno has served Penn State, first as an assistant coach for 15 years and then head coach for the past 45 years. In his tenure as head coach, Joe Paterno has garnered two national championships, seven undefeated seasons, 23 finishes in the Top 10 rankings, and three Big Ten Conference championships. His 73.6 percent career winning percentage is second-best among all active Football Bowl Subdivision coaches.

These tangible accomplishments mirror the accomplishments of Paterno's players off the field, which he has facilitated by bolstering Penn State's educational facilities. Coach Paterno emphasizes the importance of education for all of his players. In 2009, the Lions had a Federal graduation rate of 89 percent and graduation success rate of 85 percent, according to the Department of Education, the top rates for any college football team that year. His tutelage has helped Penn State cultivate 15 Hall of Fame scholar athletes, 44 academic All-Americans, and 18 NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship winners.

Coach Paterno is also a winner off the football field. He contributes immensely to the Penn State community through charitable donations and volunteering. He and his wife Sue have personally contributed over $4 million to various departments and colleges within Penn State.

Many of you may not know that his love for sports extends beyond football. Coach Paterno and his wife have been adamant supporters of the Special Olympics and, in fact, are in the Special Olympics Hall of Fame.

□ 1740

He is also the national spokesperson for the Charcot-Marie-Tooth Association, a group that raises awareness of CMT, a neurological disorder which affects more than 2 million people worldwide. Paterno uses his star power to encourage donations to this worthy cause. At the ''Honor a Star, Be a Star'' Gala in 2009, Coach Paterno raised a record $350,000 for CMT research.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this resolution and once again congratulate Coach Paterno on his 400th win as Penn State Nittany Lions' head football coach. Coach Paterno has excelled as a well-rounded mentor to young players who continue to translate their skills on the football field to rewarding lives after college.

I thank Representative THOMPSON for his leadership in bringing this resolution forward.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a living legend who has walked on the sidelines of Penn State football games since 1950, Coach Joe Paterno.

To many who watch football, his name is iconic. Joe Paterno, or JoePa as he is known by many, is forever linked with rolled up khakis and black shoes and thick, broad-rimmed glasses and traditional plain blue and white uniforms with no names on the back.

Since starting at Penn State as an assistant coach in 1950 and becoming head coach in 1966, other college football programs have seen their coaches come and go. In Paterno's tenure at Penn State, Presidents and Congresses have come and gone, dating back to the Dwight Eisenhower administration.

In his build-up to 400 wins, Paterno began winning before many coaches on other teams were born. He has turned Penn State football into a powerhouse program, one of only seven football programs in history to have more than 800 wins.

But what makes Joe Paterno so different and well respected by his fellow coaches, players and fans is the manner in which he led and built the program. Paterno emphasizes success with honor on and off the field.

When asked what the milestone meant to Joe, his wife, Sue Paterno, responded that the milestones were not important to the Penn State coach; but, rather, the most important thing to Joe was, to quote, ''The young men you develop.''

Under Joe Paterno, Penn State has had one of the highest graduation rates in college football. In 2009, the graduation rate was 89 percent, the highest of all football teams in the Associated Press Top 25. Paterno has also had 15 Hall of Fame scholar-athletes, 34 first-team Academic All-Americans with 44 overall, and 18 NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship winners.

Joe Paterno has donated millions of his own money back to Penn State University and helped raise hundreds of millions more for need-based scholarships and libraries, one of which is now named the Paterno Library. He is heavily involved in the Special Olympics and is also a national spokesperson for the Charcot-Marie-Tooth Association.

So today we honor Joe Paterno on reaching a historic milestone, his 400th win. He now has the most wins of any coach in Division I-A Football Subdivision history. Along the way he passed other legendary coaches such as Bear Bryant and Bobby Bowden, both of whom Joe Paterno called friends.

At Penn State there is a saying: ''We are Penn State.'' As an alumnus, I know it well and have heard it echo through Beaver Stadium in State College on game day. But what this one coach has done for one school, one program, thousands of players and coaches and the sport altogether has resonated throughout the country. Joe Paterno is Penn State. Joe Paterno is college football.

I urge my colleagues to commend Joe Paterno on this milestone by supporting this resolution.

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

Ms. HIRONO. It is clear that Coach Paterno is not only an exemplary coach, but he is an exemplary human being and a model to us all. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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 Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1715.

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. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECOGNIZING 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EDUCATION FOR ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN ACT

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 329) recognizing the 35th anniversary of the enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 329

Whereas the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94–142), which amended the State grant program under part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act (Public Law 91–230), was enacted into law 35 years ago on November 29, 1975;

Whereas the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 established the Federal policy of ensuring that all children, regardless of the nature or severity of their disability, have available to them a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment;

Whereas the Education of the Handicapped Act of 1975 was further amended by the Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1986 (Public Law 99–457) to create a preschool grant program for children with disabilities 3 to 5 years of age and an early intervention program for infants and toddlers with disabilities from birth through age 2;

Whereas the Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1990 (Public Law 101–476) renamed the statute as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA);

Whereas the IDEA was amended in 1997 to ensure children with disabilities are involved, and make progress, in the general education curriculum and are included in all general State and district-wide assessment programs;

Whereas IDEA was amended in 2004 to ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education that emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs and support them in transitioning to further education, employment, and independent living;

Whereas IDEA currently serves an estimated 342,000 infants and toddlers, 709,000 preschoolers, and 5,890,000 children 6 to 21 years of age;

Whereas IDEA has assisted in a dramatic reduction in the number of children with developmental disabilities who must live in State institutions that are away from their families, costly, inappropriate, and isolated;

Whereas the number of children with disabilities who complete high school with a standard diploma has grown significantly since the enactment of IDEA;

Whereas the number of children with disabilities who enroll in college as freshmen has more than tripled since the enactment of IDEA;

Whereas IDEA has raised the Nation's expectations about the abilities of children with disabilities by requiring access to the general education curriculum;

Whereas improvements to IDEA made in 1997 and 2004 changed the focus of a child's individualized education program from procedural requirements placed upon teachers and related services personnel to educational results for that child, thus improving academic achievement;

Whereas IDEA, along with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, holds schools accountable for the academic performance of students with disabilities;

Whereas IDEA requires full partnership between parents of children with disabilities and education professionals in the design and implementation of the educational services provided to children with disabilities;

Whereas IDEA has supported the classrooms of this Nation by providing Federal resources to the States and local schools to help meet their obligation to educate all children with disabilities;

Whereas while the Federal Government has not yet met its commitment to fund part B of IDEA at 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure, it has made significant increases in part B funding by increasing the appropriation by 81 percent since 2001, which is an increase of over $5,160,000,000;

Whereas IDEA has supported, through its discretionary programs, more than 4 decades of research, demonstration, and training in effective practices for educating and assessing children with disabilities, enabling teachers, related services personnel, and administrators to effectively meet the instructional and assessment needs of children with disabilities of all ages;

Whereas the challenges associated with providing a free appropriate public education to every child with a disability continue despite 35 years of IDEA implementation, including low expectations and an insufficient focus on applying replicable research on proven methods of teaching and learning for children with disabilities, requiring a continued commitment to improvement; and

Whereas IDEA continues to serve as the framework to marshal the resources of this Nation to implement the promise of full participation in society of children with disabilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) recognizes the 35th anniversary of the enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94–142);

(2) acknowledges the many and varied contributions of children with disabilities and their parents, teachers, related services personnel, and administrators; and

(3) reaffirms its support for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) so that all children with disabilities have—

(A) access to a free appropriate public education; and

(B) an equal opportunity to benefit from the general education curriculum and be prepared for further education, employment, and independent living.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 329 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. HIRONO. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 329, which recognizes the 35th anniversary of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, later renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. This historic statute guarantees that all children, regardless of the nature of their disability, have the right to a free, appropriate public education.

Prior to IDEA, many children with disabilities were placed in segregated institutions with no expectation for success. As a result of IDEA, children with disabilities have been increasingly included in general education settings and have had the opportunity to receive the same education as their non-disabled peers.

Over the years, the original bill has been amended several times to bolster educational opportunities for children with disabilities. An amendment in 1986 created preschool grant programs for children ages 3 to 5 and early intervention programs for those under the age of 3.

In 1997 IDEA was again amended to ensure that students with disabilities have access to the general education curriculum and are fully included in State assessments. In 2004, all students with disabilities were guaranteed to receive an education that considers their transition to higher education, employment and independent living.

Currently, IDEA serves about 350,000 infants and toddlers, 700,000 preschoolers, and 5.9 million children ages 6 through 21. In Hawaii nearly 18,000 students receive IDEA services in grades K–12. Since the enactment of IDEA, the number of students with disabilities graduating from high school with a regular diploma and enrolling in college has increased dramatically. However, we still face challenges in providing a free and appropriate education to children with disabilities, and student outcomes remain too low.

As we celebrate the successes of IDEA, we must continue to improve access to free and appropriate education for students with disabilities. We must ensure that all students are held to high expectations and have the opportunity to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my fellow Members for cosponsoring this legislation and again express my support for House Concurrent Resolution 329, which recognizes the 35th anniversary of the enactment of the Education for all Handicapped Children Act of 1975, also known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1750

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 329, which recognizes the 35th anniversary of the enactment of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA.

Thirty-five years ago, President Gerald Ford signed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act into law. This historic legislation, now known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, was a major milestone in the quest to end the chronic exclusion and miseducation of students with exceptional needs. More than any other law to date, this legislation helped open the door to fairness and access for millions of children with disabilities and paved the way to greater educational access.

As recent as 40 years ago, most States excluded students with disabilities from public schools. All that began to change in 1971. In PARC v. Pennsylvania, a class-action lawsuit filed in my home State, the U.S. District Court ruled, for the first time, that the State had a legal duty to educate students with intellectual disabilities, and that the U.S. Constitution guarantees of equal protection and due process prevent schools from excluding disabled children solely on the basis of their disabilities. This monumental decision was followed by similar decisions in 27 States and the District of Columbia.

During this time and shortly thereafter, Congress amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to include funds for the education of disabled children and created a Bureau of Education for the Handicapped within the U.S. Office of Education. It also boosted funding for States under the Education for the Handicapped Act of 1970 and required States to detail their plans for achieving the goal of full educational opportunities for disabled students. It also passed section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which granted specific protections to disabled students. But it wasn't until 1975, with the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, that States and school districts were required to provide a free appropriate public education to students with disabilities.

Under the law, each child must have an Individualized Education Program, or IEP, that details the range of services to be provided and where a student's education is to take place, with a heavy preference for the mainstreaming of disabled children whenever possible. The law also mandates that districts establish procedures for ensuring that parents are involved in the development of each IEP and they have a voice in the district's decisions about the range of services it will provide.

In 2004, Congress passed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act to reauthorize the law. During this latest renewal, we worked to strengthen the focus on academic achievement through the development of the child's IEP, gave parents more control over the education of their children, fostered better communication between parents and school district officials, and supported high-quality special education teachers.

While there is still much work that remains, including meeting the Federal

commitment to provide 40 percent of the excess cost of educating students with disabilities, there is no doubt that IDEA has been an important part of ensuring that students with disabilities are able to become full and productive members of society.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 329.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HIRONO. Once again, I urge all of my 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 Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 329.

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. HIRONO. 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.

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 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.)

BRANDON RANDOLPH MICHAEL

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, I recently got a letter from a grieving family in Florida. Their young 21-year-old son was killed 3 years ago in a senseless homicide by an illegal. The family is still seeking justice, however. This is their son's story.

On August 15, 2007, Brandon Randolph Michael was on the way to his lunch break. This is Brandon's photograph right here. He was driving to the credit union to cash his payroll check. His vehicle was struck by a car driven by a twice-deported illegal named Mario Tellez. Brandon's car flipped over several times and landed on its hood. Brandon was thrown into a ditch.

The illegal driver, Mario Tellez, got out of his vehicle and calmly sat on the curb. He did nothing to help Brandon. He did not call for aid. He did nothing but watch Brandon struggle when he took his last breaths.

Tellez refused to admit he was driving the vehicle, and Brandon's family had to go through a torturous, lengthy trial.

Brandon's family found out that Tellez had been in this country illegally for 7 years. He was working and sending his money back to Mexico, even after having already been deported two times.

It took a jury only 20 minutes to find him guilty of driving without a license and causing the death of another person, that being Brandon. The defendant was sentenced to only 2 years in the penitentiary, 2 years for taking the life of another individual.

Tellez has now served the 2 years for murdering Brandon Michael, and, upon release, he was deported yet again. But here is the rest of the story.

Tellez's friend, a Richard Curtis, admitted during the trial that he harbored the illegal fugitive for years and hid him out, and Curtis was never prosecuted.

It was Richard Curtis' automobile that Mario Tellez was driving when he killed Brandon Michael. Curtis worked for the Federal Government. And, get this. He worked for the IRS. Don't the laws apply to Federal bureaucrats as well as other people in this country?

So the family asked the Florida State Attorney's Office, ICE, State, and local law enforcement officers to enforce the law. The family is asking them to charge Richard Curtis with harboring, aiding, and abetting an illegal fugitive in this country.

But no one has prosecuted this apparent lawbreaker. And why not? No one seems to be talking. Brandon's family deserves some answers.

Brandon's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Michael, wanted me to know how precious their son Brandon was to them.

□ 1800

Here is what they said about him. They said he was a fun person to be around. He loved life, he celebrated with people, and he was seldom ever sad. He made others happy. He was looking forward to getting married and starting a family. And he was a Dallas Cowboys fan. He played the keyboard. And he played several different sports growing up, from T-ball as a small child to football in high school. He grew up with a loving middle-class family that raised him to respect people and respect the law.

Brandon loved giving to those that had less than him. He helped feed the hungry. He often called his friends and asked them for blankets, coats and shoes so he could give them away to the needy in his area. While in middle school, Brandon and his sister were pages for the local city council meetings. He worked hard for the car that he was driving on that dreadful day he was killed by a person illegally in this country.

Brandon loved animals and had just about every type during his childhood. He wanted to be a veterinarian.

This is a real American family, suffering real consequences because of lax immigration and border enforcement laws in this country. Brandon's life was cut short by a twice-deported illegal who should not have been in the country in the first place.

Brandon's family is a very close-knit group. They told me they have worked hard to raise children that loved the Lord and loved others and loved this country.

The family said others things. The father, Richard Michael, well, first of all, he defended this country for 20 years in the military, and the family feels as though our country has turned a deaf ear on their plight and their situation. Our government officials that they have trusted seem to have turned their backs on this case and Brandon's death.

The time to enforce the laws in this country is now, and they asked me how many American children such as their precious son have to be killed at the hands of illegals before our government gets serious about enforcing the laws of the land? They said, ''We cannot afford to ignore this enormous problem any longer. We don't want another family to endure what we have been through and are still going through.''

Mr. Speaker, Brandon Randolph Michael is worth the fight to get it right in this country, to enforce the laws that we have, to prosecute the guilty, to deport criminal aliens, and to secure the borders, because it is a national security issue to protect the lives of people like this.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING NOVEMBER AS AMERICAN DIABETES MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, every minute, three people are diagnosed with diabetes. Every day, almost 200 people undergo an amputation because of the disease. Fifty people go blind and one hundred thirty people enter end-stage kidney disease programs. If current trends continue, one in three children will face a future with diabetes. That is one of the most frightening statistics I have read in a long time.

The disease is at epidemic proportions, with nearly 24 million children and adults living with the disease and another 57 million Americans with prediabetic conditions, according to the American Diabetes Association.

So what is the cost of this epidemic? Almost one in every five health care dollars is attributed to caring for someone with diabetes. Just in my district in Pennsylvania, a 2007 estimate says it cost more than $323 million. Nationwide the price tag is $218 billion and climbing, but that figure includes

complications from undiagnosed diabetes, prediabetic, and gestational diabetes.

November is American Diabetes Month. I have cosponsored H. Res. 1690, a resolution recognizing November as American Diabetes Month, and I encourage Members to visit diabetes.org to learn of the ABCs of diabetes and keeping it under control.

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

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

PUTTING WASTEFUL DEFENSE SPENDING ON THE CHOPPING BLOCK

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last week the cochairs of the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform released their draft proposal. I don't agree with all of their recommendations, but I am encouraged to see that they believe wasteful Pentagon spending can and must be a prime target.

For years I have been calling for substantial cuts in the kinds of defense systems and programs, many of them left as relics from the Cold War, that are doing absolutely nothing for modern-day military preparedness.

The Congressional Progressive Caucus has outlined specific cuts totaling more than $600 billion. I am pleased, for example, that the Commission shares our contempt for the V–22 Osprey, which has been notorious for cost overruns as well as safety problems that have led to the accidental deaths of 30 servicemembers; billions of dollars over budget for a weapons system that is killing our own people. Not a good deal. Not a good deal for the taxpayers, to say the least.

Likewise, I am inclined to support the Commission's proposal to eliminate one-third of overseas military bases, and I agree that it is time to pull the plug on the Marine Corps' Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle, which breaks down every 8 hours on average and doesn't steer well in water.

On the other hand, I don't agree with the Commission that any kind of salary freeze is the way to go. The last thing we should do is take out our fiscal woes on the men and women, civilian or uniformed, combat or noncombat, charged with protecting the country.

My hope instead is that this body will consider some of the other Congressional Progressive Caucus recommendations. For example, has our military defense system really justified its enormous expense? And what about our nuclear weapons stockpile? We could save $15 billion a year by reducing that number of warheads to 1,000, which is still enough, Mr. Speaker, to blow up that world many, many times over.

There has been much noise made on the other side of the aisle about the size of government and supposedly out-of-control Federal spending. But many of the same folks using those talking points haven't exactly shown great restraint when it comes to the defense budgets. So I will be curious to see when they take over the majority in January, will they move to cut bloated defense programs, or does their zeal for spending cuts extend only to those domestic programs that are helping struggling families get through a recession?

That bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is this: You are not serious about closing the deficit unless you are prepared to put military spending on the table. By recommending specific cutbacks on the defense side, the Deficit Commission has at least started the conversation.

Of course, the Commission doesn't really address the elephant in the room, the ongoing war in Afghanistan and our continued military commitment in Iraq. Together their cost has already exceeded $1 trillion over the last decade. And what have we gotten for the expense? A foreign policy blunder of epic proportions, one that has cost thousands of Americans their lives without truly stabilizing the countries we invaded, without combating terrorism in a meaningful way, without advancing our national security interests.

Fiscal responsibility, Mr. Speaker, and enormous cost savings; yet one more reason to bring our troops home and bring them home now.

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

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

FAREWELL REMARKS

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will leave Congress at the end of this session with a sense of duty fulfilled, having given my all to the people of the 21st District of Florida, who have honored me by electing me and reelecting me to nine terms in Congress.

I feel deep satisfaction not only in the achievements of my term of service, such as the codification into law of the U.S. embargo on the Cuban tyranny, requiring the liberation of all political prisoners without exceptions, and the scheduling of free and fair multiparty elections in Cuba before the President of the United States can lift U.S. sanctions; or the Nicaraguan adjustment and Central American Relief Act, which granted legal residency in the United States to hundreds of thousands of our Central American brothers and sisters who were previously facing deportation. My most profound satisfaction comes from having given my all, each and every day, to my constituents.

□ 1810

I, as a private citizen, will work to help the freedom fighters inside Cuba who are resisting the brutality of the Castro tyranny with ultimate courage and patriotism. They are my heroes. As Cuban political prisoner Angel Moya wrote from his dungeon in the Castro-Cuban gulag a few days ago: "My spirit is the same; it is full of joy because I am in prison for fighting for the dignity and rights of the Cuban people. I am ready to continue resisting—physically, morally, and spiritually." Mr. Speaker, I will continue to do all in my power to help in the struggle for the freedom of Cuba.

This country, the United States of America, is a miracle—a miracle of generosity of spirit, a miracle of freedom, of human dignity, and opportunity. May God forever preserve and protect this great land and people. For the rest of my days I will feel deeply honored to have been a Member of the Congress of the United States of America.

To all of my colleagues, those who have helped me and those who have opposed me, thank you. Thank you for the honor of having been able to serve along with you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEINRICH). 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 Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

(Mr. GRAYSON 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 New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HEALTH CARE AND THE NEW CONGRESS

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I want to do what I do often, which is come to the floor of the House and talk to my colleagues on both sides about the issues that remain in health care. This Congress, as it winds down in its last days, has certainly seen and done some dramatic work and has seen some dramatic pushback by the American people on some of the work that's been done.

So I thought it might be useful as we wind up this last part of the 111th Congress, the Congress that will forever go down in history as that which has fundamentally changed the way every man, woman, and child in this country receives and will receive health care for the next several generations, I thought it appropriate to talk a little bit about how we got to where we are, and quite frankly what I see over the horizon, what is likely to occur in the next Congress that convenes in the early part of January.

Certainly, when you look at the history that was written by this Congress, starting off with all the bright prospects in early 2009, in January 2009, and even going back a few months before that, I honestly thought that the health care bill that would see the light of day in the House was something that would actually be written by the Senate Finance Committee before this Congress was ever sworn in. I was, frankly, surprised when the Congress was sworn in and in fact inauguration day came and went and there was no introduction of a health care bill.

Then, of course, we all remember that there was a former Senate majority leader who was asked to be the Secretary of Health and Human Services, but that nomination got derailed by some tax difficulties and that post remained vacant for several months. During that hiatus, no health care bill came to the floor of the House. And it really wasn't until Senators Kennedy and BAUCUS in early June of 2009 wrote a letter to the President and said, We will in fact introduce our health care bill through our committees, that the country got a glimpse as to what was in store for this fundamental restructuring of health care that had been promised by the new administration.

The health care bill that came through the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee in June of 2009 was originally scored by the Congressional Budget Office as costing over a trillion dollars and providing insurance for an additional 13 million people. Well, wait a minute. We were told there were 37 million uninsured. Thirteen million is only about a third of that. Is that all we get for our trillion dollars?

And then, after that Congressional Budget Office report, really all of the discussion for almost the rest of that year became all about cost and coverage numbers and no bill was introduced without a CBO, Congressional Budget Office, score to say what the cost and coverage numbers were going to be. So in fact the Senate Finance Committee did not introduce a bill until much later in the year 2009.

Now in the summer of 2009, three House committees—my committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Education and Labor, the Committee on Ways and Means, all three simultaneously introduced a health care bill that was large, voluminous, and contained a lot of government control over the lives of every ordinary American. People were concerned when they saw that bill come to the floor of the House in the middle of July of 2009. But every committee reported it out with some amendments by the end of July of 2009, which took us to the August recess.

The August recess of 2009 is something that I suspect no Member who was serving in this body, again, on either side of the aisle, will ever forget, those summer town halls in August of 2009, when people showed up in numbers that were absolutely unprecedented for town halls, at least in my experience, and were concerned about the direction the Congress was taking with this restructuring of the Nation's health care; and in fact of what they had seen, they quite frankly didn't like it and wanted to tell us so.

I had an advantage in my summer town halls in August of 2009 in that having voted against the bill as it left committee, my committee of Energy and Commerce, late in the evening of July 31 before coming home for the August recess, I could honestly say I voted against the bill in committee and would oppose it when it came to the floor because in my opinion it was a terribly flawed product. But during the course of the month of August we heard over and over again from people who were, again, concerned about the direction Congress was taking. And they didn't tell us that some reform was not necessary. What they told us was, You are making us uncomfortable with this approach that changes everything fundamentally about how health care is delivered in the country.

Arguably 60, 65 percent of the country was okay with the way health care was being administered and did not want to see that change. Yes, there were people who had problems. There were problems with preexisting conditions. There were problems with people who lacked the ability to get insurance. But what the country told us during those summer town halls is we'd like you to work on that and not restructure the whole health care system which the rest of us are depending upon to get our health care. But we did precisely the opposite of what we were told.

The other thing we were told is, Could you do something about cost? Is there a way to rein in cost. Is there a way to help us with the cost of health care in the future, because we are legitimately concerned about the rapidly escalating cost of health care and whether that will price us out of the market at some point as well. So those two things: don't disrupt the system as it exists today and help us with cost for the future. Those two things seemed to be absolutely ignored by this United States Congress as it went through the process.

Now, I thought after those very contentious summer town halls that Congress would come back to town in September of 2009 and maybe hit the pause button or the rewind button or at least the stop button for a short period of time and recalibrate this. Clearly, a big, long, thousand-page bill dealing with health care upset a lot of people. Is there a way to come back and do this in a more reasonable fashion. Perhaps just tackling some of those things that the people told us they wanted to see fixed, things like the equal treatment of the Tax Code; things like help for people with preexisting conditions; things like the ability to buy insurance across State lines; things like reform of the medical justice system. Maybe those were the places where we could actually do some good and show some value for the American people.

But, again, it was not to be. In fact, the President of the United States came here to the well of the House and gave us a long discussion about the health care process in the bill and how it was going to go forward. At no time did I hear that maybe we ought to stop for a short period of time and listen to what the August town halls were telling us.

So it was full speed ahead. And later on that fall—actually a year ago, early November of 2009—this House passed the bill that had come through the three committees. Oddly enough, it was a thousand-page bill when it left the committees. It was a 2,000-page bill when it came back to the floor after it emerged from the Speaker's office, presumably with a fair amount of input by the White House and the administration as to the writing of this bill.

□ 1820

It came to the floor of the House. It passed the floor of the House by the

slimmest of margins, and then it was off to the Senate.

Now, a funny thing happened in November and December of last year over in the Senate. The other body did not just take up our health care bill and begin to work on that and then bring it back to a conference committee. The other body started with an entirely new bill. It was a House bill. It had a House bill number, 3590, which had previously passed the House as a housing bill. Yet the Senate did not take up our health care bill. They took up a housing bill, and then amended it to strip out the housing language and insert the health care language so that what passed on Christmas Eve, just ahead of a big snowstorm that was headed to town, was H.R. 3590, which started life as a housing bill and then ended life as a health care bill; but in the process of getting there, it really did upset people, and people were genuinely disquieted by the process that they saw.

What will it take to get to 60 votes? What will it take to get your vote, Senator? We saw various things: the Cornhusker kickback, the Louisiana purchase, Gator-aid, the Yukon up in Connecticut, and all of these special deals that were required to get the 60 votes over in the Senate. The American people looked at that and asked, If this bill is so great, why are they really having to encourage Senators to vote in favor of it?

The bill passed on Christmas Eve. The normal process would have been to convene some type of House-Senate conference to work out the differences between the two. Yet then, in early January of 2010, a special election was held up in the State of Massachusetts to fill the Senate seat that had previously been occupied by Senator Kennedy. A Republican won the seat for the first time since who knows when, and it was such a disruption to the process that many people in the other body said, There's no way we can get to 60 votes on a conference report. We're just going to have to take the bill as it passed here.

It was possible to do that because, remember, the Senate passed a bill that had previously passed the House. It had passed the House as a housing bill. It had gone over to the Senate and had become a health care bill. It could come back to the House. Will the House now concur with the Senate amendment to H.R. 3590? If the House concurs with a simple 218 majority, with a simple majority, then that bill gets on a fast track down to the East Room of the White House for a signing ceremony.

When that subject was first approached, the Speaker of the House at the time said that there weren't 100 votes in the House for the Senate-passed bill, and I think she was right about that, but somehow during the months of January, February and 3 weeks into March enough individuals in this House were convinced to vote for the health care bill so that it, indeed, was passed in the third week of March of this year.

Now, it was a deeply unpopular bill when it passed. It never gained in popularity. In fact, 2 weeks ago, we saw the result of that with the midterm election when so many incumbent Democrats who had voted in favor of the bill—in fact, some who hadn't voted for the bill but had allowed the process to continue which allowed the bill to come to the floor—saw that they were not successful in their reelection efforts. That happens. Wave elections happen. Certainly, Republicans were on the receiving end of a wave election in 2006, but this one did seem to be tied to the health care bill. So you have to ask yourself, Why was this so deeply unpopular?

People around the country said the health care system at times is not functioning as we would like. You would think that they would welcome the appearance of a House and Senate bill, but here is the problem: There were many things in the bill that really were seen as a vast overreach of the Federal Government. Certainly, the individual mandate requiring every man, woman, and child in this country to purchase insurance, whether they want it or not, and to use the Commerce Clause as a justification for doing that really struck a lot of people as going too far. It was really the first time that the United States Government said that we can require you to purchase a product, in this case health insurance, and the reason we can do that is that then we're going to regulate said insurance under the Commerce Clause.

Well, apply it to some other product other than health insurance and you'll really begin to see the danger of that argument. What if it's an automobile? What if it's a certain type of kitchen appliance? How can the Federal Government insert itself into the lives of Americans to that degree?

Remember, we heard previous speakers talk about how great this country is and about how great the United States Congress is. Remember, American exceptionalism comes from the fact that, over 200 years ago, our Founders got together and said there really ought to be a way that the people can see the necessary functions of government occur but only with their consent—government by the consent of the governed. It was kind of a novel approach. The Founders, when they wrote the Declaration of Independence, said our rights come from the Creator, not from our government. They come from the Creator to the individual. They are unalienable. They cannot be taken away from the individual. Then the individual loans the ability to be governed to the government.

Yet now we have the government which is dictating to the individual: You have to buy a certain type of health insurance policy that we are going to designate. We're going to tell you what it has to cover and what it can't cover, and we're going to tell you what the price is going to be. We can do that under the Commerce Clause of the Constitution. Many people said, That's just more than I ever believed my government could do.

Again, government with the consent of the governed—a novel concept in the field of human endeavor. That notion really seemed to be turned on its head with the passage of this health care law, and I really believe that that is one of the fundamental reasons that there has been such an intense, ubiquitous rejection across the country of the concept of the bill that was signed into law by President Obama last March.

Now, almost a year ago, President Obama told Charles Gibson on television, If we don't pass health reform, here is the guarantee: Your premiums will go up. Your employers are going to load up more costs on you, the individual buying health insurance. Potentially, they're going to drop your coverage because they just can't afford these increases.

That was one of the rationales the President used to push health care reform. Well, what is happening now?

I was home in my district during the month of October, which was prior to the election. People were coming to my office, saying, Look, you've got to do something. Since you passed this bill, the cost of insurance has gone up so rapidly—10 percent, 20 percent, in some cases 30 percent or more—that I just simply cannot keep up with the cost, and I'm looking at having to drop coverage for my employees. Then, of course, with the fines that will result in a few years when those kick in, employers are justifiably concerned about where this is all going.

Now, you do hear the discussion that perhaps the cost of insurance is going up just because the insurers are trying to take advantage of the situation before more of these regulations and controls come on line. Maybe that's true. Maybe it's because the insurers are having to meet more of the mandates that were put out under the health care law. Maybe that's true. How would we know the difference?

Well, we could do a hearing. My committee might have been a good place to have had a hearing and to have asked those questions, but we didn't do that. My committee has had no hearings on the implementation of this health care law since it was passed in March of this year. My committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, has a rich tradition of providing oversight for the Federal agencies under its jurisdiction. Health and Human Services is one of those agencies. The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services is one of those agencies.

Why have we not had a hearing on the implementation of the health care law? I can only speculate that it has certainly not been good for constituents and certainly not even for insurance companies. No one at this point

knows exactly what is expected of them, but what people do know is that they were promised, if this health care bill passed, we would not see our premiums go up and, if we didn't pass the health care law, that premiums would go up. We passed the health care law, and premiums are on the way up, and they're on the way up in a big way.

I've mentioned the process of how we got here and of how, indeed, disjointed and poisonous it was. Remember, during the Presidential campaign—and the President talked about this as a campaign issue—all of these negotiations were going to be open; they were going to be covered on C–SPAN, and he was going to have everyone around a big table. He said we'd get bored watching it but that all of it would be out in the open. Then the process went behind closed doors for months, and the reality is there was no transparency to this process. Again, it was a violation of one of those fundamental things. People thought that they could trust the incoming administration to be transparent in this regard, and they got anything but transparency.

□ 1830

In my committee of Energy and Commerce, I filed a resolution of inquiry—resolution of inquiry to get information from six groups that met down at the White House in May of 2009. Who were these six groups? Well, the doctors were one, hospitals, insurance companies to be sure. Medical device manufacturers also were included. The pharmaceutical companies were included, and the Service Employees International Union was included.

That meeting occurred in May of 2009. Everyone came out of the meeting and said we've saved $2 trillion, we've got $2 trillion in savings in the health care system that will now help pay for this health care reform. So we've done a good job.

I began to ask the White House for some of the information about where this $2 trillion in savings, where it was going to occur, who gave up what, who promised what, who was promised what, and never could get anything more than copies of a press release here or copies of a Web page there, stuff that was generally available through the open source, but never any of the details on these meetings, never any of the e-mails between the participants.

So, in December of last year, I filed a resolution of inquiry, which is one of the few tools you have in the minority to get information when the administration is not forthcoming. This resolution of inquiry must come up for a vote in committee within a certain period of time, a certain number of legislative days, or it comes to the floor of the House as a privileged resolution.

Well, obviously the majority does not want that to happen. So, indeed, in fact, ironically the same day that the State of the Union Address was delivered in January of this year, we had a meeting in the Committee on Energy and Commerce to consider my resolution of inquiry. And, in fact, to his credit Chairman WAXMAN agreed with many of the things for which I was asking and said we should have copies of those documents. He would not agree to report out favorably the resolution of inquiry, but did agree to write a letter with Ranking Member BARTON to ask the White House to provide this information. Well, that was 11 months ago, and I am still waiting for that information. It has yet to be forthcoming.

It's important stuff. I realize that much time has passed since then, but look at one of the things we're going to talk about in just a moment is the problems that America's seniors and America's doctors have because of the pay formula under Medicare, under what's called the sustainable growth rate formula. There is apparently a very large cost associated with fixing that problem. If money was given up in the health care bill, why not have some of it be given up as a down payment on fixing that problem with the sustainable growth rate formula?

And in fact, as the bill progressed and we saw the scoring by the Congressional Budget Office, indeed, at some point, over $400 billion over the 10-year budgetary cycle is removed from Medicare to pay for the new entitlement of subsidies, helping people purchase insurance in the exchanges that are going to be set up in 2014. But the problem is you took all that money out of Medicare and didn't even get a down payment, not even have a down payment on resolving the problem with the sustainable growth rate formula.

So I really would like to see what occurred in those meetings and what the discussion was. Surely the sustainable growth rate formula came up because any time you get two doctors together, that's almost all they can talk about. So around this table, was this not part of the discussion?

The Service Employees International Union, what did they give up, or what did they get? Did they get more than they gave up? Again, we don't know these facts, so we are left to only suppose or wonder what occurred and what transpired in that meeting.

It should never have been necessary to file the resolution of inquiry in the first place because this administration came into office saying that they were going to be the most transparent administration in history, and that all of these health care negotiations would be open and on C–SPAN for all to see, and yet, at the same time, I had to file a resolution.

As would be expected, the committee and Democrats hold a vast majority on the committee right now. That's going to change after the first of the year, but the resolution would never be reported out favorably. The chairman did sign a letter for me to get some information, but unfortunately, that information has not been forthcoming, and then at this point, it's very, very difficult to force the administration to do anything they're not inclined to do when you're still in the minority. But again, that will change within a period of weeks. So I'm very glad about that, and certainly this is an issue that I intend to continue to pursue.

You know, one of the things that's come up in the past couple of days—and we'll talk about it a little bit more—but the issue of waivers, starting about maybe the last week or so in October, where very famously the McDonald's Corporation got a waiver from the health care law for a period of a year, and then in rapid succession many more companies were given waivers, and now I think that number stands at over 100, the last time I checked on healthcare.gov.

Where do these waivers come from? Why are they necessary? Who's giving them? Who's getting them? Who's not getting them? What are the rules? What are the parameters by which these waivers are established? If the health care law was so wisely crafted and carefully put together as we heard over and over again on the floor of this House, why is it now necessary to give companies waivers?

When I have companies call my office back home, they say, you know, I saw where a company got a waiver for that health care law; I sure would like one of those, too. How can I go about getting one? And right now, again, the process is anything but transparent, and no one really knows how to advise companies to do that. I suspect we will see a great many more waivers given as the months go by, as companies have greater awareness about this.

Again, remember, one of the things that the President said that if we don't do what he said we had to do in this health care law, the premium prices were going to go up so much that employers were going to drop coverage, and yet, shortly after the bill was signed, documents received from several large companies who said, you know, we're going to have to restate our earnings now because of the passage of the health care law. The chairman of my committee, HENRY WAXMAN, sent out requests for information to all of these companies and said how dare you try to embarrass the President on the day the bill is signed. We want to see what you're referring to when you say you're going to have to restate earnings. Turns out that's to comply with the Securities and Exchange Commission regulation that if the company's profits are going to substantially change, they are required to let people know about that.

But part of the information that was delivered to the committee showed that large companies across the country were at least considering what the future holds for them; a company, say, that has a couple of hundred thousand employees where they're paying 8- to $10,000 per employee for health insurance, but on the other side if they don't provide that health insurance,

which they must under law, or they're going to get fined $2,000. Well, the insurance policy costs 8- to $10,000, the fine is $2,000. Doing some quick math on that, companies with large numbers of employees were suddenly looking at significant savings that could be available to that company, and now were they obligated to do the correct thing from a fiduciary standpoint and just opt out of providing employer-sponsored insurance and let their employees buy insurance in the State exchanges, which have yet to be set up, and as a consequence only pay that fine, rather than the 8- to $10,000 premium.

Clearly, clearly, some companies had thought about the implications of this. Now, to the best of my knowledge, no company has said yet this is what we are going to do, or this is what's going to happen, but if one company makes that decision, companies with a similar business model are likely going to have to consider the same trajectory because they have to compete in the same marketplace as the first company who has now allowed their employees to go into the exchange.

So it is a big deal, and it is affecting the ability for employers to provide health insurance, and the cost has done anything but go down.

Big concern about what's going to happen in both Medicare and Medicaid, but let's take on Medicare for just a moment because here we are in the very waning hours of the 111th Congress. We're in the so-called lame duck period after the election before the new Congress is sworn in. So as this Congress limps through the remainder of its congressional term, one of the things that we have to do, one of the things that Congress has to take up and deal with is what has perennially been known as the doc fix.

The doc fix is an adjustment to the sustainable growth rate formula that allows doctors to be appropriately reimbursed for seeing Medicare patients and providing medical care to Medicare patients. Why is that important? Because if they're not appropriately reimbursed, they can't afford to keep their doors open, they drop out of the Medicare program, patients can't find doctors and they complain to their Congressman.

So this is something that historically has happened, but as a consequence of multiple times doing this fix, the cost has now gotten so high that it becomes very difficult for Congress to pass that legislation, and maybe I could just take you through a few of the simple steps that occur in this process.

□ 1840

Here is the formula that's printed on the Web site for the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. It's a calculation for the payment formula under the physician fee schedule. Here is the payment formula: (RVUw × GPCIw) + RVUPC × GPCI.

Okay, that is starting to look pretty complicated. But if you look down here at the key for the acronyms, you begin to get an idea of what this is trying to do. RVUw, the relative value unit for work. The payment is going to be based on the relative value unit as determined by a Federal agency—not by the doctor's office, but the relative value unit for work. It is going to be modified by a geographic practice cost index for that value unit of work and then every value unit of work is further going to be modified by another constant for practice expenses as well as some geographic consideration, another based on the subscript for buying liability insurance. And then at the end, it's all times a conversion factor.

So this looks pretty complicated, but I guess you could muddle through that. But unfortunately what we don't really get is, What is the conversion factor? Well, let's take us through that just a little bit as well. So on another page of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Web site is the calculation of the conversion factor, and you have the conversion factor for the current year. It's equal to the conversion factor for a prior year, plus an update. Well, how do you get the update? Come down here, and this is how you calculate the update. One plus the Medicare economic index increase, over 100, times one, plus—wait a minute, what's UAF? Where did that come from? Wait a minute. Update adjustment factor. Well, how do you calculate the update adjustment factor?

Going to another page on the CMS Web site is how you calculate the update adjustment factor, and a lot of calculations are here. But what becomes significant is that you actually have to go back in time over 10 years and recapture the savings that should have occurred had the formula been allowed to take effect. And that is the problem with repealing what's called the sustainable growth rate formula.

Well, Congress in June passed a temporary patch that took us to November 30 of this year, and we have to do something by November 30 to postpone this update, which is actually a reduction—now almost a 30 percent reduction in physician reimbursement. Patients are clamoring for us to do this. They say it's an access issue to get in to see our doctors, and it has to be fixed.

This has been the worst year for the sustainable growth rate formula that I have ever seen in my brief tenure in Congress. We let it expire in April. We allowed it to expire in June, and now we're 2 weeks away from another expiration date. Now what do I mean when I say ''We let it expire''? Well, Congress was coming up against a congressional recess, the Easter recess, a 2-week recess, and for whatever reason could not get the so-called doc fix or the postponement of the SGR formula, Congress could not get that passed. The Democrats were unable to get that to the floor of the House and get it done. And as a consequence, we went home. Congress adjourned for Easter recess with the doctors having no resolution but the deadline of March 31 passing.

Well, okay, no problem. We'll just ask the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services to hold those reimbursement checks until Congress gets back to town in 2 weeks and fixes that problem so that when the checks go out, there will not be a reduction on those checks. Well, I've just got to tell you, if you're in a small physician office—and I would characterize ''small'' as being two, three, four, five, or six doctors—if you are in a small physician office, and even if only 15 percent of your business is Medicare business, you cut 15 percent off the operating capital of a four-, five-, or six-physician office, and that's a big deal. That's going to make it difficult for that office to cash flow for that month. And in a doctor's office, if you don't cash flow, you still have to pay the light bill, you still have to pay the cost of your supplies, you still have to pay your help, you still have to pay your taxes; so you are probably not paying yourself that month. And that, in fact, happened in small- and medium-sized physician offices all over this country.

Well, if that wasn't bad enough, when Congress finally came back and passed the fix, it was only for a couple of months' time. So June 1, the same darn thing happens. And as a consequence, we're up against another adjournment date, another recess, and the same thing repeats itself. The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services holds checks for a couple of weeks and, once again, practices all over the country say, Oh, my gosh. Here we go again. We've just barely recovered from this last one, and now we've got another one where they're holding a portion of our cash flow up every month, the people who write the checks for Medicare, for the work we have already done.

Well, in June, there was a 6-month extension passed again that carried us to November 30. So that is where we are today. Well, bear in mind that Congress is very close to adjourning for the end of the year. So are we going to get this problem taken care of this week? It's pretty hard to see how we do. There are leadership elections going on. We've got to elect a new Speaker of the House. Committee chairs have to be selected. So this week is taken up with just a lot of institutional stuff. We're doing some suspension bills on the floor, to be sure; but I haven't seen or heard any language for doing something to at least forestall this cut.

If it doesn't happen by November 30, December, as you can imagine, is a tough month to get things done. What if those checks are held? Well, yeah, it's a bad deal because of the holidays that are coming up, and that's a bad deal. But in addition to the physician offices that are now in a cash crunch, they are also trying to do their tax planning for the end of the year. They're trying to do their purchases for the end of the year. They're trying to do planning into next year. And we're not allowing them the ability to do that because they've been burned

twice already by the United States Congress, burned. Burned twice this year. That's unprecedented. And now they're fixing to be burned yet a third time by the United States Congress.

So physicians' offices all over the country are having to take a really hard look at, Do I even want to continue to participate in the Medicare system if I'm constantly under this kind of threat? And what happens if we don't do this? If we don't do this, the across-the-board cut for physician reimbursement for Medicare patients across the country is some 30 percent. Now, what in the doctor's office has gone down? What purchase does the doctor make to keep his practice going? Has the cost of electricity gone down by 30 percent? Has the cost of rent gone down by 30 percent? Has the cost of paying for labor to help in the doctor's office, has that gone down by 30 percent? I don't think so.

Now if you are in a practice that is fortunate enough to be thinking about expanding and you go down to your friendly banker and say, You know, I would like to perhaps borrow some money for an expansion of my practice. I would like to add some exam rooms. I would like to add some doctors. I would like to add some jobs in my community, in my medical practice. And the banker looks at this and says, You're going to be earning 30 percent less for this book of business after the first of the year? Are you crazy? There's no way in the world in this climate, in this banking environment that I'm going to loan money to a doctor's office for this. So we really put our practicing physicians in a tight, tight place by our inability to deal with this problem.

Now, should a doc fix occur, what will it look like? Earlier this week the administration said they wanted one for 13 months. Okay. I could be for that. Thirteen months, that allows us some time to get into the next Congress and perhaps really come up with a way to replace this formula with something that makes sense, and I would be very much in favor of that.

□ 1850

Realistically, it costs a little over $1 billion for every month in that fix, so that's a $13 billion price tag. It's going to be a little tough to come up with that. Maybe it's doable, I don't know. Perhaps we could take some unspent stimulus funds and reprogram that to this. Perhaps there's other savings where we could do away with parts of the new health care bill that are terribly expensive and offset the cost for this. I don't know. I'd be interested in looking at those proposals.

What's more likely to happen is that we'll bump it right up against the deadline and then some, and then do a 1- or 2-month fix and just dump it into the beginning of the next Congress. And again, that's okay. I expect that to happen.

Ultimately, this formula is unworkable and this formula needs to be replaced. And this formula, with all of its conversion factors and update adjustment factors, really needs to be removed, and a simpler and more straightforward way of reimbursing the Nation's physicians who agree to take care of our Medicare patients, arguably some of our sickest patients, with multiple medical problems, who take the most amount of time in an office practice, we have to find a way to do this better.

I think in the next Congress we will see some serious activity towards getting that done. I've heard the incoming leadership talk about how this is an important part of what the next Congress does, and they want to see it taken care of. A lot of discussion about what it should look like.

In my opinion, a fee-based system makes the most sense, but I understand there are people who are talking about other models that include perhaps a bundle payment model or a pay-for-performance model or an accountable care organization model or a medical home model. Fine, let's have that debate. Let's have that discussion. That's what Congress is here to do, debate and discuss these things, hold hearings, get information and come up with a rational, sustainable policy that will replace this formula.

I, frankly, do not understand why this was not tackled. As bad as the health care bill, the health care law, is—was—it would have been immeasurably better had this problem been fixed in the process. But, again, you take $500 billion out of Medicare, you don't even make a down payment on fixing this problem, and you fund a new entitlement with subsidies in the exchanges for people earning up to 400 percent of the Federal poverty level, in excess of $44,000 for a family of four.

It would have been far better to at least sequester some of that money, and say we're going to fix this fundamental problem that exists today because we know it's interfering with our Medicare patients having access to their doctors in order to get Medicare. But it's a problem that must be tackled. It's a problem that must be resolved.

Now, what about the over-the-horizon stuff? What's likely to occur?

This Congress is going to come to a merciful end in a few weeks' time, and then the next Congress will be sworn in. The 112th Congress will take over with a great deal of promise, many new Members, many more new Members than have been seen in Congress in decades; a Congress that is going to have a vast amount of experience in the outside world, in the real world.

Because of all the activity with the health care law, more doctors ran for Congress, at least on my side, on the Republican side, than I think anyone has ever seen before. Six of them were elected. There are nine physicians on the Republican side who are coming back, six more who are coming in. That's 15 doctors in Congress. I think that number is likely unprecedented in congressional history. I don't know the precise high water mark for physicians in the past, but certainly that represents a significant increase over anything that I've seen in my short tenure here.

What do we do about this health care law? Deeply flawed, vastly unpopular across the country. What is this Congress going to do with this health care law?

Now, if I could rip it out root and branch tomorrow, that's exactly what I'd do. And I think it's very important that this Congress do have a vote on repeal of this law and have that vote fairly early into the next Congress.

There are so many aspects of this new law that are so pernicious on so many levels that I believe it threatens the very fabric of our Republic. And, again, it violates that central covenant between governing by the consent of the governed. That basic premise was discarded during this health care debate and this health care vote.

Remember how the Speaker of the House said, We've got to pass this bill so you'll understand what's in it; and once you understand what's in it, you'll be all for it. That's not the way it's supposed to work.

I think that repeal vote needs to happen. I hope it happens in the first month of the new Congress.

I understand what the arithmetic here is. I understand that the other body is unlikely to go along with that repeal, but I think it would be the embodiment of what people voted for in this last election 2 weeks ago, and they need to see the physical embodiment of that vote carried out here on the floor of this House. Of course it needs to be a rollcall vote. I would even submit that it needs to be a called roll of the House of Representatives and every person have their name called and answer affirmatively or negatively as to whether or not they stand for repeal of this very flawed law.

Now, the Senate's not likely to do the same thing. If the Senate does do the same thing, the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue is likely to feel differently and provide a veto. But we don't know the answer to those questions until it's tried, and I think for that reason the repeal vote is very important. It doesn't mean that the repeal vote is all that happens. And certainly there are ways to look at the funding for the implementation of this law.

Remember that this law requires the creation of well over 150 new Federal agencies to administer various parts of this law. That's all significantly expensive. And there certainly are ways to get at the implementation structure through the funding of the implementation.

Well, I mentioned early on in the hour that my committee, the Committee of Energy and Commerce, has not held a single oversight hearing over the implementation of this new

law since it was signed down at the White House in the third week of March. And why is that important?

Well, I already mentioned a lot of consternation right now. Insurance costs are going up. The President said they'd go down, but they've gone up. Are they going up because the insurance companies are just historically bad actors and they're going to raise their prices every time they think they can get away with it? Or are insurance prices going up because they have to be able to keep up with the new mandates that have been layered upon them with this new health care law?

Wouldn't it be great to have a hearing in the Subcommittee of Oversight and Investigations, have people—we always swear in our witnesses so they'd have to raise their hand and swear to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth—come to our committee, give truthful testimony on why this is occurring. Bring the Federal agencies in; ask them to delineate the increased number of mandates that the insurance companies are having to deal with, and have the insurance companies come in and tell us why the costs are going up.

Remember, in the course of this law there's also another provision called the medical loss ratio which is set at 85 percent for large insurance companies, 80 percent for small insurance companies. This medical loss ratio means that there is only a 15 percent or 20 percent portion that can be spent on administrative activities, and the rest must be spent on clinical activities. So if the insurance companies have raised their rates just simply to cover future losses, when those calculations are done on the medical loss ratio, when those rules are finally written and those calculations are applied, if there is an overcharge on the part of the insurance companies, they will be required to rebate that money back to the ratepayers. So it really would be only a very short-term gain by the insurance companies to do that.

But still, let's have the hearings. Let's ask the questions. Let's get the information and not just point fingers at either the Federal agency or insurance companies as to who's to blame for these vast premium increases because, quite honestly, our constituents, the American people, don't care. They're just concerned about the amount of premium increase that has occurred during this enrollment period this fall and what is going to happen to them going forward.

□ 1900

So certainly it has had a devastating effect on how people purchase their insurance.

Another thing that I would just like to point out. Remember, every time in that 2,700-page bill where it said in there, ''and the Secretary shall,'' that creates a whole episode of new rulemaking by the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Now, we have had some experiences with that in the past. Once those rules are written and the final comment periods are closed and the final rule is submitted, it becomes very, very difficult to walk back from that process. Wouldn't it be at least an improvement on that rulemaking process if we were to invite the relevant agencies in and the relevant participants in that rulemaking process to talk to us as these rules were being developed, to talk about whether or not there were any questions about congressional intent, to ask questions about how the implementation is going to occur? What will be the cost? Are there going to be any effects? Are there going to be any effects on employers or employees? Are there going to be any employment effects?

Remember, one of the things that this last election 2 weeks ago was all about was jobs and the lack of job creation. So maybe Congress ought to be focused on that, and maybe that ought to be some of the questions that we would ask during those oversight hearings.

Now, we did have some experience with that in the stimulus bill that was passed in February of 2009, because there was a provision in the bill that provided for funds to help pay for electronic medical records.

Now, a lot of people will say electronic medical records are a good thing and they are going to help cut down on waste, fraud, and abuse, and it is going to make it easier for the doctors to give good care and quality care. Okay. That is something we can all be for.

The law passed in February of 2009, and the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology got busy about crafting those rules. Sure enough, 11 months later, in January of 2010, they come forward with the rules that govern things like meaningful use, and these are all going to be the parameters on which the possibility of payment or subsidizing the purchase of electronic medical records, that is upon which it is going to be based. The problem was, the rule for meaningful use, when it came out, doctors and hospitals were quick to call our offices and say: This doesn't work in the world in which we live. This is not something that is applicable to the real-world situation. Can you do something about that? And, indeed we tried.

Another Member on the Democratic side, Zack Space from Ohio, and I circulated a letter, got well over 250, 260 signatures on it within a very short period of time; sent it back to the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services: Can you help us with this rule? Can you help us perhaps make this something that is more manageable in a real-world situation?

And the answer was: Yeah, we can do some things; but, basically, the rule is set at this point, and that is what it is going to be going forward.

So it becomes very difficult to modify the process after the fact. We saw that with the stimulus bill.

Okay. We are into this health care bill, now 7 months into it. We know there is a lot of rulemaking that is going to occur, because every line in there that says ''and the Secretary shall'' invokes that period of rulemaking and period of public comment and a rule proposed and then a final rule coming down. All of that is going to affect the delivery of health care, again, for every man, woman, and child in this country for the next three generations.

Aren't we obligated to try to get it right? Aren't we obligated to at least, from time to time, ask the Secretary into our committee and ask how this process is going, and, again, if they have any question as to congressional intent?

One of the things that disturbs me as we go through this and watch the implementation strategy on this bill is the creation of entirely new Federal agencies that are basically being created not by the United States Congress but by the Federal agency itself.

The United States Congress pushed a lot of the power that we would normally have in the legislative process over to the executive branch in the rulemaking process. We did it in the health care bill. It also occurred in the financial regulatory bill. It is not a good way to govern, and you don't get your best legislative product by doing that, in my opinion.

We would have been far better served to retain this activity within our committees; and, in fact, that is the way the Founders envisioned. Because we are reelected every 2 years, we are immediately accountable to the people. The folks that draw paychecks from the Federal agencies, you may be accountable when you elect a President but maybe not, because you have career people in all of the Federal agencies that are in fact very much insulated from whether or not the people are in agreement with what they are doing or not. So, in my opinion, it was wrong to push so much power over to the executive branch and to the Federal agencies. That power should have been retained within the United States Congress.

But here is an example of one of the new Federal agencies that has been created: The Office of Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight. A fairly benign-sounding name, and probably some functions that would make some sense, but, in fact, the language for the creation of this Office of Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight occurs nowhere in the bill. Nowhere in the legislative language does it call for the creation of this Office of Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight. It is a function that the Secretary deemed was an additional agency that she would need in order to do her work, as she saw it, that was outlined in the bill.

But now we have a brand-new Federal agency, space being rented somewhere in a building for them to occupy, new positions being advertised for and hired. Obviously, this costs some

money. Where has it come from? I don't know.

Remember, the United States Congress has not passed a single appropriations bill this year. We are running on the appropriations bills from last year under a continuing resolution that was passed on September 30, before we went home at the end of September. But the Office of Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight did not exist until June of this year, so where is the money appropriated that is responsible for running this agency?

Well, I am told it is reprogrammed from other places within HHS, and HHS has the money for this implementation. But I beg to differ. Those monies are supposed to be appropriated by the United States Congress. We are, by law, under the Constitution, responsible for the purse strings. We are supposed to be the ones that write the checks to the Federal agencies to allow them to do their work; and it is by that activity that the United States House of Representatives is able to keep a little bit tighter leash, as far as oversight is concerned, on Federal agencies.

But here we have a brand-new Federal agency that, as best as I can determine, was not called for in the law that was signed by the President. You have various offices, all of which will be employing multiple people. So every one of these places on the flowchart are going to have a number of people working there and answering to the director of that part of the Office of Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight.

Wouldn't it be great to have at least one hearing in the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, or the Health Subcommittee, to ask the folks who are in charge of this to come in to the committee and tell us what they are doing?

Who has been in charge? Just for an example, who has been in charge of looking at this to see if there was duplication? Surely all of these functions, some of them were probably already being performed by the Department of Health and Human Services. Have we got anybody looking at the duplication of effort that may now be occurring?

Everyone bemoans the growth of Federal Government. Everyone bemoans the rapid rise in Federal debt. But do we have anyone who is looking at where duplication may be occurring, where there may be cost savings?

If there is an Office of Insurance Programs and the Office of Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight, maybe there is another office that can be closed in the Department of Health and Human Services. If there is a Division of Rules Compliance, maybe there is another office at either Health and Human Services or the Office of Personnel Management that is no longer necessary. Why have we not had the oversight hearing to understand where the duplication is occurring and where the additional costs may be being expended that are actually unnecessary?

What is the total employment for this entire flowchart? What is the total employment? What is the total salary information? Is there anyone who is being paid in excess of what would be the normal Federal pay level? We don't know the answer to any of these questions.

What is the background of the individuals who have come here? Are they basically people who have contributed to political campaigns in the past, or are these people who have brought with them particular expertise? And again I would argue, if there is particular expertise that they are providing, is that expertise then not necessary in another office that is currently in existence in the Department of Health and Human Services?

Look, let's be honest. This health care bill that was signed into law last March was not a bipartisan product.

□ 1910

The only thing that was bipartisan about this bill was the opposition. Democrats crossed the aisle and voted with Republicans against this bill. No Republican voted in favor of this bill last March.

What have we seen as a result of this election? A profound, profound change in what the American people saw and did in regard to the United States Congress. There are six new doctors in the freshman class. Absolutely unprecedented, again, in my time in Congress, and I think it says something about the people who actually deliver the health care in this country, what their opinion is of Congress at this point. ''My golly, if this is what they are going to do, maybe I better get up there and take care of it myself.'' After all, that is the way doctors are wired.

This is a flawed process that led to a flawed product. It must be repealed. I look forward to that day in January when that repeal vote is held. In the meantime, and after that, until we can actually get things under control, the oversight process and the funding for the implementation must be under strict scrutiny.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER

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

NOV. 15, 2010.

Hon. LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk, House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAME CLERK: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for deposition testimony and documents issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia in connection with a civil case now pending before that court.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII of the Rules of the House.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House.

REDUCING THE DEFICIT

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, tonight, since we have heard over and over about how destructive the deficits are from the President, I thought we would discuss some of the ways we can work on that. There are plenty of good solutions.

We discussed yesterday the fact that this administration pushed through a $400 billion land grab bill that would allow them to spend $400 billion to just buy land. I like my friend from Utah Rob Bishop's proposal that before people from States that don't have much, if any, Federal ownership of land keep pushing through bills to buy up land in other States, that they should be required to sell land first to the Federal Government in those States, so that any State that has less than 20 percent ownership by the Federal Government needs to find out what it is like when the Federal Government takes over land in a State, deprives the local government of any tax base from that land, deprives the local area of any economic growth to speak of from that land.

Yes, there are parks in certain ones that are very active and provide money to the area, jobs, things like that. But more often, when the Federal Government comes in and grabs land and puts it off limits, it just starves the local schools, it starves the local government of any assistance.

Now, originally when the Federal Government started grabbing land and taking it away from local areas, yes, they paid something for some of it, but there was an agreement; look, we know we are taking away all of this revenue from local government, from schools, so tell you what: We will provide you with part of the revenue off of the land, whether it was from the trees, which are one of our greatest renewable resources, or whether it was from natural resources like oil, gas and minerals of different kinds.

But that all changed, and so many local governments and schools have been left high and dry, which is often the case. The Federal Government makes you promises, and you rely on those promises to your detriment, and unlike in the law with any individual who makes promises on which you rely to your detriment, raising the legal issue of promissory estoppel, you can't use it against the Federal Government. In fact, all that you get is a look from some people in Federal Government that, well, it is all your fault, because you trusted us. Did you not know you can't trust our Federal Government?

So we don't even know what land has been purchased with that $400 billion that we were borrowing from China and other places. But if we just quit buying, sold what we had, sold our interest in General Motors and Chrysler, sold our interest in Wall Street, sold off Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, sold off things that this government shouldn't be doing, opened up the Federal Reserve books so everybody could see what was going on, clean that up of anything that there is Federal involvement in that there shouldn't be in the way of assistance and ownership and money just flowing to Wall Street buddies of this administration, we could save a lot of money from that, $400 billion just from that one bill.

Then when you look at the $10 billion that we are in arrears on maintenance and upkeep for our current buildings on national parklands, the reason is we are just squandering it buying more and more land, and in many cases we are buying land adjoining parks that really has no similarity to the characteristics that made it a park in the first place. Sometimes it was just some friend in Congress that some wealthy landowner was able to get to push through a bill to make it a part of a national park, which forced the Federal Government to buy it.

We need to have a committee go through and examine exactly what is really characteristic of a national park for the reason that it was set aside. You have got some that will be enormous, whether it is Yellowstone or the Grand Tetons, some beautiful national parks, Grand Canyon and others. But for those that are not so big but we just added thousands of acres, we need to take a look at disposing ourselves of that land for a price and getting out of that business, and then using the money to actually help the national park facilities that we have, and with the rest of it, bring down the deficit.

One of the other things that we could do to save money and actually would be a far better foreign policy is in a bill I introduced in this Congress, the 111th. It is H.R. 4636. I have filed it in the 110th and in the 109th Congress, this is the third time, and it doesn't look like it is going to get to the floor in this Congress, but I have hopes for the next Congress.

What this bill does, and the summary of the bill at the top, officially it says ''To prohibit United States assistance to foreign countries that oppose the position of the United States in the United Nations.''

Basically in essence it goes through, it is a very short bill, just 5 pages, nothing like a 2,800- or 1,300- or 2,000-page bill, 5 pages, but in essence any nation that votes against the United States' position in contested votes more than half the time will receive no financial assistance from the United States the following year. Each year, on or about March 31st, we get a report from the U.N. on all the votes and how each member nation voted, so it is really easy to calculate after March 31st of each year exactly how nations voted.

Now, some would say, oh, well, that is not caring and loving, and you have said before that you are a Christian. How can you treat nations like that? And it is very important that people understand the basis for a Christian approach to government.

We don't use our office to shove our beliefs down on others. But just so people know where the philosophy comes from, it is helpful to take a look. In fact, I was noticing online regarding the book by Jerry Boykin, just a real national treasure, a national hero, a lieutenant general in the United States Army, part of the original Delta Force. It has been my honor and pleasure to meet with him and share a meal with him.

□ 1920

But this is a real hero. And he has a book out, ''Never Surrender.'' Publishers Weekly went through and said, Lieutenant General Boykin's illustrious military career takes center stage in this personal account of religious faith in the proverbial foxhole. He was thrust into several harrowing encounters such as the events portrayed in the film ''Black Hawk Down,'' the Iranian hostage crisis, and the current war on terror.

Boykin delivers frontline perspectives on the military missions in which he engaged, and the accounts are charged with excitement. Some may find his writing a bit polarizing. He's not subtle regarding his dislike for Democratic political figures like Jimmy Carter and JOHN KERRY. Others will be inspired by how he faced death on a number of occasions and held tightly to his faith as a buoy through tumultuous and dark times.

Toward the end of his career, Boykin began giving public talks, inspiring people to faith in God and to ideals of the United States. While Boykin is to be commended for his patriotism, bravery, and conviction, the book never successfully explains, this says, how his military career co-existed with some of the more pacifist tenets of Christianity.

And so sometimes people hear debate on the floor, they hear people taking different positions, and a question like this being raised by Publishers Weekly is often helpful because we know where people are ignorant so that we can help bring them along so that you can understand where people are coming from the different faiths that exist here in the Members of the House of Representatives.

But, regarding that, many know scriptures. I've heard friends across the aisle accusing people on this side—I've have had Democratic friends say, Jesus said you're to be kind one to another; treat your neighbor as yourself. The Golden Rule, of course, is often used here. Helping widows and orphans. Things like that. We are to turn the other cheek. We're to be humble as individuals. But when it comes to the government, the government has a far different role. The government's role is exactly as the oath we take in this Chamber and will do so on January 5, 2011, exactly what it says.

One of the most important—I think the most important—is providing for the common defense. Protect the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. You have to go back to the founding of this country. It is easy to look at the back of a dollar bill and understand those are the two sides of our great seal on the back of a dollar bill. On the one side, the eagle with the ribbon through his mouth, e pluribus unum; out of many, one.

We welcome immigrants. We do. Thank God for the immigrants that have come to this country. I asked my mother once—my late mother once—what we were on her side of the family, and she said, Son, you're a duke's mixture. I said, Well, that sounds good. What does that mean? And she said, Well, if we were in the dog world, son, you would be a mutt. So apparently I come from many different areas of the world in my genealogy. But that's what e pluribus unum was designed to address. We welcome people from all over the world. They come here and become one people. We welcome people that speak all kinds of languages. But in order to do as that phrase says that our Founders thought was so important, we need one language.

You go do research. Or, as I was an exchange student in the Soviet Union, you find one of the problems they have was trying to make sure all of these people within the Soviet Union spoke the same language. They were very aggressive about it. Pretty mean-spirited about it. We're not. But we need people to speak the same language. And when I see people across the country saying, Let's teach these immigrants in their own language, let's teach these children in the language of the country they come from, I know they mean well. But what they do is condemn those children to manual labor jobs. Like my good friend Gus Ramirez back in Tyler, Texas, said, his parents immigrated from Mexico, and his dad was exceedingly strict about it. Gus said his mom and dad spoke Spanish in their home, but in essence he said, Son, if you're going to be anything in this country, you've got to speak good English. And that is why I expect you kids to speak English in the home.

As a result, Gus has been city councilman, county commissioner, a successful businessman. But if you really care, you would want these young children to reach their God-given potential. Be the president of the company, not the ditch digger for the company. Just teach them English. And we can be one Nation under God, e pluribus unum; out of many, one.

On the other side, though, you have the pyramid with the triangle above it and you see the all-seeing eye of God.

The eye represents the all-seeing eye of God. And above it the Latin phrase ''annuit coeptis,'' meaning he, God, has smiled on our undertaking. They believe that. Because as Ben Franklin said at the Constitutional Convention, during the contest with Great Britain when we were sensible of danger, Franklin said, we had daily prayer in this room. Our prayers, sir, were heard and they were graciously answered. They knew that. They knew that God was smiling on their undertaking.

But underneath the pyramid are the words ''novus ordo seclorum,'' Latin, meaning in essence, ''new order of the ages.'' Now order of things. And the reason they had that was they knew there had been a parliament in England, of course. They talked about it. They knew that there had been a senate in ancient Rome. There had been other places where there had been legislating groups. But they also knew in all of those there was a king or a Caesar or somebody who could overrule whatever was done and even disband the legislative body.

So what they were designing was a government where the people would be the government. The people would rule themselves. That's why this was a totally new order of things. This was not a new world order. It was a new order of the ages where people would get to govern themselves. And for most of this country's history people understood they were the government and that you would have the hiring day and you should prepare yourself for hiring day so that when you went and voted or hired servants to go do your will, that you, the people as the government, would hire successful servants who would do the will of the government. That was their thought. That's why it was a new order of the ages. People were going to govern themselves.

So in that context, when we know that the government of this country was supposed to be we, the people, and that those of us who are elected and sent to this august body, we're supposed to be servants. That was the point. So if you look to a chapter that addresses the government's obligation, it's different from those of individuals—individuals being kind. But when you're government here, when you're the servants that are supposed to carry out the government job, you have an obligation to protect the people that sent you here. You're the servants that are supposed to protect the people. If you're in the military, you're the extension, you're the instrument of the government to protect the people.

So when you look at Romans 13, and this is in the New American translation, you will find it says—Romans 13:1—let every person be subordinate to the higher authorities, for there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been established by God. Parenthetically, here, that means in the United States, in this new order of things, the people are that authority.

□ 1930

It is the people who elect, who hire the servants, and so the collective will of the people is the government, as carried out by their servants, they send to places like Washington.

Verse 2 says: Therefore, whoever resists these authorities opposes what God has appointed. Those who oppose it will bring judgment upon themselves.

However, here in the United States, this government was created where the people are the government, so they are expected to do their jobs—to hire good people. So, when the people get upset, they're resisting the servants in this country. They're not resisting the government. They are the government. They're resisting the servants and the arrogance and the atmosphere of arrogance that has so resided in this city for so long.

Verse 3 goes on: that basically rulers are not a cause of fear to good conduct but to evil.

Do you wish to have no fear of authority? Then do what is good. You'll receive approval from it.

For it, the government, is a servant of God for your good; but if you do evil, be afraid, for it, the government, does not bear the sword without purpose. It is the servant of God to inflict wrath upon the evildoer.

So, apparently, the folks at Publishers Weekly were not aware of that basis that I know our friend and our hero, General Jerry Boykin, was aware of. He was the sword. He was part of the sword as the military. So, if you do evil, whether it is in Iran or in Panama or wherever our military and the Delta Force was sent, Romans 13 says to be afraid because they don't bear that sword in vain. If you do evil, they're coming after you.

Why would they do that? Because they are part of the instrument that is to protect the people in this country so that the people can go about carrying out the beatitudes that Jesus pointed out.

Some say that Washington surely wasn't a Christian, but in his own resignation that he sent out to the 13 State Governors, he ends his resignation like this—and I won't read the whole thing, but it says:

I now make it my earnest prayer that God would have you and the State over which you preside in His holy protection and to entertain a brotherly affection and a love for one another, for their fellow citizens of the United States and particularly for their brethren who have served in the field and, finally, that He would most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility and peaceful temper of the mind, which were the characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion and without a humble imitation of whose example in these things we can never hope to be a happy Nation.

He signed with the words: ''I have the honor to be, with great respect and esteem, your Excellency's most obedient and very humble servant, George Washington.''

Well, he understood. He got it. He was the servant of the government. That was part of the new order of things, the New Order of the Ages—people governing themselves—but the military is the instrument. It is the sword. Some people may not be aware, but a sword is not meant as a loving touch to people. Normally, it could be used to knight people in some places like England of old, but the sword is an instrument of war, and it's not wielded by the government in vain. If you come after this country, it's supposed to be wielded in response. When we are attacked, when an act of war comes against this Nation as attacking a Nation's embassy is—taking embassy personnel hostage is an act of war—then there should be a sword to execute wrath immediately.

I was at Fort Benning when that happened in 1979, and our President did nothing but, in essence, beg the Iranians to let them go. It seemed that it was 2 or 3 days that the spokesman in Iran for the Ayatollah was saying, The students have them. The students have them. It seemed to me, as a member of the United States Army at the time, that he's leaving himself a backdoor.

President Carter should have said, Okay. You're saying the students have them. You get our hostages out within 48 hours or we accept what happened as what it is, an act of war, and we are bringing the full wrath of the United States military to Tehran. If you harm those hostages, then to use the words of Romans 13:4, be afraid because we're not going to wield the sword in vain. You will pay a very heavy price.

Since our President didn't do that—he allowed them to keep the hostages for well over a year—it has been a great recruiting tool for the terrorists for the last 30 years. Look. Remember 1979? We committed an act of war against the United States, and they did nothing. They, you know, just sat around and looked helpless.

There was the disastrous effort in the desert, and from what people I know and trusted back at the time had told me and from what I've read since and from what I've heard from people involved since, President Carter scaled down the escape effort going into Iran from what was originally proposed. As a result, they didn't have enough helicopters when they got to the staging area.

As we should have learned from Vietnam and as we should know in Afghanistan, unless you're going to have rules of engagement which say to our men and women in uniform that we're going to give you everything you need and that your life is precious to us, so you protect yourselves, and you go win the war, and do everything you can to win, and we'll give you everything you need to win—unless we're willing to do that, we shouldn't send them. Don't send

them. This President hasn't shown sufficient commitment to those in Afghanistan, and if we're not going to do that, we need to get them out. We need to bring them home.

Yet there are people who want to destroy us over there who we haven't adequately addressed, and it is turning into another Vietnam, it seems. That's not our role. If you believe the Biblical perspective, we're to execute wrath on those who have done evil, and we haven't finished doing that.

So I have this bill in this Congress, H.R. 4636. I don't know what the number will be next year. Just so people know how things stand, I'll give you some of the numbers:

Heck, Pakistan. I think we gave Pakistan $738 million, and they voted against us last year 87.5 percent of the time. Shoot, the Philippines. They've shown that as a government they don't have a lot of love and adoration for this country. They voted against us a majority of the time, and we gave them over $116 million. Russia, which just provided their best antiaircraft weapon from Lebanon to Iran, heck, we gave them nearly $100 million. They may have used some of that $100 million, since money is fungible, to build the S–300s to provide to Iran so they could shoot down Israeli or American planes. We might simply, if we have a courageous President, someday go after the nuclear threat that is looming in Iran. South Africa, they voted against us most of the time last year, and these figures say we gave them $574 million. Sudan, they voted against us 90 percent of the time last year. We gave them $337 million.

Interesting stuff here.

Let's see. You've got Yemen, Yemen which provided people who apparently attacked us in what was an act of war against the USS *Cole*. We didn't respond, really, as if it were an act of war. We didn't wield a sword and do what we should have, but we gave Yemen about $17 million last year, and they voted against us most of the time, naturally.

□ 1940

These attempted terrorist attacks of the packages that were sent, apparently planned and emanating from Yemen, well, we're giving Yemen money to help that country as they attempt to fight everything we believe in, most everything we believe in, in the U.N.

Venezuela, our dear friend Venezuela. We gave them $10 million. There may have been some other pockets we used money from, but from this pocket we gave them nearly $10 million, and, of course, they vote against us the vast majority of the time.

Uganda votes against us most of the time. We gave them $351 million.

Let's see, others. Bangladesh, they voted against us 80 percent of the time. We gave them $105 million. Bolivia, they voted against us 70 percent of the time. We gave them $103 million.

Brazil, heck, we just provided a $2 billion loan for their deepwater drilling program. Probably didn't hurt that that was George Soros' single largest investment, as far as we know. So the $2 billion that the U.S. taxpayers are standing good for on a loan will sure help make him rich. That's a great thing, I'm sure, if you're a big Soros fan.

Cambodia votes against us most of the time, and we gave them $58 million. Let's see, we've got—well, gosh, we gave Cuba $45 million. Wasn't that special? And they vote against us 90 percent or so of the time.

Republic of the Congo, we gave them $104 million, and they vote against us most of the time. Heck, Egypt, we gave them just this pocket of money at $1.7 billion. As I understand, it's more than that, and they voted against us 81.8 percent of the time. Ethiopia voted against us 83.3 percent of the time, and we rewarded their opposition to things we hold dear by giving them $455 million.

India, $100 million, and they vote against us about 89 percent of the time. Indonesia, where the President just visited, it seems like he got a pretty good reception, but when it came to his positions, they voted against him about 80 percent of the time in the U.N., but we did reward them with about $190 million.

Now, people are out of work. They're struggling, they're trying to make ends meet as best they can, and yet we're just giving money away hand over fist, like we were just the richest folks in the history of mankind, that we got money to burn. We're just throwing it away, and as I've said previously, and it continues to be true, you don't have to pay people to hate you; they will do it for free. It's that simple.

Why keep paying billions and billions of dollars to countries that despise us, that oppose everything we believe in, that oppose our love of freedom and liberty, that oppose our belief in equality of men and women and different races? Why do we keep giving billions of dollars to people that oppose that and are doing everything they can to make life an absolute hell for people based on religious beliefs, race, creed, color, national origin, gender, treat women like property? I mean, why do we keep giving people billions and billions of dollars?

I know charities across America are hurting right now. They're not getting the contributions they do normally in a good economy, because when people lose their job, they run out of money. They're barely providing for themselves and their family, the people under their roof. They're not able to give like they do during the good times. And so charities are hurting here in the United States.

But what we find with this government—and it's not new to this administration—this administration is doing it, but it's been going on for a long time. It's not new. With all fairness to the Obama administration, it's been going on a long time. We are in a world of hurt. We're being told by nations around the world that you're spending money like an irresponsible person. You've got to stop spending money in such a crazy fashion.

So, normally, if we were acting as a responsible person or a responsible entity, we'd say, you know what, we're pretty broke right now, so we can't keep giving money to people that hate us and are doing everything they can, many of them funneling money to groups who use it to hurt us. That might seem strange. But then you look around the world. We recently just rearmed Lebanon. Let's see. Lebanon. Oh, yeah, that's right, they went to war against Israel. We're helping groups that keep attacking our dear friend Israel. Why are we giving them money? Do we honestly think we're going to buy their love and affection?

You can't buy love and affection. When you try, what you purchase is contempt, because they know that we know they hate us, they know that we know they vote against us most of the time. So how could they think otherwise, that we're the most stupid, irresponsible people in the world to keep paying people to hate us? It makes no sense.

You know, these nations are sovereign. We respect a nation's sovereignty. Make your own calls. Vote as you want to vote. If you're in the U.N., vote as you want to vote, but we're not going to pay you to oppose us at every turn.

That's why I keep filing this bill, and that's why I am hopeful that eventually we'll get it passed. We mean no ill will to these countries who keep opposing us, who want to treat women like property, stone women to death, what they call honor killings, and what I would have found someone guilty of murder in my court back in Texas, because it sure looks and sounds like murder to me under our law, and under our law is where we're supposed to be found, not under sharia law, not under some other nation's law, but under our law.

So why do we keep paying countries to mistreat women and children and torture their own people and to deprive them of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness? They're sovereign. They can make their own choices, but we should not pay them to hate us.

Now, in follow-up for the rest of this time, I know our President has said before we're not a Christian Nation, and I will not debate that with the President because he may be right, he may very well be right, but what I know is where we came from. As a student and a lover of American history, I know enough about our founding and apparently a great deal more than our President learned when he was in school in Indonesia and other places. He didn't learn the history of this Nation as I did. Well, what would you expect?

Of course, in Indonesia they're not going to teach you American history,

certainly not the best parts. They may teach you parts that make you think less of America, I can see that, and perhaps that's why Indonesia votes against us most of the time in the U.N. They just don't have our values, and, of course, in their schools they would teach their values, which include being against the things that we hold dear.

But we have history to rely on, and so I'm just going to go through some historic writings and speeches just, Mr. Speaker, so people know a little bit more about our history and where they came from, because as great philosophers have said through the ages, if you don't know where you came from, you cannot possibly find the proper direction ahead.

□ 1950

John Quincy Adams was the first son of a President to have been elected President. In September of 1811, in a letter to his son, who was a U.S. minister in St. Petersburg, Russia, John Quincy Adams said, ''So great is my veneration for the Bible, and so strong my belief, that when duly read and meditated on, it is of all books in the world, that which contributes most to make men good, wise, and happy—that the earlier my children begin to read it,'' the Bible, ''the more steadily they pursue the practice of reading it throughout their lives, the more lively and confident will be my hopes that they will prove useful citizens of their country, respectable members of society.'' That was John Quincy Adams.

Another from Abraham Lincoln. This was March 30, 1863. These are Abraham Lincoln's own words. We have them in writing from him. This is March 30, 1863, his prayer proclamation. Lincoln said in part, ''We have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious Hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us. It behooves us then to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness,'' Abraham Lincoln.

Forty-five days before his assassination in his second inaugural—and that's inscribed in the marble on the north wall of the Lincoln Memorial—he's talking about the North and the South. And I realize the President says we're not a Christian nation, but Lincoln was addressing what had been founded as a Christian nation and what had been founded upon Christian tenets. As a Christian nation, we welcome people of all walks of life, of all nations, all races, national origin, gender. We welcome them because that is part of the Christian teaching for individuals. But he was trying to theologically deal with the issue of a horrible, horrible war, like the Civil War, where brothers fought, family members fought and died at the hand of another.

Lincoln's words, March 4, 1865, he said, ''Both read the same Bible,'' talking about the North and the South, ''and pray to the same God. The prayers of both could not be answered. That of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has His own purposes.'' Then he quotes from scripture and says, ''Woe unto the world because of offenses.''

''Yet, if God will that the war continue until all the wealth piled by all the bondsmen's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said''—another scripture quote—''the Judgments of the Lord are true and righteous.''

I know that our current President reveres President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and so I figured he would certainly be rewarded in knowing Franklin D. Roosevelt's own words. So for the sake of this body and anybody that might happen to see, I will provide Franklin D. Roosevelt's own words. For example, March 4, 1943, in his first inaugural address, these were his words, ''First of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself. In such a spirit on my part and on yours, we face our common difficulties. They concern, thank God, only material things. Practices of the unscrupulous money changers stand indicted in the court of public opinion, rejected by the hearts and minds of men. They know only the rules of a generation of self-seekers. They have no vision. And when there is no vision, the people perish.'' That, of course, Proverbs 29:18. ''The money changers have fled from their high seats in the temple of our civilization. We may now restore that temple to the ancient truths. We face arduous days that lie before us in the warm courage of national unity; with the clear consciousness of seeking old and precious moral values. In this dedication of a nation, we humbly ask the blessing of God. May he protect each and every one of us. May He guide me in these days to come.''

More words of Franklin Roosevelt, December 6, 1933. If I were asked to state the great objective which church and state are both demanding for the sake of every man and woman and child in this country, I would say that great objective is a more abundant life.

Franklin Roosevelt, December 24, 1933. Roosevelt said, ''This year marks a greater national understanding of the significance of our modern lives of the teachings of Him whose birth we celebrate. To more and more of us, the words 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself' have taken on a meaning that is showing itself and proving itself in our purposes and daily lives. May the practice of that high ideal grow in us all in the year to come. I give you and send you one and all, old and young, a Merry Christmas and a truly Happy New Year. And so, for now and for always, God Bless Us, Everyone.''

Continuing, Franklin Roosevelt's own words, this is December 24, 1934: ''Let us make the spirit of Christmas of 1934 that of courage and unity. That is, I believe, an important part of what the Maker of Christmas would have it mean. In this sense, the Scriptures admonish us to be strong and of good courage, to fear not, to dwell together in Unity.''

Another excerpt from Franklin Roosevelt, 1935. ''We cannot read the history of our rise and development as a Nation without reckoning with the place the Bible has occupied in shaping the advances of the Republic. Where we have been the truest and most consistent in obeying its precepts, we have attained the greatest measure of contentment and prosperity.''

Continuing on with Franklin Roosevelt's words. January 20, 1937, he said in part of that inaugural address, ''I shall do my utmost to speak their purpose and to do their will, seeking Divine Guidance to help each and every one to give light to them that sit in darkness and to guide our feet in the way of peace.''

Again, Franklin Roosevelt, January 6, 1941. ''We look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first in freedom of speech and expression. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way. This Nation has placed its destiny in the hands and heads and hearts of its millions of free men and women; and its faith in freedom under the guidance of God.'' Again, Franklin Roosevelt, January 20, 1941: ''A Nation, like a person, has something deeper, something more permanent, something larger than the sum of all its parts.

□ 2000

''It is that something which matters most to its future, which calls forth the most sacred guarding of its present. It is a thing which we find difficult, even impossible, to hit upon a single simple word, and yet we all understand what it is, the spirit, the faith of America. It is the product of centuries. It was born in the multitudes of those who came from many lands, some of high degree, but mostly plain people who sought here early and late to find freedom more freely.

''The democratic aspiration is no mere recent phase of human history. It is human history. It permeated the ancient life of early peoples. It blazed anew in the Middle Ages. It was written in the Magna Carta. In the Americas its impact has been irresistible. America has been the new world in all tongues to all peoples, not because this continent was a newfound land, but because all those who came here believed they could create upon this continent a new life, a life that should be new in freedom. Its vitality was written into

our own Mayflower Compact, into the Declaration of Independence, into the Constitution of the United States, into the Gettysburg Address. If the spirit of America were killed, even though the Nation's body and mind constricted in an alien world lived on, the America we know would have perished. That spirit, that faith speaks to us in our daily lives in ways often unnoticed. We do not retreat. We are not content to stand still. As Americans, we go forward in the service of our country by the will of God.'' Franklin Roosevelt.

Again, Roosevelt, January 25, 1941:

''To the Armed Forces. As Commander in Chief I take pleasure in commending the reading of the Bible to all who serve in the Armed Forces of the United States. Throughout the centuries men of many faiths and diverse origins have found in the Sacred Book''—Sacred Book is capitalized—''words of wisdom, counsel and inspiration. It is a fountain of strength and now, as always, an aid in attaining the highest aspirations of the human soul. Very sincerely yours, Franklin D. Roosevelt.''

That's inscribed on the inside of the New Testament that my uncle got going into World War II that my aunt gave me.

''December 7, 1941, a date which will live in infamy, the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by Naval and Air Forces of the Empire of Japan. Our people, our territory and our interests are in grave danger. With confidence in our Armed Forces, with the unbounding determination of our people, we will gain the inevitable triumph, so help us God.''

And I have one other from Roosevelt. This was Franklin Roosevelt's radio broadcast June 6, 1944:

''My fellow Americans''—and for those, Mr. Speaker, that may not be aware, this is D-day, June 6, 1944—Franklin D. Roosevelt said, ''Last night when I spoke with you about the fall of Rome, I knew at that moment that troops of the United States and our allies were crossing the channel in another and greater operation. It has come to pass with success thus far, and so in this poignant hour I ask you to join with me in prayer.

And then Franklin Roosevelt prayed these words for the Nation over national radio. It would have been TV, but radio is what he had. Roosevelt said:

''Almighty God, our sons, pride of our Nation, this day have set upon a mighty endeavor, a struggle to preserve our Republic, our religion, and our civilization and to set free a suffering humanity. Lead them straight and true. Give strength to their arms, stoutness to their heart, steadfastness in their faith. They will need Thy blessing. Their road will be long and hard for the enemy is strong. He may hurl back our forces. Success may not come with rushing speed, but we shall return again and again. We know that by Thy grace and by the righteousness of our cause, our sons will triumph.''

Parenthetically, if I might insert into Roosevelt's prayer here, General Jerry Boykin had an outcry in this country from the left when he said words to the effect, at a church, we prevailed in Iraq with such speed because our God was stronger than their God. Had those same people and forces that attacked General Boykin at the time been around June 6, 1944, D-day, there's no question they would have had to attack Franklin D. Roosevelt for this type of prayer. Nonetheless, it's part of our history, so I continue with Roosevelt's words:

''For these men are lately drawn from the ways of peace. They fight not for the lust of conquest, they fight to end conquest. They fight to liberate. They fight to let justice arise and tolerance and goodwill among all Thy people. They yearn but for the end of battle, for their return to the haven of home. Some will never return. Embrace these, Father, and receive them, Thy heroic servants into Thy kingdom.''

And for us at home, Roosevelt says, ''Fathers, mothers, children, wives, sisters and brothers of brave men overseas whose thoughts and prayers are ever with them, help us, Almighty God, to rededicate ourselves in renewed faith in Thee in this hour of great sacrifice.

''Many people have urged that I call the Nation into a single day of special prayer. But because the road is long and the desire is great, I ask that our people devote themselves in a continuance of prayer as we rise to each new day. And again, when each day is spent, let words of prayer be on our lips invoking Thy help to our efforts.''

Roosevelt goes on. He says:

''Give us strength too, strength in our daily task, to redouble the contributions we make in the physical and the material support of our Armed Forces. Let our hearts be stout to wait out the long travail, to bear sorrows that may come, to impart our courage into our sons, wheresoever they may be.

''And, O Lord,'' Roosevelt continues, ''give us faith. Give us faith in Thee, faith in our sons, faith in each other, faith in our united crusade. Let not the keenness of our spirit ever be dulled. Let not the impacts of temporary events, of temporal matters, of but fleeting moment, let not these deter us in our unconquerable purpose. With Thy blessing,'' Roosevelt finishes, he says, ''we shall prevail over the unholy forces of our enemy. Help us to conquer the apostles of greed and racial arrogances. Lead us to the saving of our country and with our sister nations into a world unity that will spell a sure peace, a peace invulnerable to the scheming of unworthy men and a peace that will let all of men in freedom reaping the just rewards of their honest toil. Thy will be done, Almighty God.''

That was Franklin D. Roosevelt. What a powerful prayer.

A couple of things to finish. Ronald Reagan, 1978, his own words in his own hand. He was talking about Jesus of Nazareth, Jesus Christ, and he says these things about Jesus. Reagan says: ''Either he was what he said he was or he was the world's greatest liar. It is impossible for me to believe a liar or charlatan could have had the effect on mankind that he has had for 2,000 years. We could ask would even the greatest of liars carry his lie through the crucifixion when a simple confession would have saved him? Did he allow us the choice, you say, that you and others have made to believe in his teaching, but reject his statements about his own identity?''

□ 2010

In 1981, in his inaugural he said, in part, Ronald Reagan's words: ''Your dreams, your hopes, your goals are going to be the dreams, the hopes, and the goals of this administration, so help me God. I am told that tens of thousands of prayer meetings are being held on this day, and for that I am deeply grateful. We are a Nation under God, and I believe God intended for us to be free. It would be fitting and good, I think, if on each inaugural day in future years it should be declared a day of prayer.

''The crisis we are facing today does require, however, to believe that, together with God's help, we can and will resolve the problems which now confront us. And, after all, why shouldn't we believe that? We are Americans.''

Reagan concluded with ''God bless you.''

Mr. Speaker, that is my conclusion as well.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF MONDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2010, AT PAGES H7418 AND H7419

ECONOMIC ISSUES: THE GOOD, THE BAD AND THE UGLY

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

Mr. SHERMAN. I come here to address the House on economic issues facing us this month and next month. And I come here to talk about the good, the bad and the ugly. First, the good.

The Federal Reserve Board is going to buy $600 billion worth of long-term bonds, quantitative easing. This will increase America's share of the American market for manufacturers' goods. That's why it has been condemned by China, Germany and Japan, because they know it means moving jobs from Germany, Japan and China to the United States.

This is an effective tool that is reversible. We can expand the money supply now, and then the Federal Reserve

Board can reverse its action when the economy improves. Therefore, it involves no increase in the money supply that is permanent and, of course, involves no increase in our national debt.

The unemployment rate is over 9.6 percent. We need to act to bring down that unemployment rate. And the Fed is to be commended. This does not mean that its decision is risk free. Just, given all the risk that we're confronted with, this is a good move. And the fact that the countries that are running giant trade surpluses with it have condemned us gives it an additional advantage.

Second, the bad. The tax proposals, and I focus here only on the tax proposals of the Simpson-Bowles proposal, they have offered three different versions of their tax proposal and I will address what they call the Wyden-Gregg approach. There are two other approaches, the zero plan, which is even worse than the one I'm going to describe, and a third option of basically doing nothing except inviting the Ways and Means Committee to earn their salary and to look at our tax law.

Now, I was anxious to embrace this proposal because we need to see shared sacrifice. We all are looking for a way to pay down the debt, and I, for one, was willing to embrace a program of shared sacrifice and austerity. But Messrs. Bowles and Simpson have given sacrifice a bad name by using our desire for shared sacrifice to disguise a giant tax cut for large corporations.

□ 1910

In the name of austerity and shared sacrifice we are told that the tax rate on the wealthiest Americans needs to be cut to 35%—roughly a 12% cut in their tax rate. And we are told that the corporate tax rate needs to be cut by a quarter. This in the name of increasing revenue. This in the name of austerity and shared sacrifice. No. This in the name of using the debt crisis as an opportunity to shift wealth and power and income from the middle class to corporate elites and the very wealthy.

Now, it is true that they talk about reducing certain corporate tax expenditures, but only in vague terms, only to a small degree. It is basically a dramatic decline in corporate tax, in the revenue of the corporate income tax.

Now, finally on to the ugly. We have been told by our Republican colleagues on so many occasions that the worst thing we could do is increase taxes in the middle of a recession; yet the Republican proposals, all of them, involve a dramatic increase for working families going into effect this next year, namely by allowing the Making Work Pay Tax Credit, the so-called Obama tax cuts, $800 for every working couple, $400 for every working single, expire at the end of this year. I urge my colleagues to join with me in cosponsoring our colleague SCOTT MURPHY's bill to extend this $800/$400 tax credit.

With all the talk of extending the Bush tax cuts, with all the talk for those who make more than a quarter million dollars a year, we should not forget that the Obama tax cuts expire at the end of this year, and for well more than half of all American families, the Obama tax cuts are more important than the Bush tax cuts.

Now, why is nobody even talking about extending the Obama tax cuts? Because no one with an income of over $150,000 a year gets any of that benefit. So when we have a tax cut that is targeted at working families that is more important than the Bush tax cuts to over half of American families, we see this tax cut about to expire without any discussion from those who tell us that the worst possible thing would be to increase anyone's taxes in the middle of a recession. I do not want to hear about spending $700 billion over the next 10 years to provide tax relief to the top 1 percent. I do not want to hear that from those who are talking about increasing taxes on more than half of America's working families. It is time to extend the Obama tax cut.

I look forward to working in a bipartisan way to provide tax relief to get this economy moving again and then to shift to fiscal austerity, but allowing the Obama tax cuts to expire and then cutting corporate income tax by one quarter is not the way to go.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. HIRONO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, November 17 and 18.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 17, 2010, at 10 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> ''I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.''

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 111th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

MARLIN A. STUTZMAN, Indiana, Third.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

10326. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency with respect to Iran originally declared on November 14, 1979, by Executive Order 12170, is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 2010, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 111–153); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PENCE:

H.R. 6406. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to remove the mandate on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market Committee to focus on maximum employment; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 6407. A bill to clarify that schools and local educational agencies participating in the school lunch program under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act are authorized to donate excess food to local food banks or charitable organizations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 6408. A bill to allow States to return certain funds made available for high speed rail and intercity rail projects to the general fund of the Treasury for Federal budget deficit reduction; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 6409. A bill to prohibit the Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration from requiring the replacement of street and highway signs that are in upper case letters with such signs that are in mixed case lettering with the initial letter in upper case followed by lower case lettering; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 6410. A bill to improve air cargo security; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. BERMAN):

H.R. 6411. A bill to provide for the approval of the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Australia Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 6412. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to require the Attorney General to share criminal records with State sentencing commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 6413. A bill to ensure that individuals who receive Social Security or certain other Federal benefits receive a one-time payment equal to 5 percent of the total annual amount of such benefit in the event that no cost-of-living adjustment is payable in 2011; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HARE, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H. Con. Res. 329. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 35th anniversary of the enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H. Con. Res. 330. Concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring the commitment and sacrifices of military families of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WEINER:

H. Con. Res. 331. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that an appropriate site on Chaplains Hill in Arlington National Cemetery should be provided for a memorial marker to honor the memory of the Jewish chaplains who died while on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H. Res. 1716. A resolution urging the Government of Belarus to conduct a free and fair presidential election on December 19, 2010, and expressing support for the Belarusian people's desire for democratic government that respects human rights and the rule of law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. WU, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. TOWNS):

H. Res. 1717. A resolution congratulating imprisoned Chinese democracy advocate Liu Xiaobo on the award of the 2010 Nobel Peace Prize; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 1718. A resolution honoring the commitment and service of the Albert Einstein Healthcare Network, Southwest Airlines, and the Philadelphia International Airport for helping families dealing with autism gain confidence in public places and honoring the University of the Sciences in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and the Gray Center for contributions to the Autism Accessibility Program housed at Albert Einstein Healthcare Network; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. ELLISON):

H. Res. 1719. A resolution recognizing the cultural and religious significance of Eid al-Adha and wishing Muslim-Americans and Muslims around the world a prosperous holiday; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY introduced a bill (H.R. 6414) for the relief of Angela Stefanova Boneva; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 122: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 272: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 571: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 614: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 718: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 891: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 984: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1024: Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 1050: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1458: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1589: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 1625: Ms. KILROY, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1800: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 1895: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1923: Mrs. BACHMANN.
H.R. 2261: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2262: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 2308: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2324: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 2345: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2361: Mr. FARR, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 2365: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2425: Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2579: Mr. HARE and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2752: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 2766: Mr. BACA and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3185: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 3188: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 3668: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 3724: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3742: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 3927: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 3974: Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 4114: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4115: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 4197: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 4310: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 4466: Mr. ROONEY and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 4530: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 4599: Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 4653: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 4745: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4800: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. INGLIS, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 4808: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. KIND, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 4844: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 4914: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 4923: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. WU, and Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 4925: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4993: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 5000: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 5040: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 5043: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 5078: Mr. STARK and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5117: Mr. SCHAUER.
H.R. 5120: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 5191: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 5270: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 5309: Ms. WOOLSEY and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5434: Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DICKS, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 5441: Mr. HARE and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 5492: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 5527: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5549: Ms. CHU, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 5565: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 5575: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FILNER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 5593: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 5597: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 5627: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 5636: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 5652: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.
H.R. 5671: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5723: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 5944: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 5950: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 5983: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 5987: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HOLT, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. WATERS, Ms. CHU, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 6021: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 6045: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 6085: Ms. CHU, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 6116: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 6139: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. WEINER, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 6172: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 6218: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 6222: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 6240: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 6268: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 6282: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 6283: Mr. HODES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FARR, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
H.R. 6377: Mr. WU, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 6403: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. LEE of New York.

H.R. 6404: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BACA, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. COHEN.

H. Con. Res. 261: Mr. DUNCAN.

H. Con. Res. 267: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. WOLF.

H. Con. Res. 318: Mr. KUCINICH.

H. Con. Res. 325: Ms. WATERS and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 327: Mr. MCMAHON, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Res. 200: Mr. WAMP and Mr. MCCAUL.

H. Res. 236: Mr. WAMP.

H. Res. 363: Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 840: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. HERGER.

H. Res. 1217: Mr. NYE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. PLATTS.

H. Res. 1264: Mr. BACA, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. NYE, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. BARROW, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. POSEY, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Ms. JENKINS.

H. Res. 1476: Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Res. 1489: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 1498: Mr. JONES, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. HARE.

H. Res. 1590: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. CARTER.

H. Res. 1622: Ms. JENKINS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 1641: Mr. HONDA, Mr. SIRES, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. ADLER of New Jersey.

H. Res. 1652: Ms. HIRONO.

H. Res. 1654: Ms. HIRONO.

H. Res. 1670: Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BACA, and Ms. CHU.

H. Res. 1690: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WEINER, Mr. HILL, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

H. Res. 1692: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. STARK.

H. Res. 1704: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Res. 1714: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H. Res. 1715: Ms. HIRONO and Mrs. EMERSON.