



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 2009

No. 63

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 28, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LOIS CAPPs 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.

TRIBUTE TO FIRST LADY LAURA LANE WELCH BUSH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBLE. Madam Speaker, Michelle Obama is enjoying immense popularity throughout America. She has been described as a "breath of fresh air" and the "First Lady we have been waiting for."

A Democrat constituent spoke to me several days ago expressing approval of the First Lady's high marks, but she furthermore expressed concern that we do not forget Mrs. Obama's immediate predecessor, Mrs. Laura Bush. I am in

agreement with my constituent in that I am pleased for Mrs. Obama, but I don't want her high marks to diminish the high marks Laura Bush recorded.

Madam Speaker, there is no blueprint for successfully filling the office of First Lady. Members of Congress have elections and constituents to provide constructive criticism along the way. The First Lady has no such benefit, and as a result, she must master the art of on-the-job training with the world's microscope on her every move.

Mrs. Laura Bush perfected this art as well as any other First Lady in our history. Not only is her list of accomplishments long and meaningful, but they were achieved with little fanfare during a tumultuous period in our history.

She is responsible, Madam Speaker, for spearheading the effort to bring the National Book Festival to the National Mall. She led the charge to bolster Teach for America, which helped increase the number of teachers being produced by this program every year. All of these teachers will teach in impoverished urban and rural schools. She helped stave an impending crisis in our libraries, which were facing a 40 percent rate of attrition. Furthermore, much of her time overseas was spent sharing information on HIV/AIDS and malaria awareness and the needs of women.

Madam Speaker, Mrs. Bush has sought no praise or public attention. This is exactly why her accomplishments should be recognized—and perhaps even memorialized to some extent so that future First Ladies can learn from her legacy.

When Mrs. Bush was asked whether she would assume a role by a previous First Lady, she replied that she would define her role as First Lady for herself.

Mrs. Bush's demeanor portrays her as quiet and unassuming. Oftentimes, Madam Speaker, people—male and female—who maintain quiet, unassuming

roles are not seriously embraced. Oftentimes, they are cut adrift or cast aside; not true with Laura Bush.

We wish Mrs. Obama well as she commences her role as our First Lady, while at the same time I want us to favorably recall the 8 years Laura Bush served as our First Lady.

BUDGET—OUR LONG-TERM ECONOMIC PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, we are working to pass this week in both the Senate and the House a budget resolution. It is a long-term economic plan that we are working together with the administration that will mark President Obama's 100th day in service.

The fallout from the failed policies over the last 8 years has made this job even tougher. Let's talk about what has happened over the last 8 years and what exactly President Obama inherited.

A record time during the last 8 years, President Bush—and the Republicans with that—built on a deficit of \$5.8 trillion. When President Obama came into this office, a \$5.8 trillion deficit; when President Bush came in, he had a \$5.6 trillion surplus when you looked at it over this time period.

The national debt doubled, and the amount held by foreign countries of ownership in this country has more than tripled. The smallest rate of job growth in three-quarters of a century. There have been flat wages. And more Americans are living in poverty without health care insurance.

But this isn't anything new to the American people. We have experienced this. We have seen it firsthand. And the

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H4843

American people spoke back in November with an election and said that they wanted a new direction and change.

Our long-term economic plan takes steps to reduce health care costs, one of the largest contributors to the deficit, and a growing burden on our businesses' ability to compete and families' prosperity.

Our long-term economic plan is something that the American people have been calling for, a true look at transparency, looking at the impacts of the cost of the war in both Iraq and in Afghanistan.

We have to consider in this long-term budget looking at the targeted investments that must be made that will ultimately end in savings; investments in health care, investments in energy, investments in education, and real concrete proposals that will pay for these investments.

This plan marks the beginning of a new era of honesty. I, as a Member, had an opportunity to go before the Budget Committee and to share what my priorities were, as every Member of Congress had an opportunity to do. This is a new era of honesty, budgeting accuracy, and openly representing costs like the war, as I previously mentioned. Previous Republican budgets masked these costs to make the deficit appear to be smaller.

Our economic plan contains key integrity initiatives to protect the taxpayers' money by rooting out waste, fraud and abuse, and saving taxpayers nearly \$50 billion.

The American people called for a change, a new direction back in November. That is exactly what this Congress is delivering.

TAX TEA PARTY DECLARATION

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

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the thousands of people in the Sixth Congressional District of Florida who stood together and told this administration and this Congress to turn off the taxpayer-funded spigot of government bailouts.

These hardworking Americans made their point loud and clear; they do not want to see our Nation bankrupt from a fiscal policy that ignores the free market principles this country was founded upon and attempts to spend its way out of record-breaking debt through increased government control and expansion of inefficient bureaucratic power.

Let me go ahead and read an excerpt from their 4-page declaration that over 1,800 people from my hometown, Ocala, signed on April 15, tax day.

"We raise our voices against the arrogance and the ruinous policies of our government, a government that ignores We the People, a government that drowns us in debt, a government that forsakes the free enterprise system that has driven the engine of the

greatest economy on Earth in favor of a relentless march towards socialism designed to subvert the worth of the individual and encourage the intrusion of government into all aspects of our lives."

Madam Speaker, I will submit the entire "Tax Tea Party Declaration" for the RECORD. And also, I have a petition signed by over 2,000 people in Ocala, Florida, demonstrating their commitment to ending this bad economic policy.

Like those who attended rallies in Starke, Trenton, Gainesville, and Orange Park, I have not and will not support bailout after bailout as sound economic policy. It is unconscionable for this administration and this Congress to continue committing good money after bad.

In October of 2008, the U.S. Government committed an astounding \$700 billion in public funds to failing private financial institutions through the Troubled Asset Relief Program, TARP. However, just last week, the TARP Special Inspector General reported that the total cost of TARP will cost the American taxpayer between \$2.4 trillion and \$2.9 trillion.

It is evident that we can no longer allow government bureaucrats such as Timothy Geithner and Henry Paulson to use their position and the taxpayer-funded Federal Reserve to act as a safety net for their partners on Wall Street when they fail due to incompetence and unchecked greed.

I am a strong believer in free markets. And inherent in that economic model is that not every person or idea makes money. It is time for Wall Street to understand this unmistakable tenet and not rely on the Federal Reserve and the American taxpayer to continue to save them when their gambles accumulate into significant losses.

Anna Schwartz, co-author along with Milton Friedman of "A Monetary History of the United States," viewed by many as the definitive account of how U.S. monetary policy turned the stock market crash of 1929 into the Great Depression and which Ben Bernanke, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, has called the "leading and most persuasive explanation of the worst economic disaster in American history," contends that the Treasury, through its actions, has prolonged this crisis. Let me quote here on this board:

"They should not be recapitalizing firms that should be shut down. Rather, firms that made wrong decisions should fail. You shouldn't rescue them. And once that is established as a principle, I think the market recognizes that it makes sense."

As true capitalists, these titans of Wall Street should understand the risks and rewards of a free market economy and be allowed to fail like the rest of Main Street when they make foolish or risky decisions.

Many economists look to the past to predict economic futures; it is a tested way to learn from past mistakes and

avoid making them in the future. Looking to the past, we discover that Henry Morgenthau, FDR's Treasury Secretary, gave this very important quote in May of 1939 during the Great Depression. He said, "We have tried spending money. We are spending more than we have ever spent before and it does not work. I have just one interest, and now if I am wrong, somebody else can have my job. I want to see this country prosper. I want to see people get a job. I want to see people get enough to eat. We have never made good on our promises. I say, after 8 years of this administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started, and enormous debt to boot."

This current economic policy of bailout after bailout and colossal government spending is just plain wrong, Madam Speaker, and the American people know it.

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for like-minded patriotic citizens to rally as one against the powers that threaten to alter, diminish and destroy this country we love, proper respect for the opinions of our fellow citizens requires that we should clearly state the grievances that impel us to gather at this Ocala tea party to protest peacefully, but passionately in the tradition of our forefathers whose Boston Tea party resonated around the world.

The history of the present government of these United States is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having the effect of establishing an unacceptable tyranny over the citizens of these states. Let the facts be self-evident and speak for themselves . . . and let these grievances be heard in the halls of power in 2009, just as they were heard in the palace of Britain's King George the third, as they thundered forth from the text of the Declaration of Independence on July 4th, 1776.

Be it resolved on this 15th day of April, in the year 2009, at the Great Ocala Tea Party in the Town Square in Ocala, Florida, that just as our forefathers at the Boston Tea Party protested tyranny at the hands of the British Crown and taxation without representation, we hereby raise our voices against the arrogance and the ruinous policies of our own government . . . a government that ignores the will of "We The People" . . . a government that drowns us in debt . . . a government that forsakes the free enterprise system that has driven the engine of the greatest economy on earth, in favor of a relentless march toward socialism designed to subvert the worth of the individual and encourage the intrusion of government into all aspects of our lives.

Let the word go forth from this time and place that we are freedom loving Americans who cherish individual liberty, our constitution and all that this nation has stood for over 233 years. We love our country, and we are here to take it back!

Let us hereby resolve that we have had enough of massive government driven bailouts using our money! Stop spending money we do not have! This is not your money, this is our money, and we demand you stop the madness!

We have had enough of so-called economic stimulus plans that falsely promise we can spend ourselves back to prosperity!

We have had enough of trillion-dollar spending schemes being passed without congress or the people knowing what is in them. This is taxation without deliberation and we will not tolerate it!

We have had enough of the out of control government spending that is mortgaging our future and threatening our very way of life!

We have had enough of both major parties being arrogant and unresponsive to the people they were elected to serve!

We have had enough of seeing money taken unfairly from honest hard working Americans through excessive taxation and redistributed to individuals who have not earned the money!

We have enough of capitalism being targeted as the problem instead of the solution!

We have had enough of government being called the solution, when government is the problem!

In every stage of these oppressions, we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms. Our repeated petitions to our elected officials have been answered only by repeated injury, if, in fact, they have been answered at all. A government so arrogant and unresponsive to its people is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

We, therefore, the people of the United States of America, in general congress assembled, here in the Town Square of Ocala, Florida, on this 15th day of April, in the year 2009, do, in the name and by the authority of the good people of this city and nation, solemnly publish and declare that we are a free people, in this free and independent state, and that we have the power to demand that our government cease serving its own interest, and whatever political and ideological agendas it may be pursuing, and become the Government Of The People, By The People, and For the People to which we are entitled as Americans. And that for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 44 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

As Your people and as a Nation, we hear Your summons: "Sing a new song to the Lord."

Our song, Lord, is the song of freedom. As our ransom, You have set us free. As Your children, we chose to resemble You in all our choices and decisions.

Throughout our history, some others have been shocked by the rhythm of our song; others have been inspired to find their own voice and enter the song.

But the song of true freedom is planted within us by You, O Lord. Your spirit finds expression and touches others around the world because Your song of

freedom comes from our hearts. So all honor, power and glory go to You, Lord, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Ms. SCHWARTZ 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.

WHY THE BUDGET IS IMPORTANT FOR HEALTH CARE

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

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, as we mark President Obama's first 100 days in office this week, the House will vote on the President's budget which sets a new vision of hope and responsibility for America.

As vice chair of the Budget Committee, I know that this budget is fiscally responsible and it sets forth a path to meet our Nation's greatest challenges. With more than 47 million Americans uninsured, this budget includes critical language ensuring that Congress will act this year to expand access to care and to reduce costs.

Soaring health care costs are impeding our economic competitiveness, straining the Federal budget and causing families all across this country to make difficult choices about their health and well-being. This budget sets the context for this important work that Congress will do to find a uniquely American solution to health care access and costs, one that includes innovation and technology, incentives for an effective delivery system, a renewed commitment to prevention, and consumer protections in the private-public marketplace.

We cannot sustain the status quo, nor should we. Now is the time to finally get health care to all Americans. We should pass the budget resolution and begin the task ahead.

A BUDGET OUR CHILDREN WILL LIVE TO REGRET

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has voted for unprecedented debt,

and a look at Treasury's borrowings shows a stark picture. On Monday, we borrowed \$98 billion. Tomorrow, we will borrow another \$61 billion. On average, Congress is forcing the Treasury to borrow \$157 billion a week.

Over the first 100 days, our debt has increased by more than \$5.5 billion per day. China has cut its lending to the United States by 95 percent, effectively canceling this Congress' credit card.

Let me finish with a couple of personal facts.

With only 111 million Federal taxpayers, the rate of spending by this Congress in the first 100 days has shown the congressional leaders put each taxpayer into debt at a rate of \$1,400 per week, \$3,200 per quarter, and over \$9,000 each just for the first 6 months of this Congress. That's quite a record, a world record, and one our children will live to regret.

HONORING ROBERT DANA

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

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor a man who has affected the lives of countless Iowans, Mr. Robert Dana. His life and work are shining examples of Iowa's long tradition of excellence in literature.

For 40 years, Mr. Dana taught at Cornell College where I was honored to teach and now represent as part of Iowa's Second District. While there, he had a tremendous impact on students, developing young writers' minds and pushing them to new heights.

After leaving Cornell, he continued to inspire Iowans serving two terms as our State's Poet Laureate. Mr. Dana has used his signature poems to give an everlasting voice to official Iowa events. With his poetry, R.P. has captured the feeling Iowans have for their towns and land.

Thank you, R.P., my former colleague, for your contribution to Cornell College, to Iowa, and to American literature.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO NORTH CAROLINA SHOOTING VICTIMS

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, eight people died 1 month ago when a gunman opened fire at the Pine Lake Health and Rehabilitation Center in Carthage, North Carolina. On that dreadful day, the staff and residents at Pine Lake Center responded very effectively and professionally. Equally professional and effective were the law enforcement community and the citizens of Carthage and Moore County.

This cruel and unforgivable act imposed upon Pine Lake that day did not succeed in defeating the spirit of the

Pine Lake facility, Carthage and Moore County.

Mr. Speaker, we extend our condolences to the survivors of the eight whose lives were so brutally taken on that ill-fated day.

HAWAII AND AMERICAN CLEAN ENERGY ACT

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is committed to energy self-sufficiency as a matter of national security. Hawaii's situation is especially acute as Hawaii is the most oil dependent State in the country and has the highest fuel and electricity costs nationwide. Thus, Hawaii is particularly aware of the need to change the status quo and focus on achieving a clean energy economy.

Recently enacted legislation has given consumers and businesses in Hawaii and across the country incentives to invest in clean and renewable technologies, and more will be accomplished through the American Clean Energy and Security Act on which we are working.

Our actions result in real decisions by real businesses. For example, because we extended the solar tax credits, a solar panel company and a local business in Hawaii got together to install photovoltaic panels on the roof of the business, which now generates 95 percent of its electricity from these panels.

Our work on the American Clean Energy and Security Act will help States like Hawaii reach our energy goals.

HOMELAND SECURITY PARANOIA

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, according to a recently released secret memo by Homeland Security, America now faces new serious threats. I am not referring to al Qaeda, the Somali pirates, or radical Islamic terrorists. The memo states we are in danger from people who are concerned about our porous borders, gun owners, returning military veterans, the recent tax protestors at the TEA parties, and those who want to protect the unborn.

Mr. Speaker, these Americans simply disagree with the administration on certain issues. But by disagreeing, they are now labeled and vilified by Homeland Security as extremists and threats to America. So because of Homeland Security paranoia, is the cloak and dagger agency going to watch these people and spy on them under the guise of national security? We shall see.

This is a dangerous policy and attack on individual liberty and a denial of free speech. Homeland Security should do their real job like finding radical Is-

lamic terrorists who want to kill us in the name of religion rather than making a watch list and snooping around in the private lives of patriots who are just exercising their absolute right to disagree.

And that's just the way it is.

A HUGE BET THAT IS WORTH MAKING

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, this week more than 100,000 people will gather at Churchill Downs in my district for the 135th running of the Kentucky Derby. They will be placing big bets. And this week, this Democratic Congress is going to be placing a big bet, too.

We're going to pass a budget resolution that makes a huge bet on America and the American people. By investing in targeted ways and developing a health care system that provides affordable, quality health care for every American, by creating a new energy system and a new energy direction in this country, and investing in higher education so that every American has the tools necessary to bring us into the 21st century, we will be making a huge bet that the American people can grow us out of the huge hole that we're in now.

I am proud that we're willing to make that bet, and I urge all of my colleagues to join us in betting on the American people.

DON'T PLAY POLITICS WITH NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 8 years since the tragedy of 9/11, and America has not experienced another catastrophic terrorist attack on our home soil, not due to blind luck but due to hard work. Homeland Security during this period thwarted attacks through enhanced interrogation of suspected terrorists. This is a fact. For this, we should thank them, not mire them in millions of legal fees.

But in recent days, more sympathy has been shown to current and potential attackers than to the men and women hired to prevent their deadly acts from coming to fruition. Memos detailing American interrogation methods were selectively released by the administration for political reasons, when other memos showing their life-saving results have not.

Most Americans believe releasing this important information has endangered many innocent Americans in the future and subjects us to future terrorist attacks. Shouldn't we remember it was the self-paralysis of our intelligence systems that led to 9/11 in the first place? Why should we go back?

FUNDING TO CDC FOR POSSIBLE FLU PANDEMIC

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, we are still learning the details of the new influenza outbreak threatening our country. I want to take a moment to praise our colleague, Chairman OBEY, who tried to make sure that the Centers for Disease Control were prepared for a possible pandemic by providing funding in the stimulus package for flu vaccines and preparation.

Unfortunately, the politics of "no" trumped common sense when, in order to get three Republican votes, the Senate removed \$462 million for the Centers for Disease Control and \$900 million for pandemic flu preparations.

Mr. Speaker, the choices we make here in Congress are more than just cable news sound bites. Our choices have consequences. Let me remind my colleagues that the 1918 flu epidemic killed more people than all of World War I. We must reconsider and revisit the funding issue for pandemic flu preparation. It could mean the difference between life and death.

NORTHERN ROCKIES ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. REHBERG. Congress is moving forward on the Northern Rockies Ecosystem Protection Act. Montanans have a long and proud heritage as good stewards of our land. Working together, folks in Montana have found solutions that work for everyone—without top-down meddling from Washington, D.C. Unfortunately, this bill throws that consensus approach out the window.

Take a look at the cosponsors. The vast majority of them are from districts east of the Mississippi, and 17 cosponsors are from California; none from the districts actually impacted by the legislation such as Idaho, Wyoming, Eastern Oregon, Eastern Washington, and, of course, Montana. That is right. None.

Montanans don't tell folks from New York or San Francisco how high to build their skyscrapers or how many lanes their freeways need. We let you deal with your problems, and we respectfully ask that when it comes to the Northern Rockies, you take into consideration the opinions of those of us who live there.

NORTH KOREA FREEDOM WEEK

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and raise awareness of the 2009 North Korean Freedom Week.

Currently, approximately 13 million people in North Korea suffer from malnutrition, and over 2 million North Koreans have died of starvation since 1995. In addition, over 200,000 men, women, and children are imprisoned in political prison camps in North Korea.

North Korea is controlled by a dictatorial regime where human rights and personal freedoms are nonexistent. The region suffers from an extremely weak economy and is dependent on the international community even for its food. Unfortunately, about 30 percent of all the international aid that is provided to North Korea goes to the country's military and its elite, and very little of that ever gets to the real people of North Korea.

Under the current regime, universal human rights do not apply to the people of North Korea, and freedom remains a foreign idea for the men and the women of this repressive country.

I call on my colleagues in Congress and the Obama administration to take action to improve the deteriorating human rights crisis in North Korea.

□ 1215

ENERGY

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

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we are at a crossroads in the way we power America. Breaking our dependence on foreign oil will not only create new domestic jobs, but it will ensure our economic recovery is sustained for future generations.

The American Solar Energy Society recently released a report that stated in 2007, the renewable energy and energy-efficiency sectors created 9 million jobs in the United States and over \$1 trillion in revenues. In my home State of Colorado alone, the energy-efficiency field added 81,000 jobs in 2007, and we all know it is cheaper to use less energy than to make it.

Innovation and entrepreneurship have always been the backbone of the American spirit. As I travel to the eastern plains of Colorado, the landowners often tell me they are ready to install wind turbines on their property as an economic development tool. However, we must update our fragmented transmission system to transmit these vast resources.

By becoming a leader in renewable energy and energy-efficiency technologies, we can invest in our future and put Americans back to work.

MYTH: AMERICANS DON'T WANT BROAD HEALTH REFORM

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, another health care myth. It

is amazing that opponents of comprehensive health care reform still make the argument that Americans don't want it, but they do, and it is time to debunk it. According to an April 2009 Kaiser Family Foundation Health Tracking Poll, just from this month, 59 percent of Americans say that it is more important now than ever to pass health care reform, 59 percent. And it is easy to understand why. Because of costs, 42 percent of Americans reported that they didn't see a doctor in the past year; 36 percent skipped dental care; 27 percent skipped a recommended medical test or treatment; and 18 percent of Americans reported that they cut their pills in half because they couldn't afford it.

This isn't time for small ideas. This isn't time to just protect the status quo. Americans demand comprehensive health care reform, and it is time that this Congress gives it to them this year.

BORDER VIOLENCE

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, just across the border, heavily armed militias fueled by drug trafficking cartels are at war with the Mexican Government. Although the worst of the violence has been contained south of the border, its impact is being felt throughout the region.

These trafficking organizations are powerful, but we are fighting back. Recently, the Flagstaff Police Department busted a major drug ring that supplied a quarter of the methamphetamine in the area. I congratulate the Flagstaff Police Department on their successful bust, which helps keep drugs out of our community and is a blow against drug trafficking organizations on both sides of the border.

CREDIT CARDHOLDERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in these difficult economic times, we, as leaders, must ask ourselves the question, whose side are we on? Are we on the side of people—the consumers, the taxpayers, and hardworking families across the Nation? Well, I certainly am.

Today, I rise in favor of the Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights. For too long, hardworking Americans have been victimized by high fees, high interest rates, and confusing credit card agreements that these companies can change at will.

The Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights protects everyone from the unfair and often abusive practices that credit card companies put on everybody. It prevents credit card companies from unfairly increasing interest rates on existing balances.

The Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights will protect everyone. It ends unfair penalties for cardholders who pay on time, and it protects vulnerable consumers from high fees due to subprime credit cards. In short, it prevents these companies from constantly moving the goalposts and taking advantage of ordinary people who have done nothing wrong.

Let's pass the Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights and build a better Nation for everyone.

ENERGY

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a progressive vision for America's energy future and the opportunity to create millions of American jobs for our working families.

President Obama and this Congress are taking on our Nation's energy crisis with a plan to create green jobs and build a clean energy economy; a plan that creates 300,000 new jobs by implementing a Renewable Electricity Standard, and another 222,000 new jobs with its high efficiency savings provisions.

Mr. Speaker, we have a choice to make in this Congress; we can choose to create millions of new American jobs that cannot be shipped overseas, reduce our dependence on oil from overseas, increase production of cleaner renewable energy sources, crack down on polluters who damage our air and our water quality, and give American entrepreneurs and innovators the tools they need to stay combative in the global economy, or we can do something else.

America can become a world leader in the new clean energy economy, or we can continue the failed policies of the last 8 years.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 627, CREDIT CARDHOLDERS' BILL OF RIGHTS ACT OF 2009

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on Wednesday, April 29, at any time for the Speaker, as though pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, to declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of H.R. 627, and that consideration of the bill proceed according to the following order: The first reading of the bill is dispensed with; all points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI; general debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services; after general debate, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion; and, no further consideration of H.R. 627

shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

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

There was no objection.

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.

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY FOR SHOOTING VICTIMS IN BINGHAMTON, NEW YORK

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 340), expressing sympathy to the victims, families, and friends of the tragic act of violence at the American Civic Association in Binghamton, New York.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 340

Whereas on Friday April 3, 2009, the Nation experienced an appalling misfortune when a gunman entered the American Civic Association in Binghamton, New York, and murdered 13 and wounded 4 innocent people;

Whereas the shooting resulted in the tragic loss of Lan Ho, Parveen Nin Ali, Li Guo, Dolores Yigal, Hong Xiu Mao, Marc Henry Bernard, Maria Sonia Bernard, Maria Zobniw, Jiang Ling, Hai Hong Zhong, Roberta King, Layla Khalil, and Almir O. Alves;

Whereas the attacker wounded Long Huyng, Shirley DeLucia, Sumi Lee, and Liqiao Chen;

Whereas this act of violence created numerous secondary victims, including over 40 people who were in the building at the time, as well as friends and family of the deceased who are struggling to cope with the impact of this tragic act;

Whereas many of the victims of this assault were residents of Binghamton, New York, in Broome County, New York, a close-knit, diverse community with a long history of welcoming people from all backgrounds, nationalities, and religions, as well as immigrants and visitors from abroad;

Whereas the American Civic Association in Binghamton, New York, has proudly served the community since 1935, assisting immigrants and refugees with counseling, resettlement, citizenship, family reunification, language skills, and other critical services that have played a vital role in the effort to secure the dreams of immigrants seeking legal citizenship;

Whereas the law enforcement agencies led by the City of Binghamton Police Department, with support from the Broome County Sheriff's Department, the New York State Police, and neighboring municipalities responded quickly, professionally, and heroically to the crime scene;

Whereas swift action by emergency medical responders addressed the needs of the

wounded and quickly transported them to hospitals;

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and others provided swift and invaluable cooperation and resources to assist local efforts and provide additional services to help the community cope with this tragedy;

Whereas the United States State Department quickly offered, and is now providing, assistance with processing visas to expedite the travel of victims' family; and

Whereas, although the effects of this shooting will be felt for years to come, the Binghamton community will overcome this tragedy and re-emerge stronger than before and with renewed sense of unity, cooperation, and understanding: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its heartfelt condolences to the families and friends of the victims of the April 3, 2009, shooting in Binghamton, New York;

(2) conveys its gratitude to the city, county, State, and Federal officials and agencies whose quick and comprehensive response helped save lives and start the long healing process; and

(3) honors the American Civic Association for the services it provides to assist people from across the world who seek the American dream.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, with House Resolution 340, this Chamber expresses its profound sympathy to the victims of the tragic attack at the American Civic Association in Binghamton, New York, on April 3. Our thoughts continue to be with the families, friends, and the people of Binghamton, and they remain in our prayers. Thirteen men and women were murdered in this attack and four were wounded, shaking the community and the entire Nation.

House Resolution 340 was introduced by our friend and colleague, Representative HINCHEY of New York, and is co-sponsored by over 50 Members of Congress.

Given the tragic events on which House Resolution 340 is based, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform moved quickly to consider a report on the bill, which brings us to today's consideration of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we thank the American Civic Association for its continued service over the years as it has helped

immigrants and refugees with counseling, resettlement, citizenship, family reunification, language skills, and other critical services, playing a vital role in the effort to secure the dreams of immigrants seeking U.S. citizenship. We want them to know that they have our prayers and our heartfelt sympathies during this difficult time.

I would also like to commend the City of Binghamton Police Department, the Broome County Sheriff's Department and the New York State Police for their swift response to this attack. In addition, we thank the FBI, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Office, and other Federal agencies for their assistance.

We were all deeply saddened to hear of this attack, and it is difficult for us to comprehend such an act of violence. We will feel its effect for years, but we can be sure that in time Binghamton will heal, emerging from this tragedy stronger and more united than ever before.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the passage of this resolution expressing sympathy to the victims, families, and friends of the tragic act of violence at the American Civic Association in Binghamton, New York.

For immigrants in the Binghamton area, the American Civic Association, located on Front Street, is a representation of their ongoing pursuit of the American dream as newcomers from around the world learn English and the skills necessary to obtain United States citizenship. But on April 3, the American Civic Association—a welcoming place serving 60 to 100 people per day—became a killing zone. On that dreadful day, a deranged man, whose own dream of immigrating from Vietnam to America had now come to nothing but despair and senseless turmoil, ended the dreams of one aspiring citizen after another by opening fire on unsuspecting employees, volunteers, and hopeful immigrants, resulting in the loss of 14 lives, including the shooter, and four wounded people.

As we remember the victims, we also commend the efforts of the first responders—local police, fire, emergency medical crews, city and county officials, and the community as a whole—for their rapid and cohesive response to this unfortunate tragedy. In addition, we commend the United States Department of State for quickly offering assistance with processing visas to expedite the travel of the victims' families so they could arrange for the burial of their loved ones.

The memory of this senseless event will not soon be forgotten. However, the strength and determination of the Binghamton community as well as the citizens of New York will help the healing process.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI).

Mr. ARCURI. I thank my good friend for yielding.

Over the past several weeks, many of you have seen the images and read the news about the tragic shooting in Binghamton, New York, on April 3, 2009. Thirteen innocent people lost their lives at the American Civic Association building due to senseless violence.

While I don't represent the City of Binghamton, I represent the suburbs in the area around Binghamton and know many people that work and live in the Binghamton area. I want to take this time to again offer my deepest condolences to the families and friends of those who lost their lives on that day and offer my sincerest gratitude to the local officials and first responders on the ground whose immediate action then prevented further loss of life. And their continued leadership now has allowed for the Binghamton community to start the healing process.

I want to especially mention the Broome County Executive, Barbara Fiala; Binghamton Mayor, Matt Ryan; Binghamton Police Chief, Joe Zikuski; and Broome County Emergency Services Director, Brett Chelis, who led the team of hundreds of first responders consisting of police, fire, rescue and medical staff. To the staff at the local hospitals that cared for the victims of this tragedy and worked tirelessly to save lives, I sincerely say thank you.

I want to say how thankful I am—and I know that so many in the Binghamton community are—to my colleague, Congressman MAURICE HINCHEY. Congressman HINCHEY answered the call at the first sign of trouble and was in his district working with his people to make sure all that could be done was being done throughout the crisis.

I again give my continued full support to all those involved, and ask that we learn from such a tragedy and do all that we can to ensure that an incident like that never happens again.

□ 1230

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to say in closing for myself that this is an experience that no Member of Congress wishes to face. However, at the same time, I must confess admiration not only for the law enforcement authorities and the medical staff and families who have been affected in this case but also, and I think especially from our standpoint here in the House, the way in which Representative MAURICE HINCHEY, faced with this disaster, this terrible tragedy in his district, flew back to his district, rolled up his sleeves, opened his heart to the people that he cares about and represents here in Congress every day, and began the very dif-

ficult work of helping his community in Binghamton heal from these wounds.

And I just want to say there are occasions that are forced upon us unwillingly that really show, I think, in a greater depth and a more meaningful extent the true content of our character, and seeing the way the community in Binghamton came together in this tragedy to comfort those who were victimized and to bring some peace to those families, the way the law enforcement community and the nurses and docs in taking care of those families came together, and seeing how Mr. HINCHEY sprang to action and addressed the tragedy himself was a shining example, I think, of the strength of the United States and of our core communities. And I just think that if there is any silver lining that one can gain from this tragedy, it is just that: The way this community has responded to a senseless, senseless tragedy and the way they have provided comfort to people in their own communities is truly admirable.

I think, as Members of Congress here on both sides of the aisle have acknowledged here, the way that MAURICE HINCHEY had weighed into the process was truly, I think, exemplary for all of us, unwanted admittedly but certainly extremely admirable under the circumstances. And we will pay special attention to this tragedy going forward.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), the lead sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the opportunity to speak about this important issue, and I very much appreciate everything that has been said here by Members focusing attention on this critical issue.

I rise today as a representative of the 22nd Congressional District in the State of New York, which includes that wonderful, magnificent City of Binghamton.

Now, less than 4 weeks ago, this proud community suffered a devastating tragedy. On the morning of Friday, April 3, 2009, a single gunman entered the offices of the American Civic Association and there murdered 13 innocent people and seriously wounded four more. I am here today on behalf of Congress to offer our formal condolences, to honor the victims of this tragedy, and to express gratitude to the heroes who responded.

With this resolution, we remember those who were lost that day, offer our condolences to their families, express our hopes that those wounded and touched by this tragedy are on the path to recovery, and thank all those who responded. I want to thank Chairman TOWNS and Ranking Member ISSA for their support in allowing this resolution to come to the floor. I also want to express my appreciation to our Speaker and to our majority leader who assisted us with this resolution.

Binghamton, New York, is a close-knit, diverse community with a long history of welcoming people from all backgrounds, all nationalities and religions, as well as immigrants and visitors from anywhere abroad. It's a place where those looking for a better life are welcomed with open arms and where being a part of a community means being part of a family.

The American Civic Association performs no small role in this process. This organization, the American Civic Association, has proudly served the community since 1935. It offers immigrants and refugees critical services such as counseling, language education, and family reunification in order to help people realize their own American dreams. Their noble work is lauded in the community and supported by people from all political parties and all backgrounds.

The 13 individuals who lost their lives that day ranged from the age of 22 to 72 and included a mother of three, a newly-wedded bride, a student, a teacher, and many others, all of whom were hardworking individuals who had the same goal of being able to offer a better life for their children, their families. I would like to take a moment to pay respect to those 13 victims:

Parveen Ali, Almir Alves, Maria Sonia Bernard, Marc Henry Bernard, Li Guo, Lan Ho, Layla Khalil, Roberta King, Jiang Ling, Hong Xiu Mao, Dolores Yigal, Hai Hong Zhong, Maria K. Zobniw.

Shirley DeLucia was among the four who were wounded. She showed her bravery that day by placing the 911 call after being shot in the abdomen.

I would like to thank those who showed swift and decisive action that morning. First and most importantly, I would also like to offer my utmost gratitude to the law enforcement agencies who responded so quickly and professionally to this major event. The City of Binghamton Police, led by Chief Joseph Zikuski, worked in conjunction with the Broome County Sheriff's Department, the New York State Police, and other neighboring municipalities to heroically address the critical needs of the city and the people.

I would also like to make mention of the help afforded us by our Federal agencies, notably the Department of Justice for its swift action during the immediate situation and to the State Department and the Bureau of Customs and Immigration for their assistance during the difficult aftermath. I would like to thank Binghamton Mayor, Matthew Ryan, and Governor Paterson for their efforts in organizing local and State resources in a very effective and efficient way. I would also like to thank the White House for its direct response and particularly Vice President BIDEN for reaching out and helping to coordinate agencies on the Federal level.

Many lives were lost that day, but many more could have been lost were

it not for the brave and effective actions of our men and women in uniform. They deserve our highest level of respect and gratitude.

While we must continue with our daily lives, let us not forget those who have had their lives permanently altered by this event, and let us also use this tragedy as a daily reminder of how fragile life is and how to make the most of the time that we have.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I simply urge our colleagues to join Mr. HINCHEY in supporting this resolution.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 340, a resolution that expresses sympathy to the victims, families and friends of the tragic act of violence at the American Civic Association in Binghamton, NY.

My heart goes out not only to the victims and families of this senseless tragedy but to the entire city of Binghamton, New York. I am deeply saddened by the violence that has afflicted that community and that together, the citizens can regain a sense of safety and hope. I would also like to thank and commend the first responders and all of law enforcement who responded to the crime scene and who continue to help the community cope with this tragedy. Binghamton, New York has a long history of welcoming people from all backgrounds, nationalities, and religions, as well as immigrants and visitors from abroad and the American Civic Association in Binghamton has been at the heart of these efforts. For over 80 years, the American Civic Association has served its community assisting immigrants and refugees with counseling, resettlement, citizenship, family reunification, language skills, and other critical services that have played a vital role in the effort to pursue the dreams of immigrants seeking legal citizenship.

Many of those who sought a haven in the Association had escaped the violence of war and tyranny in their home countries to create a better life in the United States. It is a sad irony that instead, they found tragedy.

In the midst of tragedy, I respectfully remind my colleagues that we will continue to be vigilant against these cowardly acts of violence and that our condolences are with the victims and their friends and families. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 340.

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.

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY FOR ALABAMA SHOOTING VICTIMS

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 341) expressing heartfelt sympathy for the victims and families of the shootings in Geneva and Coffee Counties in Alabama, on March 10, 2009.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 341

Whereas the communities of Geneva and Coffee Counties in Alabama have endured a tragic event in southeast Alabama that resulted in the loss of 10 lives and injuries to several others;

Whereas, on March 10, 2009, a man fired at members of his family and other innocent bystanders throughout several towns in Geneva and Coffee Counties in Alabama;

Whereas the result of this shooting spree resulted in the deaths of Bruce Maloy, Lisa McLendon, Andrea Myers, Corrine Gracy Myers, Sonya Smith, James Starling, James White, Virginia White, Dean Wise, and Tracy Wise;

Whereas State Trooper Mike Gillis, Greg McCullough, Ella Meyers, and Jeffrey Nelson, were wounded as a result of the shootings;

Whereas the first responders, State Troopers of the Dothan Troopers Post, officers of the Geneva Police Department, officers of the Geneva County Sheriff's Department, and an officer of the Conservation and Natural Resources department pursued and eventually found the gunman deceased; and

Whereas the grieving and celebration of the lives of those lost in this senseless tragedy will be with the communities of Geneva and Coffee Counties for months and years to come: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its heartfelt sympathy for the victims and families of the shootings in Geneva and Coffee Counties in Alabama on March 10, 2009; and

(2) conveys its gratitude to the city and county officials, and all the police, fire, sheriff, and emergency medical teams who responded swiftly to the scene and helped prevent further violence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. 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 gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

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

As a member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I solemnly join my colleagues in the consideration of House Resolution 341, which expresses our heartfelt sympathy for the victims and families of the shootings in Geneva and Coffee Counties of Alabama on March 10, 2009.

House Resolution 341 was introduced by our colleague Congressman BOBBY BRIGHT of Alabama on April 21, 2009, and was considered by and reported from the Oversight Committee on April 23, 2009, by voice vote. This measure has the support and cosponsorship of 58 Members of Congress.

On March 10, 2009, the people of Geneva and Coffee Counties in southeast Alabama suffered senseless shootings that resulted in the loss of 10 lives and a number of injuries. On that tragic day, the reckless killings began at the shooter's, Michael McLendon, residence in Kinston, Alabama, where he killed his own mother and in addition set the house on fire. The shooter then drove a dozen miles southeast to Samson in Geneva County, where he gunned down six more victims, including four members of his own family. The victims of this senseless act included James Alford White; Tracy Michelle Wise; Dean James Wise; and 74-year-old Virginia E. White, the shooter's own grandmother. Also killed were the wife and daughter of local sheriff's deputy Joshua Myers, Andrea Myers and Corinne Myers, who was only 18 months old.

The shooter continued on his rampage, killing three more people. These random and innocent victims were James Irvin Starling, Sonja Smith, and Bruce Wilson Malloy.

The rampage ended another 12 miles farther east in Geneva at the metals plant where, with a valiant attempt to end the rampage, the State troopers of the Dothan Post, the police department, and county sheriff's department and an officer of the Conservation and Natural Resources Department were among the first to respond and help resolve the situation. After a gun battle with police, Mr. McLendon took his own life.

The memory, the pain, and the grief of this reckless killing spree will remain with the victims in the communities of Geneva and Coffee, Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, with this bill we have the opportunity to acknowledge the lives lost and the courage and resolve of the many law enforcement officials and community members that helped end the situation. I would like to thank the gentleman from Alabama for introducing and ushering through this House such a thoughtful and considerate measure which can only express the heartfelt sympathy we all feel on behalf of those Americans that were impacted by this tragic event.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge my fellow colleagues to support the adoption of House Resolution 341.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the passage of this resolution recognizing the tragedy that befell the communities of Geneva and Coffee Counties, Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution seeks to take a moment to reflect on the impact one man's senseless acts of violence can have on a community, a State, and a Nation.

On the afternoon of March 10, 2009, the worst killing rampage in Alabama's history began as a disturbed

man started his shooting spree in Samson, Alabama. He indiscriminately fired at passersby and finally took his own life 12 miles away at a manufacturing plant in Geneva, Alabama, where he was once employed.

□ 1245

Once the terror ended, the gunman had left a trail of death and destruction across two counties. Tragically, the lives of Bruce Maloy, Lisa McLendon, Andrea Myers, Corrine Gracy Myers, Sonya Smith, James Starling, James White, Virginia White, Dean Wise and Tracy Wise were taken. Along with the devastating news of the 10 deaths, many others were injured, including four State troopers: Mike Gillis, Greg McCullough, Ella Meyers and Jeffrey Nelson.

It is appropriate that we take this opportunity to express our support and sympathy for the families and friends of the murder victims of this horrible act. In addition, we must take a moment to thank the first responders on that day, the Dothan Troopers Post, the Geneva Police Department, the Geneva County Sheriff's Department, the Conservation Natural Resources Department and the medical professionals that all played a role in quelling what could have been an even larger massacre.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the chief sponsor of this resolution, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BRIGHT).

Mr. BRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 341, which expresses heartfelt sympathy for the victims and families of Geneva and Coffee Counties in Alabama.

On Tuesday, March 10, a lone gunman began a rampage in the Town of Kinston and continued into Samson and Geneva that would leave 11 dead and four injured in southeast Alabama. Without question, it was the worst tragedy Alabama has seen in recent memory.

When I first arrived in Geneva County a day after the shootings, I saw a community still in shock. You never think something like this could happen to you until tragedy strikes in your own backyard. Residents of the Wiregrass were left questioning how one of their own could commit such a heinous and violent crime on his family and neighbors.

A community can never fully prepare for events like these, but first responders, local citizens and elected officials responded to the incident with flying colors. Sympathy for the Wiregrass quickly spread, and an outpouring of aid and goodwill poured into Alabama from across the country. To my colleagues in the House and to people watching across the country, we thank you for your support.

I was impressed by the courage of the people and the ability for everyone to

come together and get through this crisis. I truly believe Americans will remember the Wiregrass as a place that will do whatever it takes to help its fellow citizens. One of our greatest strengths as a country is our ability to collectively respond to tragedy and help our fellow men and women in their times of need. The response to the events of March 10 certainly epitomized the strengths of the American spirit.

After the dust settled, it became clear that the incident could have been much worse without quick and decisive action by our local law enforcement. Much has been said about the actions of law enforcement during and after the shootings, and indeed we cannot thank them enough. Without their heroic efforts, the number of casualties could have been much worse. It was a reminder of how much we appreciate those who are on the front lines protecting and defending us every day. We owe a debt of gratitude to our law enforcement officials for what they do to protect us each and every day.

Though it has been nearly 2 months since the tragedy occurred, the loss of so many in a small community still weighs heavy on the minds of the people in the Wiregrass area. To make problems worse, Geneva and Coffee Counties have experienced intense flooding and violent tornadoes over the last several weeks, inflicting hundreds of thousands of dollars of damage to an already grieving community.

While the resolution on the floor today can offer little solace to the families and friends of those who lost loved ones, I wanted the people of Geneva and Coffee Counties to know that my colleagues in Washington are thinking about them and offering their sympathy and continued support.

I hope this resolution offers some peace of mind to the families of those killed: Bruce Maloy, Lisa McLendon, Andrea Myers, Corrine Gracy Myers, Sonya Smith, James Starling, James White, Virginia White, Dean Wise and Tracy Wise; and that it provides moral support and encouragement to those injured and still recovering: State Trooper Mike Gillis, Greg McCollough, Ella Meyers and Jeffrey Nelson.

And finally, we cannot forget the law enforcement and public officials who provided so much support to a community in shock. Their actions are truly appreciated and heroic.

Additionally, I would like to thank the Alabama congressional delegation, my colleagues, Representatives ADERHOLT, BACHUS, BONNER, DAVIS, GRIFFITH and ROGERS, and the 50 other cosponsors of this resolution. The people of southeast Alabama will forever appreciate your unwavering support and sympathy for my constituents in the Second Congressional District of Alabama.

I urge passage of House Resolution 341.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my friend of 10 years, the gentleman from Alabama, BOBBY BRIGHT, for introducing this resolution and giving the House a chance to vote on it and pass it today, and let me pick out just two things to say about this unspeakable tragedy, if I can.

One of the mysteries of human existence is that evil can exist in a divinely inspired world. The people who live in south Alabama are some of the most humble, God-fearing, patriotic people on the face of this Earth. Their God and their faith is an animating principle to them, and it is enormously difficult to contemplate how such good people could have been visited by such remarkable afternoon horror.

I am comforted, as I know the people in that community were comforted, by all of the expressions of support from around the United States of America, by all of the people who came to their aid, by all of the people who lent their good wishes.

The second observation I would make is there is one thing that stood out to me beyond the television images. We all saw the television images, which were sheer terror. But the next morning I made a phone call to one of the chiefs of the police in one of these small communities and I asked him if he knew any of the people who had been killed or injured. Without missing a beat, he said into the phone, "Mr. Davis, I knew them all. I knew them all." He went on to say, "We are a small town. We go to church together. We play ball together. We meet at each other's homes for holidays. We celebrate events together. We all know each other."

That is the other unique thing about this event, Mr. Speaker, that this event ripped such a hole in the soul of a community of people who were knit close together. That is the special tragedy.

My final observation, I want to thank again BOBBY BRIGHT from the Second District. When I called him the morning after this event, his first instinct was to think like the very good mayor that he was until he came here. He said, "I am getting on a plane. I am going back home because I want to know if they need anything. I want to know if they need help."

That is how executives think, that is how this mayor thought, and the people of the Second District are very privileged and fortunate to have that kind of individual, whose first instinct was "what can I do?", not just to lend support, but to be of assistance.

So I extend my condolences to these individuals and to their families. May God bless the souls of the lost, and may He mend the bodies of those who are left and wounded.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has no further speakers, I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I simply urge my colleagues to join with Congressman BRIGHT and Congressman DAVIS in support of this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 341.

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.

BRIAN K. SCHRAMM POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1595) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3245 Latta Road in Rochester, New York, as the "Brian K. Schramm Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1595

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

SECTION 1. BRIAN K. SCHRAMM POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3245 Latta Road in Rochester, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Brian K. Schramm 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 "Brian K. Schramm Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the House subcommittee with jurisdiction over the United States Postal Service, I am pleased to present H.R. 1595 for consideration. This legislation will designate the United States postal facility located at 3245 Latta Road in Rochester, New York, as the Brian K. Schramm Post Office Building.

Introduced on March 18, 2009, by my colleague Representative CHRIS LEE of New York and reported out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee on April 2, 2009, by unanimous consent, H.R. 1595 enjoys the support of the entire sitting New York House delegation.

A lifelong resident of the town of Greece in Rochester, New York, Lance Corporal Brian K. Schramm bravely served in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom with the 2nd Assault Amphibian Battalion, 2nd Marine Division, 2nd Marine Expeditionary Force out of Camp Lejeune, North Carolina. On October 15, 2004, Lance Corporal Schramm was killed in action at the age of 22 during an enemy shrapnel attack in Babil Province, Iraq.

Upon his graduation from Greece Olympia High School in 2001, Lance Corporal Schramm chose to fulfill one of his life's dreams and join the United States Marine Corps. He served his first tour of duty in Iraq shortly following the March 20, 2003, launch of Operation Iraqi Freedom, and he bravely returned to the region in June of 2004 for his second tour.

As noted by his devoted father, Keith, Lance Corporal Schramm was a genuine American hero who clearly knew what he wanted to do in life and he did it. Brian's loving family members also described the young soldier as a strong leader and motivator who was never down. He loved life and treated every day as an opportunity for adventure.

Lance Corporal Schramm's friends and teachers at Greece Olympia High School and the surrounding community similarly remember Brian for his depth of decency, his contagious sense of humor, and his refusal to quit any assignment or mission, regardless of the difficulties he faced or the challenges that he met.

Lance Corporal Schramm's genuine devotion to community service will also never be forgotten. In addition to his courageous military service, Brian frequently returned to his alma mater to discuss the war in Iraq, and was hoping to eventually become a police officer.

It is in light of Brian's character and devotion to public service that Greece Olympia High School has already established the Brian Schramm Scholarship, awarded annually to a college-bound senior who demonstrates the extraordinary qualities exhibited by Brian Schramm. And it is my hope that we can further honor this fallen hero through the passage of this legislation, to dedicate the Latta Road post office building in his name.

Mr. Speaker, Lance Corporal Brian Schramm's life stands as a testament to the bravery and dedication of our heroic men and women who have served our Nation at home and abroad, and I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting H.R. 1595.

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

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 1595, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3245 Latta Road in Rochester, New York as the "Brian K. Schramm Post Office Building."

Today we honor one of our nation's fallen heroes—Marine Lance Cpl. Brian K. Schramm.

He embodied every sense of the word hero and paid the ultimate sacrifice on October 15, 2004 at the age of 22.

Lance Cpl. Schramm of Rochester, New York, assigned to the 2nd Assault Amphibian Battalion, 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force out of Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, was killed by enemy action in Babil Province, Iraq. Schramm had spent five months in the Middle East and Iraq in 2003 and was deployed again to Iraq in June of 2004.

Babil Province was a hotspot south of Baghdad and the U.S. military had launched a major offensive in October of 2004 to try to put down the insurgency. Lance Cpl. Schramm was serving his second tour of duty in Iraq at the time.

Friends and family remember Lance Cpl. Schramm for his enduring sense of humor and decency. A high school friend of his described Schramm as "the most genuine person you'd ever meet in your entire life."

Lance Cpl. Schramm's father, Keith, speaks of Brian's desire to become a Marine early on in his childhood. "It was a lifelong dream" of Brian's to become a Marine.

It is with this in mind that we honor Brian today. With gratitude for his bravery and sacrifice to his country, I ask that all members join me in supporting H.R. 1595, which will rename the post office in Rochester, New York, in Lance Cpl. Brian K. Schramm's honor.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the State of New York (Mr. LEE), the original sponsor of this legislation.

□ 1300

Mr. LEE of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wanted to thank the chairman and the ranking member for helping to bring this legislation to the floor. I also want to thank the members of our New York delegation for cosponsoring this measure.

Last month, I visited with Army National Guardsmen based out of Western New York who spent part of 2007 and most of 2008 serving in Afghanistan. These are soldiers who put their lives on hold for more than a year to help train the Afghan national army and police. They take great pride in the work that they do over there, but what they are most proud of is the fact that everyone came home safe and sound. Of course, not all units are fortunate.

A great hero by the name of Brian Schramm, who grew up in Monroe County, a native of the town of Greece, heard the call to serve early on in his life. He signed up not long after graduating high school and went on to become a tremendous Marine.

On October 15, 2004, Lance Corporal Schramm was on his second tour of Iraq when he became the first resident of the 26th Congressional District to be killed in action in Iraq. He was 22.

Brian made the ultimate sacrifice to protect the values that sustain this country, family, community, hard work and freedom. That is why I introduced this proposal to rename the post office in his honor just a few miles down the road from where Brian had grown up.

This is one way to pay tribute not only to Brian's sacrifices, but those of his loved ones as well, his parents, Keith and Mary Ellen; his older sister, Jennifer; and his two younger brothers, Kyle and Michael.

Keith and Mary Ellen, who I've had the privilege to meet, have honored their son's legacy by becoming very active in local veterans' issues. Mary Ellen recently started the Rochester chapter of Gold Star Mothers.

Being part of a military family requires a great amount of courage, and in Keith and Mary Ellen, the town of Greece has two everyday heroes.

This post office would certainly not be the last tribute to Brian's memory. Each year a student at Brian's alma mater of Greece Olympia High School receives a scholarship in his name. This award is a testament to Brian's incredible work ethic and his lifelong desire to help others.

Today, western New Yorkers seek to take another step towards repaying the great debt of gratitude we owe to Lance Corporal Schramm by redesignating a Federal facility in his honor.

This legislation will make it so that children growing up in the town of Greece now and years to come will ask their parents, who was Brian Schramm? And then they will come to know about the selfless individual and brave patriot who gave his life to protect this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better way to ensure that Brian's legacy endures.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, but I continue to reserve.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers. And I just ask that my colleagues would give unanimous support for the renaming of this post office for this fallen hero.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LEE) in asking our Members to unanimously support this designation of this post office in memory of Brian Schramm.

I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1595.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR VIETNAMESE REFUGEES DAY

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 342) expressing support for designation of May 2, 2009, as "Vietnamese Refugees Day".

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 342

Whereas the Library of Congress' Asian Division together with many Vietnamese-American organizations across the United States will sponsor a "Journey to Freedom: A Boat People Retrospective" symposium on May 2, 2009;

Whereas Vietnamese refugees were asylum-seekers from Communist-controlled Vietnam;

Whereas many Vietnamese escaped in boats during the late 1970s, after the Vietnam War and by land across the Cambodian, Laotian, and Thai borders into refugee camps in Thailand;

Whereas over 2,000,000 Vietnamese boat people and other refugees are now spread across the world, in the United States, Australia, Canada, France, England, Germany, China, Japan, Hong Kong, South Korea, the Philippines, and other nations;

Whereas over half of all overseas Vietnamese are Vietnamese-Americans, and Vietnamese-Americans are the fourth-largest Asian American group in the United States;

Whereas, as of 2006, 72 percent of Vietnamese-Americans were naturalized United States citizens, the highest rate among all Asian groups;

Whereas Vietnamese-Americans have made significant contributions to the rich culture and economic prosperity of the United States;

Whereas Vietnamese-Americans have distinguished themselves in the fields of literature, the arts, science, and athletics, and include actors and actresses, physicists, an astronaut, and Olympic athletes; and

Whereas May 2, 2009, would be an appropriate day to designate as "Vietnamese Refugees Day": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives supports the designation of "Vietnamese Refugees Day" in order to commemorate the arrival of Vietnamese refugees in the United States, to document their harrowing experiences, and subsequent achievements in their new homeland, to honor the host countries that welcomed the boat people, and to recognize the voluntary agencies and nongovernmental organizations that facilitated their resettlement, adjustment, and assimilation into mainstream society in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. 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 stand to join my colleagues in the consideration of House Resolution 342, which expresses our support for the designation of May 2, 2009, as "Vietnamese Refugees Day."

And House Resolution 342 was introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman CAO, on April 21, 2009, and was considered by and reported from the Oversight Committee on April 23, 2009, by unanimous consent. This measure has the support and cosponsorship of 67 Members of Congress.

Basically, Vietnamese refugees were asylum-seekers from Communist-controlled Vietnam. In the late 1970s, many Vietnamese escaped in boats and by land across the Cambodian, Laotian and the Thai borders into refugee camps in Thailand after the Vietnam war. Over 2 million Vietnamese boat people and other refugees are now spread across the world, in the United States, Australia, Canada, France, England, Germany, Japan, China, Hong Kong and South Korea, also in the Philippines and other nations. Over half of all overseas Vietnamese are Vietnamese-Americans, and Vietnamese-Americans are the fourth largest Asian American group in the United States.

As of 2006, 72 percent of Vietnamese-Americans were naturalized United States citizens, the highest rate among all Asian groups. Vietnamese-Americans have made significant contributions to the rich culture and economic prosperity of the United States.

Vietnamese-Americans have distinguished themselves in fields of literature, the arts, science and athletics, and include actors and actresses, physicists, an astronaut, and Olympic athletes and so on. And on May 2, 2009, many will come together to recognize what has been designated as "Vietnamese Refugees Day."

Mr. Speaker, with this bill, we have the opportunity to commemorate the arrival and integration of Vietnamese refugees into the United States and remember the arduous task that many citizens and the citizens of the world have had to travel to attain for their liberty, safety and prosperity.

I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CAO) for authoring such an important resolution, and I urge my colleagues to join all of us here on the floor now in support of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, and I wish to yield as

much time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague from the great State of Louisiana (Mr. CAO), the original sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. CAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 342, to designate May 2, 2009, as “Vietnamese Refugees Day.”

As the Vietnam war came to an end, millions fled Communist-controlled Vietnam by boat and by land, across the Cambodian, Laotian and Thai borders into refugee camps.

Like me, many of the conflict’s refugees came to the United States. In fact, it was April 28, 1975, exactly 34 years ago today, that, as Saigon fell, I climbed aboard a C-130 destined for the United States and my new life. To date, over 2 million Vietnamese boat people and other refugees of the conflict remain dispersed globally.

In the United States, as of 2006, 72 percent of Vietnamese Americans are naturalized United States citizens, the highest rate among Asian groups. Vietnamese Americans have made significant contributions to the cultural and economic prosperity of the United States. They count among their ranks artists, singers, actors, scientists, astronauts, restaurateurs, Olympians and elected officials. While Vietnamese Americans’ accomplishments are significant and notable, it is critical that their history and the history of their ancestors be recorded.

Mr. Speaker, on May 2, 2009, the Library of Congress Asian Division is joining many Vietnamese American organizations across the United States in sponsoring a symposium entitled “Journey to Freedom: A Boat People Retrospective.” In honor of this significant event, I ask my colleagues to support House Resolution 342 to designate May 2, 2009, as “Vietnamese Refugees Day.” By doing so, we enshrine in the hearts and consciousness of Americans the tragic, heroic and uplifting stories of perseverance and the pursuit of freedom of millions of Vietnamese refugees to ensure those stories will stand as an inspiration to generations of Americans to come.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, but I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), and my good friend and classmate, a great American.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) for the time and for recognizing our valuable partnership in this fine august body.

Mr. Speaker, today I also rise, as the Vietnamese community in my district gathers for their regular meeting, to express my support for a national Vietnamese Refugees Day.

Throughout the past years, I have listened with great interest and admiration to the poignant stories of hardship and triumph that many members

of the Vietnamese community have shared with me. I am deeply moved by their dedication to the principles of liberty that have distinguished our American experience. This is expressed in the difficult decisions to leave their beloved homeland of Vietnam and to embrace our Nation’s founding principles, principles that those of us who have never experienced life under oppression and communism invariably run the risk of taking for granted.

Even today, Vietnamese American refugees gather across this Nation to raise awareness of concerns affecting their loved ones back in Vietnam. Lincoln’s Vietnamese American community has been particularly concerned with religious freedom and Vietnam’s two-child policy. And I have tried to make it a priority to urge the Government of Vietnam to uphold its stated commitments to religious freedom. I deeply value the active civic engagement of the Vietnamese American community in Nebraska with regards to these and other important human rights issues.

It is my privilege to serve the Vietnamese American community. And I want to thank Congressman CAO, who, as he mentioned, at 8 years old, 34 years ago today, fled his homeland of Vietnam on a United States of America C-130 transport plane, for bringing this important resolution forward and allowing us to reflect on the profound commitment of the Vietnamese refugee population to the well-being of our Nation.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, we continue to reserve.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, it’s my privilege to yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague from the State of New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 342, offered by my good friend and colleague, Mr. JOSEPH CAO. The “Vietnamese Refugees Day” resolution sets aside May 2, 2009, as a day of remembrance and celebration for the growing Vietnamese American community in the United States and throughout the world.

First, I would like to say a few words about Mr. CAO, the first Vietnamese-American elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. JOSEPH is a husband, proud father and man of deep and abiding religious faith and currently serves the people of Louisiana’s Second District with honor and distinction.

Mr. CAO is far too modest and humble to say it, but he is the quintessential example of a refugee success story.

JOSEPH CAO’s father, a lieutenant in the Army of the Republic of Vietnam, was captured by the North Vietnamese at the end of the war and was incarcerated for seven terrible years in a reeducation camp.

In 1975, at the age of 8, JOSEPH escaped Vietnam with two of his siblings. His mom and jailed father remained behind. JOSEPH CAO worked hard in his new adopted homeland. Smart, re-

sourceful, devout and generous to a fault, JOSEPH earned his Bachelor’s Degree at Baylor, his Master’s from Fordham University, and his J.D. from Loyola Law School.

□ 1315

Never forgetting the plight of refugees, and wanting to make a difference in the lives of the disenfranchised, JOSEPH became an immigration lawyer. He worked tirelessly to aid refugees and to assist in unifying families. He served as a member of the board of directors of Boat People SOS, and he is now a member of the United States Congress and is a rising star in the House.

Mr. Speaker, JOSEPH CAO is an inspiration to all who escape tyranny and come to America. With persistence and hard work and faith, JOSEPH inspires a new generation of refugees and, really, everyone else as well that you can achieve much and do wonderful things if you put your mind to it and you persist.

JOSEPH’s legislation highlights the extraordinary work and the contributions made by Vietnamese Americans and the work of groups like Boat People SOS and the work of people like Dr. Thang, who have welcomed Vietnamese asylum seekers fleeing reeducation camps, harassment, and religious persecution, labor violations and other human rights abuses.

Over 2 million boat people and other refugees from Vietnam have received asylum in the United States and around the world. Half of those individuals have made their home in the U.S. Vietnamese Americans have made and continue to make a significant contributions to our country, bringing their rich heritage and culture and work ethic to the United States, their new, cherished permanent home.

The sad thing, Mr. Speaker, is that Vietnam’s government continues to repress its own citizens, and the human rights record of that country’s government remains deplorable. So many Vietnamese suffer each day at the hands of the government and secret police. It’s deplorable.

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Additionally, ethnic religious minority groups such as the Montagnards in the Central Highlands and the Khmer Krom Buddhists continue to face intense persecution, beatings and even death.

I would hope that Mr. CAO’s resolution causes this Congress to reexamine Vietnam’s human rights record and redouble our efforts to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam and to remove hindrances for Vietnamese people seeking asylum in the U.S. and elsewhere around the world.

Again, I congratulate my good friend and colleague. His is a success story that needs to be held up in neon lights. JOSEPH CAO, you are an extraordinarily talented and courageous leader.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, we continue to reserve.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. CAO, for introducing this piece of legislation, and I urge my fellow Members to support the passage of H. Res. 342.

Mr. Speaker, in 1975, after the Vietnam War, a mass immigration to the United States of Vietnamese people began. These early Vietnamese immigrants were fleeing persecution by the Communists in power in that region of the world. They came to America, sometimes with barely the clothes on their back, seeking asylum and a better life.

Many of them can recount harrowing experiences in having to flee their homelands, some by boat, and others by land across Cambodia, Laos and Thai borders into refugee camps. In fact, over 2 million Vietnamese boat people and other refugees are now spread across the world, in the United States, Australia, Canada, France, England, Germany, China, Japan, Hong Kong, South Korea, the Philippines and other nations.

And yet despite these harrowing escapes from oppressive regimes, Vietnamese-Americans have made significant contributions to the rich culture and economic prosperity of the United States. Vietnamese-Americans have distinguished themselves in the fields of literature, the arts, science and athletics. In fact, just a few months ago, the people of Louisiana's Second Congressional District, elected the first Vietnamese-American and sent the author of this piece of legislation, Representative ANH "JOSEPH" CAO, to Congress.

According to Census Data, as of 2006, 72 percent of foreign-born Vietnamese are naturalized U.S. citizens. When combined with the 36 percent of Vietnamese born in America, a full 82 percent of Vietnamese are American citizens. Over half of all overseas Vietnamese are Vietnamese-Americans. What's more, there are well over 1 million people in the U.S. who identify themselves as Vietnamese alone or in combination with other ethnicities, ranking fourth among the Asian American groups.

According to 2006 Census Data, the Vietnamese American population has grown to 1.6 million and remains the second largest Southeast Asian American subgroup.

In light of the civic achievements of Vietnamese-Americans, I am pleased to support, and urge my colleagues to support this resolution, designating May 2, 2009 as "Vietnamese Refugees Day" in order to commemorate the arrival of Vietnamese refugees in the United States, to document their harrowing experiences and subsequent achievements in their new homeland, to honor the host countries that welcomed the boat people, and to recognize the voluntary agencies and nongovernmental organizations that facilitated their resettlement, adjustment, and assimilation into mainstream society in the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to congratulate Mr. CAO on his leadership in sponsoring this resolution. I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for his leadership as well.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 342 and the designation of May 2, 2009 as "Vietnamese Refugees Day."

Millions of Boat People and other Vietnamese refugees endured harrowing voyages

to escape the tyranny and deprivations of communist Vietnam. Hundreds of thousands of those refugees reached the United States, and we are all better for it. Like so many immigrants before and since, they came seeking freedom, and in turn became valuable members of their new communities. I have the privilege of representing many Vietnamese-Americans in San Jose, California, and can attest to this first-hand.

Unfortunately, I cannot speak with the same warmth about the situation inside Vietnam. To this day, the Vietnamese government refuses to respect the basic human rights of its own citizens. Reports by the State Department, the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, and non-governmental and Vietnamese American organizations document egregious abuses of free speech and expression, religious liberty, and many other fundamental freedoms.

So today I rise to honor the experiences of Vietnamese refugees, and to commend the Vietnamese Americans who have successfully rebuilt their lives in the United States while fighting for the rights of those left in Vietnam.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 342.

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.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 13, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

Mr. MCGOVERN (during consideration of H. Res. 357), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-90) on the resolution (H. Res. 371) providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2010, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SUPPORTING FINANCIAL LITERACY MONTH

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 357) supporting the goals and ideals of Financial Literacy Month 2009, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 357

Whereas personal financial literacy is essential to ensure that individuals are prepared to make informed financial choices, as well as manage money, credit, debt, and risk and become responsible workers, heads of households, investors, entrepreneurs, business leaders, and citizens;

Whereas personal financial management skills and lifelong habits begin to develop during childhood, making it all the more important to support youth financial education;

Whereas a 2008 survey of high school seniors conducted by the JumpStart Coalition for Personal Financial Literacy revealed that students in 2008 answered correctly only 48.3 percent of the survey's questions, a decline from those posted by students in 2006, who correctly answered 52.4 percent of the questions;

Whereas 84 percent of undergraduates had at least one credit card in 2008, up from 76 percent in 2004, with the average number of cards increasing to 4.6 according to Sallie Mae's National Study of Usage Rates and Trends 2009 entitled "How Undergraduate Students Use Credit Cards";

Whereas personal saving as a percentage of disposable personal income was 4.2 percent in February, compared with 4.4 percent in January, and up from a 12-month average of 1.7 percent in 2008, according to the Bureau of Economic Analysis;

Whereas the average baby boomer has only \$50,000 in savings apart from equity in their homes, according to the Federal Reserve Board's Survey of Consumer Finances for 2007;

Whereas studies show that as many as 10,000,000 households in the United States are "unbanked" or are without access to mainstream financial products and services;

Whereas public, community-based, and private sector organizations throughout the United States are working to increase financial literacy rates for Americans of all ages and walks of life through a range of outreach efforts, including media campaigns, websites, and one-on-one financial counseling for individuals;

Whereas bankers across the United States taught savings skills to young people on April 21, 2009, during Teach Children to Save Day, which was started by the American Bankers Association Education Foundation in April of 1997 and has now helped more than 72,000 bankers teach savings skills to nearly 3,200,000 young people;

Whereas staff from America's credit unions are making presentations to young people at local schools on financial topics such as student loans, balancing a checkbook, and auto loans during National Credit Union Youth Week, April 19-25, 2009;

Whereas more than 100 Federal agencies have collaborated on a website, www.consumer.gov, which helps consumers shop for a mortgage or auto loan, understand and reconcile credit card statements and utility bills, choose savings and retirement plans, compare health insurance policies, and understand their credit report and how it affects their ability to get credit and on what terms;

Whereas Members of the United States House of Representatives established the Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus (FELC) in February 2005 to provide a forum for interested Members of Congress to review, discuss and recommend financial and economic literacy policies, legislation, and programs, collaborate with the private sector, and nonprofit and community-based organizations, and organize and promote financial literacy legislation, seminars, and events, such as "Financial Literacy Month"

in April, 2009, and the annual "Financial Literacy Day Fair" on April 30, 2009; and

Whereas the Council for Economic Education, its State Councils and Centers for Economic Education, the JumpStart Coalition for Personal Financial Literacy, its State affiliates, and its partner organizations, and JA Worldwide have designated April as Financial Literacy Month to educate the public about the need for increased financial literacy for youth and adults in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Financial Literacy Month, including raising public awareness about financial education;

(2) recognizes the importance of managing personal finances, increasing personal savings, and reducing personal debt in the United States; and

(3) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling on the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, other entities, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs and activities with the goal of increasing financial literacy rates for individuals of all ages and walks of life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert any extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I would first like to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois, for her good work on the issue of financial literacy. I would also like to recognize my colleague, Mr. HINOJOSA, as co-founder and cochair of the Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus and to commend him for his work on this issue.

Possessing the skills to make informed financial decisions not only helps American families, but it's important for long-term fiscal soundness. From basic financial tools like balancing a checkbook and making a family budget, to more complex themes such as understanding intricate contracts, everybody can benefit from a little education on financial literacy.

As we have seen with the recent housing market problems, for example, too many people are unfamiliar with basic economic concepts needed to make responsible investments. With serious questions about the long-term viability of Social Security, it's clear that we do need to do a better job of educating people about the importance of private retirement savings.

Most importantly, however, we must ensure that throughout their regular

education, our students have access to programs that promote financial literacy so they can form good money management habits before they inadvertently learn bad ones. Studies show that the percentage of undergraduates with credit cards is rising, while their basic understanding of the terms of these cards is on the decline. We must do something to stem this tide.

With responsible money management skills, it is easier for Americans to ride out rough economic times and prosper in times of economic richness. As we face the toughest economic challenge in our country since the Great Depression, it's evident that exercising prudent monetary practice is not a luxury, but a necessity, for all Americans.

We need to highlight the need for financial education and understanding. H. Res. 357 supports these goals and the goals of Financial Literacy Month. I couldn't be happier to be a cosponsor.

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

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

I rise today as a cosponsor of House Resolution 357, which recognizes April as Financial Literacy Month, and I would strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

I would like to begin by thanking my good friend and fellow chair of the House Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus, Mr. HINOJOSA, for his continuing efforts to improve financial literacy rates in America. I know he would have liked to have been here. He has been such an important force in financial literacy matters and will continue to be. I would like to thank my colleague from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) for managing this bill on his behalf.

Our Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus has been at the forefront of this issue for several years, but we have much more work to do before us if we are going to help today's children become tomorrow's smart investors, entrepreneurs and business leaders, especially in tough economic times like this.

Mr. Speaker, efforts to stimulate the economy cannot succeed unless we equip Americans with the knowledge and resources they need to succeed in today's market.

According to the JumpStart Coalition, high school seniors in 2008 answered only 48.3 percent of their organization's survey questions correctly on personal finance, a decline of 4.1 percent from 2006. And your average baby boomer still only has less than \$50,000 in savings, and that savings continues to shrink as our economy continues to regain its momentum.

I know it's kind of odd to think about, but one of the few bright spots in the current economic climate is that savings rate has finally risen above the near zero level up to the 4 percent range. I think Americans are learning that a financial buffer is critical when times get unexpectedly tough.

So while we want to stimulate commerce in the short term, we must ensure that people do not forget the lessons of the past. We need to be prepared for tuition costs, a home, health care and retirement. We need a financial cushion against unexpected challenges like the death of a family member or a health condition, and we need the capital necessary for new entrepreneurs to launch the startups and open the small businesses that drive this economy.

Every American should have the opportunity and the know-how to fulfill each of these goals, and we must share these lessons with our children and our grandchildren through new, effective methods of teaching sound money management skills. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and show that financial literacy remains a top priority for Congress.

I would also like to encourage Members of the House and their staff to attend Friday's annual Financial Literacy Day Fair, which will be held from 12 noon to 4 p.m. in the afternoon in the Cannon Caucus Room, where you will be able to find a broad array of financial educational materials and ideas for reaching out to constituents on this important issue.

With that, I would urge support of this resolution and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I would join my colleague from Illinois in inviting Members to attend this Financial Literacy Day. This is very, very important and I appreciate her mentioning that.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 357, supporting the goals and ideals of Financial Literacy Month. I would also like to commend the gentleman from Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, and the gentlewoman from Illinois, Mrs. BIGGERT, the co-chairs of the Financial Literacy Caucus, for all of their hard work on this important issue.

It is imperative in our current economy that we do everything we possibly can to encourage greater financial literacy for all Americans. As we all know, a major factor in the collapse of our financial markets can be attributed to unscrupulous lenders who took advantage of consumers. In these cases, predatory lenders, looking to make a quick buck, misled consumers by encouraging them to enter into complicated mortgage products, such as adjustable rate mortgages, without fully understanding the implications if home prices fell or interest rates adjusted. In other cases, irresponsible borrowers took advantage of so-called "no-doc" loans to exaggerate income information to buy a home they couldn't afford or re-finance to pull equity out, as if their home were an ATM machine. This eventually led to higher mortgage delinquencies and contributed to the housing downturn, ultimately affecting responsible homeowners who lived within their means and paid their mortgages on time. Even the best and brightest minds on Wall Street fell prey to this problem, making bad bets and overexposing their organizations with complicated financial products based on these bad loans. As mortgage defaults increased, the value of many of these real estate-related products collapsed, creating a

downturn which spread to other sectors of the global economy.

It is clear that an understanding of personal finance—from basic spending decisions to deciphering borrowing terms to investing and saving—is important to effectively plan for the future. And there are significant signs that we need to help our youth establish a strong foundation in personal finance at an early age and practice these lessons throughout life. For example, the JumpStart Coalition's 2008 survey found that only 48.3 percent of high school seniors possessed an understanding of basic finance, a decline from the 2006 survey. At the same time, according to an April 2009 Sallie Mae report, 84 percent of college undergraduates had at least one credit card. This represents a disturbing trend, as these statistics demonstrate that while these young adults have access to credit, they may not necessarily understand how to use it wisely. If we don't encourage our children to understand personal finance now, we run the risk of repeating the same mistakes all over again.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we must all do our part to enhance financial literacy. On April 21, the American Bankers Association Education Foundation held their annual Teach Children to Save Day, to help young people enhance their savings skills. Since 1997, 72,000 bankers have participated to teach nearly 3.2 million youth. Also, America's credit unions made presentations at local schools on financial issues during National Credit Union Youth Week, April 19 to 25. In addition, www.consumer.gov, a website sponsored by 100 Federal agencies, provides assistance to consumers on a variety of financial matters, including shopping for a mortgage or auto loan, understanding credit card statements and planning for savings and retirement.

At the same time, Congress needs to take action to help workers and families begin to rebuild their savings and retirement accounts, and prepare for the future. That is why I am supporting the Savings Recovery Act, which I co-authored this month with several of my colleagues. This bill includes a number of provisions that will help working families recoup the losses that have been suffered and once again build up the savings and retirement accounts that give us all confidence in our financial futures.

Also of note, late last year, the Federal Reserve Board approved final rules which enhance consumer protections and improve credit card disclosure terms. The new rules, which go into effect on July 1, 2010, protect against unexpected interest rate increases, provide consumers with adequate time to make payments and make borrowing terms more understandable for consumers.

Put simply, financial literacy is about opportunity. It is about empowering individuals to make informed financial decisions, helping them to attain financial independence and future prosperity. Working together, we can ensure that America's youth gain a fundamental understanding of personal finance to help them succeed later in life. I am honored to be an original co-sponsor of this measure and urge Members to vote "yes" on the resolution.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 357, which recognizes the month of April as Financial Literacy Month.

As a cosponsor of this important resolution, it is my goal to empower individuals with knowledge so they can make informed deci-

sions and achieve financial freedom. During these tumultuous and unprecedented financial times, it is particularly important that Americans access available financial counseling and individuals pay close attention to details of all their financial agreements. These are surefire ways to ensure that families and individuals have the resources necessary to secure a solid future.

Through a financial plan, we begin to dream. When we dream, we have the incentive to save; and through savings, we flourish financially. Financial stability is the foundation on which freedom and prosperity are built.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Financial Literacy Caucus, I am thrilled to cosponsor this resolution so that many Americans, some for the first time, can begin to dream of a life of financial security, and work to reach their highest goals and aspirations.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 357, Supporting the goals and ideals of financial literacy month 2009. This resolution is timely. I would like to thank Representative HINOJOSA for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor. In light of today's economic realities—the fact that this is the deepest recession since the Great Depression with unemployment at record highs—I would encourage each of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Americans are taught to work hard and make money and to buy house, but we are never told about financial literacy. In these tough economic times, it is imperative that Americans know about financial literacy; it is crucial to our survival. Americans need to be prepared to make informed financial choices. Indeed, we much learn how to effectively handle money, credit, debt, and risk. We must become better stewards over the things that we are entrusted. By becoming better stewards, Americans will become responsible workers, heads of households, investors, entrepreneurs, business leaders and citizens.

In 2008, 84 percent of undergraduates had at least one credit card. This figure is staggering. Young people who themselves might not even have job are able to get credit cards. This is astounding because it begins the cycle of indebtedness.

Recent studies have indicated that young people do not even know basic financial topics such as the impact of student loans on one's credit, how to balance a checkbook, and the impact of automobile loans on one's credit.

Because of my concern that young people are not sufficiently informed about financial literacy, I have introduced a H.R. 1325. H.R. 1325, To require financial literacy counseling for borrowers, and for other purposes. This legislation is important because approximately two-thirds of students borrow to pay for college according to the Center for Economic and Policy Research. Moreover, one in ten of student borrowers have loans more than \$35,000. Passing this legislation will ensure that our nation's college students will be more prepared when incurring student loan debt and help them to avoid default as student loans severely impact one's credit score. Currently there is about \$60 billion in defaulted student loan debt.

Many students do not understand the reality of repaying student debt while taking out these loans. While most Americans have debt of some kind, student loan repayment is especially scary, as one cannot just declare bank-

ruptcy and have their loans discharged. Due to the lack of financial literacy counseling for borrowers, student loan payments are often higher than expected. Recent grads are unable to afford the monthly payments resulting in them living paycheck to paycheck, acquiring credit card debt and in extreme cases, grads leaving the country in order to avoid repayment and debt collectors.

Students and parents are not currently receiving the proper or any information of the burden that their student loans will have once they graduate. This is possibly a result of the relationship between student loan companies and universities, as some lenders offer universities incentives to steer borrowers their way.

College campuses are one place that young Americans are introduced to credit and the possibility of living beyond their means. With proper loan and credit counseling the burden of debt incurred in college could be greatly reduced. Especially in this time of recession, financial literacy is one of the most important tools that we can give to our students in order to ensure their success in the future.

This legislation will provide financial literacy training to students taking out Federal Student Loans and will require a minimum of 4 hours of counseling including entrance and exit counseling. Counseling will include the fundamentals of basic checking and savings accounts, budgeting, types of credit and their appropriate uses, the different forms of student financial aid, repayment options, credit scores and ratings, as well as investing.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and to support my bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 357.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO ARNOLD PALMER

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1243) to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Arnold Palmer in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence and good sportsmanship in golf.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1243

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Arnold Palmer is a world famous golf professional, a highly successful business executive, a prominent advertising spokesman, a devoted husband, father, and grandfather, and a man with a common touch that has made him one of the most popular and accessible public figures in history.

(2) Arnold Palmer amassed 92 championships in professional competition of national or international stature by the end of 1993, 62 of which came on the Professional Golf Association Tour.

(3) Arnold Palmer's magnetic personality and unfailing sense of kindness and thoughtfulness have endeared him to millions throughout the world.

(4) Arnold Palmer has been the recipient of countless honors including virtually every national award in golf and both the Hickok Athlete of the Year and Sports Illustrated's Sportsman of the Year awards, and he was chosen Athlete of the Decade for the 1960s in a national Associated Press poll.

(5) Arnold Palmer has received numerous honors outside the world of sports, including the Patriot Award of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society, the Golden Plate award of the American Academy of Achievement, and the United States Navy Memorial Lone Sailor Award.

(6) Arnold Palmer was honored by the United States Golf Association with the opening of the Arnold Palmer Center for Golf History on June 3rd 2008.

(7) Arnold Palmer served his country for 3 years in the United States Coast Guard and was among those chosen to address the Joint Session of Congress on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

(8) Arnold Palmer served as Honorary National Chairman of the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation for 20 years and played a major role in the fund-raising drive that led to the creation of the Arnold Palmer Hospital for Children in Orlando and the Latrobe Area Hospital Charitable Foundation in his Western Pennsylvania hometown.

(9) Arnold Palmer remains active in tournament golf, although he retired from competition in the major championships on April 14, 2002, when he played the last of his 48 Masters Tournaments, where he was given an emotional standing ovation as he finished the 18th hole.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the presentation, on behalf of the Congress, of a gold medal of appropriate design to Arnold Palmer in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence and good sportsmanship.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purpose of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, the Secretary may strike duplicate medals in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 2 and sell such duplicate medals at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the duplicate medals (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses) and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL MEDALS.

The medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 5. FUNDING.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF CHARGES.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund an amount not to exceed \$30,000 to pay for the cost of the medals authorized by this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals under section 3 shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank Chairman FRANK, Ranking Member SPENCER BACHUS and my colleague, JUDY BIGGERT, who is also a co-sponsor of this legislation.

I want to take the time to thank my colleagues in the House of Representatives for their support on this bill. It truly is a bipartisan bill.

I also want to thank my staff for their hard work and dedication. I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1243, to honor Arnold Palmer with a Congressional Gold Medal. Arnold Palmer's golf record is one history will forever remember. He is a legend and a giant amongst golfers.

I have had the opportunity to play with Arnold Palmer before. My son, Joe Baca, Jr., mayor pro tem, City of Rialto, was also in attendance. This was the most memorable outing I have had the pleasure of experiencing. It was an experience the two of us will never forget.

It was like a dream come true. I had to pinch myself to make sure that this wasn't just a dream. Not only is he a golf legend, but also a genuine person with a great sense of humor.

Walking these 18 holes with him will forever be one of my greatest moments in life, besides, of course, marrying my wife and having my four children.

His drive and passion for the game is an example of sportsmanship of the highest caliber and was an inspiration to me.

However, I ask that Arnold Palmer be awarded the Congressional Gold Medal for his leadership as an American.

□ 1330

Palmer was born in Latrobe, Pennsylvania in September of 1929. He learned golf from his father, Deacon Palmer, who was the head professional and greenskeeper at Latrobe Country

Club. At the age of 7, Palmer broke 70 at Bent Creek Country Club.

Can you imagine the rest of us with the kind of equipment that we have today and his having that equipment and breaking 70 at that tender age? My Lord, that is something else.

As a youngster, Palmer was only allowed on the Latrobe course in the early mornings or late afternoons when the members weren't playing. He attended Wake Forest University on a golf scholarship. He left upon the death of close friend, Bud Worsham, and enlisted in the Coast Guard where he served for 3 years and continued to hone his skills.

Palmer gathered himself and returned to competitive golf. His win in the 1954 U.S. Amateur Championship made him decide to try the pro tour for a while, and he and his new bride, Winifred, whom he had met at a Pennsylvania tournament, traveled the circuit for 1955.

As a member of the Professional Golfers Association, PGA, which also stands for "posture, grip and alignment," Palmer won the 1955 Canadian Open in his rookie season. He raised his game systematically for the next several sessions.

With the help of his unfailing personality and lucrative business ventures, Arnold Palmer has almost single-handedly brought golf out of the elite country clubs and into the consciousness of mainstream America, which is where most of us are from, mainstream America.

Palmer won his first major championship at the 1958 Masters, cementing his position as one of the leading stars in golf. Palmer is credited by many for securing the status of the Open Championship—the British Open—among U.S. players.

After Ben Hogan won the championship in 1953, few American professionals had traveled to play in The Open due to its travel requirements, relatively small prize purses and the style of its links courses. That means traveling across the country for the game of golf and for the love of the game of golf to ensure that others love the game and are as compassionate as he is about the game.

Palmer's Open wins in the early 1960s convinced many American pros that a trip to Britain would be worth the effort. He secured his popularity among the British and European fans and, of course, the American fans.

In all, Arnold Palmer won 92 professional events. Can you imagine what that's like? Ninety-two. Some of us can't even win when we go out and play on a weekend. Ninety-two professional events. His most prominent professional titles were four Masters—and I repeat four Masters—in 1958, 1960, 1962, and 1964—wow—two British Opens in 1961 and 1962 and the memorable U.S. Open Championship at Cherry Hills in Denver, Colorado in 1960.

In 1960, he won the Hickok Belt as the top professional athlete of the year

and Sports Illustrated magazine's Sportsman of the Year award—something that a lot of us are striving for that we'll probably never, ever make, but we congratulate him on that award.

In 1967, he became the first man to reach the \$1 million in career earnings on the PGA Tour. Can you imagine the amount of money during that period of time and what he would have won now if they'd paid the same amount of money? He'd be equal to Tiger Woods, I believe, but that wasn't the case. They didn't pay as much.

Palmer won the Vardon Trophy for the lowest scoring average four times in 1961, 1962, 1964, and 1967. Can you imagine the lowest scoring? Well, most of us get the highest scoring award right now versus the lowest scoring award on the average, and that's quite a compliment, you know, for someone to receive.

Arnold Palmer also represented the U.S. in the Ryder Cup matches seven times as either a player or as a captain. Seven times. You know, when we've had the Ryder Cup that has come here in our congressional, I'm glad that I've been a member of our Ryder Cup. We've been successful in defeating that cup; but can you imagine Arnold Palmer being there seven times as either a player or as a captain? That's quite an honor. He was the last playing captain in 1963 and captained the team again in 1975.

Palmer was eligible for the Senior PGA Tour from its first season in 1980, and he was one of the marquee names who helped it become successful. That's giving those individuals who play on the young tour an opportunity to continue or it's creating hope for seniors who want to become professionals. There are others who have become professionals as seniors. Thanks to Arnold, those gates were opened to allow individuals to get there.

He won 10 events on the tour, including five senior majors. He retired from tournament golf on October 13, 2006.

One of his favorite drinks is a combination of half iced tea and half lemonade. You thought I was going to say some kind of mixed drink or liquor. No. Half iced tea and half lemonade. It's a drink which is often referred to as the "Arnold Palmer" in his honor. That's a great drink for those of you who haven't had the Arnold Palmer. I'm not soliciting, asking you to go out and do that, but that's great. It's a good drink to get when you're out on the golf course.

I ask that we honor Arnold Palmer with a Congressional Gold Medal because of the way Arnold Palmer lives his life. He is a perfect example of how Americans should live—and I state: how Americans should live. Arnold Palmer's way of life is a perfect example of how all Americans should give—how Americans should give.

He is a devoted husband, father and grandfather who cares for his family and who has helped many other fami-

lies during times of hardship and struggle. He has helped many other families during times of hardship and struggle, and that's what we're going through right now in this Nation and in this country with the recession that we're in and with many people losing their homes and their jobs.

Arnold Palmer's work in philanthropy shows his dedication towards helping others. He is known to have an unflinching sense of kindness, and has used the game of golf as a means of sharing. He proactively helps others survive extreme health emergencies. As a cancer survivor, he knows firsthand how devastating health issues can be. Arnold Palmer served as Honorary National Chairman of the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation for 20 years. That means he dedicated himself for 20 years to the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation. He played a major role in the fund-raising drives that led to the creation of the Arnold Palmer Hospital for Children and Women in Orlando in the 1980s. The hospital has been healing women and children from central Florida and around the world with care, compassion and a leading edge in medical care.

The Winnie Palmer Hospital for Women and Babies has left a permanent mark on the lives of thousands of families from around the world—and that's around the world.

The Arnold Palmer Prostate Center—and I state "prostate center" because most of us may be having it, but we want to make sure that we look at prevention. He has recognized every cancer patient as unique because of his prostate cancer center. It offers a variety of programs, including counseling, nutrition, support groups, a cancer lecture series, exercise for cancer patients, and arts in health care, because he cares about those patients or those individuals who have been affected with prostate cancer. Even my bishop, Bishop Barnes, had prostate cancer, and I remember that. It's for individuals who care about others and who want to improve their quality of life, which is what Arnold Palmer has done for them.

Arnie's Army Battles Prostate Cancer is a unique funding-raising and awareness campaign of the Prostate Cancer Foundation. This program is designed to help organizers and participants use golf as a fund-raising tool to raise money for better treatments and for the cure of prostate cancer. Every dollar raised by Arnie's Army tournaments—and I state "every dollar"—goes directly to the Prostate Cancer Foundation. That means every dollar goes to the Prostate Cancer Foundation.

The Arnold Palmer Cancer Pavilion fulfills a longtime dream of his to offer outpatient oncology and testing. They are committed to the prevention, detection, diagnosis, and treatment of cancer in his home town.

The Winnie Palmer Nature Reserve Trust's mission is to permanently im-

prove and maintain property preserved by the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation.

We thank Arnold Palmer; his late wife, Winnie; his two daughters, Peggy and Amy; and his five grandchildren, Emily, Katherine Anne, Anne Palmer Saunders, Nicola Wears, and Samuel Palmer Saunders, for making America a better place. He, too, is a role model, an example that, if you lead by example, others can be better, and he has done that in what he has demonstrated and in what he has done as an American.

Although Arnold Palmer does not feel comfortable being called the "king of golf," Arnold Palmer is royalty, royalty in the eyes and hearts of those he has helped. We thank Arnold Palmer. We thank you for your life's work.

His legions of fans were often called Arnie's Army. Well, now we can be called Arnie's Congressional Army. So he no longer just has the army out there. He has Arnie's Congressional Army.

You are a true American, an American deserving not only of the Presidential Medal of Freedom and of the U.S. Navy's Lone Sailor award, to name a few, but Arnold Palmer deserves to be honored with a Congressional Gold Medal. For this reason and for many reasons unsaid and of stories unsaid and for the people who have met him, I urge all Members to support this passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

As Sports Illustrated said in a 1994 story, "All Arnold Daniel Palmer did was save golf. All he did was bring golf back to the truck drivers and the mailmen, whoever. Basically, he took a game that was a little too prissy, a little too clubby, a little too saturated with Ivy League men trying not to soil their cardigans and breathe sweet life into it."

Every one of us, even nongolfers, can name a few men of the links—Tiger Woods, of course, and perhaps Phil Mickelson of today's game; Gary Palmer, Gary Player and Jack Nicklaus from a couple of decades ago; and for those who have been playing for years, maybe Ben Hogan and Byron Nelson to whom we awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor in the 109th Congress, but everyone would name Arnold Palmer.

Amazingly, for a man who won the 92 professional tournaments and who at one time was the highest paid professional athlete, earning more than \$1 million a year, Arnold Palmer always seemed as someone who was an everyman. His swing looked pretty much like the guys' you would see on a course on a weekend. It definitely was not the picture perfect one of a pro, but it did matter. Arnold Palmer was a man who understood the history and continuity of the game.

Born in a steel town east of Pittsburgh, he moved to Latrobe, Pennsylvania with his parents when he was

young. His father was known as Deacon Palmer, who worked at the Latrobe Country Club for years, rising from a groundskeeper to a teaching pro. He started his son at the age of 3 with a set of golf clubs and, really, was Arnold Palmer's only teacher.

Years later, in 1960, Palmer began a successful crusade to resurrect the status of the British Open at the old course in St. Andrews, Scotland, becoming the first American of stature to play there since Ben Hogan.

Arnold Palmer put his good winnings to use, becoming so involved in business that some thought it detracted from his golf game, but he also worked tirelessly for various charities, spending 20 years as the honorary chairman of the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation and in spearheading the creation of the Arnold Palmer Hospital for Children and Women in Orlando, as well as raising funds for the Latrobe Area Hospital Charitable Foundation in his hometown.

You heard from Mr. BACA of many, many more things that he did, but as a Member of Congress from Illinois who has the most golf courses in her district in Illinois, I am honored to manage this bill.

With that, I urge Members to join me in support of H.R. 1243, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

With that, I would reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1345

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that we get to talk about people that we consider to be a true gentleman, a true friend and a great American. That is what Arnold Palmer is to all of us. I am honored that he lives in my congressional district, at least during the warm months, out in Youngstown, Pennsylvania, an area close to Latrobe, Pennsylvania, at the place that he grew up.

Now, I am not a great golfer. And, in fact, to discuss it at all would be an embarrassment to me. But I did have a chance to play with Mr. Palmer once, and in so doing, traveling across his golf course, he points to a tree, or formerly a tree, which is now carved in the likeness of his father. And that brings about many a story about Deacon and how he taught young Arnold to play golf and many of the other things about him that have become famous icons: that tractor which he brings out now and then to show people when they come to the golf course, or how you will often see Arnold sitting out there talking to anybody who comes by, signing anything they put before him, because he is just so close to the people of the district and of America, always willing to shake their hand.

And a handshake means something to Arnold Palmer. Very famously, he had that long-term agreement with his former manager, Mark McCormack, that lasted from 1960 until his death in May of 2003. He has the same kind of agreement with Doc Giffin, his assistant. That's the way Arnold does business. A handshake means something to him. You don't have to put it in writing.

We can also look at other parts of his life. Back when he was a champion golfer at Wake Forest, he left there after the death of a friend and joined the Coast Guard. And one would have thought he gave up golf entirely except he went out and played a little golf in Cleveland and rediscovered this great talent he had, and, well, the rest becomes history.

But more so than the stories of golf are the stories of what he has done in western Pennsylvania and really around the Nation.

As a pilot, he helped to develop Latrobe Airport, and interestingly enough, served in its authority for many years except during a time when he had his own business interests there. Being the true gentleman and person of high ethics that he is, he stepped off that aviation board for a while to make sure he didn't have any conflicts of interest.

He's also given a great deal to many charities. He helped establish the Winnie Palmer Nature Preserve that just yesterday, there was the laughter of children there on the St. Vincent's College campus exploring that area in the woods and marshes that his former wife, Winnie, had talked about, how it was so important to preserve that area. He's also given so much to Latrobe Hospital where he remains head of their charitable board after raising so many millions of dollars for that hospital to help with charitable care. And also the Arnold Palmer Pavilion, part of Latrobe Hospital's Mountain View Medical Park facility.

But beyond all of that, other ways to describe him is when you go to his office there—it's along the same road where he grew up out there on Arnold Palmer Road it's now called—you go up to his office and you'll see it's filled with trophies and photos of people he's played with of all levels. And of course that famous room where he always tinkers and works on his own putters and a wall filled with I don't know how many thousands of putters. He's got another area there, a warehouse filled with everything that anybody has ever given him. In fact, I gave him some congressional golf balls, and he said, "I'll put these in the warehouse with everything else." I'm sure he catalogues it all.

I remember walking through and pointed to a certain club and said, "Do you know what all these are for?" He said, "Sure." You name a certain hole, a certain year, a certain course, he will tell you what club he used and what happened on that. Most famously he

has that twin set of golf balls mounted on the wall in his office. This is when he hit the back-to-back holes-in-one in 1968 at TPC Avondale. He hit it one year—I think it was the No. 5 hole, I'm not sure—hit it and the next day he shows up on the hole again and there's all the camera crews there. He said, "What are you doing here?" They said, "We want to watch and see you hit another hole-in-one." He didn't expect it, but that's what he did.

There's a couple other things about him, too. In his office, he has a table, and it's filled with the medals that he receives from every tournament that he wins. But there are a couple of empty spaces on that table. I remember asking Arnold what those are for. He said, "You never know. You might just win another medal." Quite frankly, I think that would be a good place for this Congressional Medal to go.

A story about him and golf was told to me by a person who probably doesn't want me to use his name, so I won't. But it's probably some of the best golf advice any of us could ever have and, again, shows some of the spirit of Arnold Palmer.

He was playing with this other golfer who was not having a very good day and was probably doing his share of slamming his club down and cussing and swearing, I suppose, as he shanked the ball and hit it to the left and right off the course. At some point, Palmer said to him, "Would you like some advice?" Now, imagine what any of us, no matter what level of golf you have as talent or lack thereof, if Arnold Palmer, the King of Golf, says to you, "Would you like a little advice?" At this point the golfer eagerly said, "Yes, I'd love it." And Palmer said to him, "You're not good enough to get mad."

Well, so it is great advice for all of us. We're not good enough to get mad. Let's leave that to the professionals in this.

But it is important that we recognize Arnold is good enough to receive this recognition. And I might say in all the years I have known Arnold Palmer, he's never asked me for anything—well, except for one thing. The man who seems to have it all has never come to his Congressman saying, I want you to do this or that. He just asked this: When you drive down Arnold Palmer Road and you come across the entrance to Latrobe Country Club where the sign says "slow down, golf cart crossing," he really doesn't want anybody to get hurt there, and he would sure appreciate it if you just slowed down your car.

All in all, though, for a life that is still very rich in its accomplishments and for a person who has made America a better country because of what he has done, not only for the sport of golf but for health and for so many people around this country, Mr. Speaker, Arnold Palmer is a man well-deserving of this Congressional Medal.

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague over there who is a great golfer for introducing this resolution and my colleague from Pennsylvania.

One of the things I will just say at the outset is I envy you because you had a chance to play golf with him. Tom Ridge, our former colleague, promised me when he became governor, he was going to arrange for me to play with Arnold Palmer, and he never did it. So when you see Governor Ridge, would you tell him I am still disappointed about that. Would you do that for me? Thank you. Be sure to tell him.

There's been a lot said about Arnold Palmer today, and I am not going to be redundant and go over the things that have been said. But I will tell you this: that I have been an avid golfer and have followed golf all of my life as soon as I was 12 years old, and there's nobody that I know that brought golf from a minor sport into the major arena like Arnold Palmer did.

Years ago, he won the Los Angeles Open, and on the front page of the Indianapolis Star newspaper they had a picture of him with a check for \$5,000, and he was holding it up like, "My gosh. Isn't this a tremendous amount of money?"

When Arnold Palmer came on the scene and started making the great comebacks that he did in the Masters and U.S. Open and the PGA and British Open, he brought a new attitude to golf, a new sensation to golf. You talked about Arnie's Army, and people across the country who didn't play golf, who weren't really interested in the sport, became interested because here was a guy you see on television coming down to the 16th or 17th hole, two shots behind, and you knew he was going to be there at the end. He was a lot like Tiger Woods is today. He would knock in a putt at the 16th or 17th hole and everybody would go crazy, and he would win the tournament on the last one. We've seen Tiger Woods do that. Arnold Palmer was the Tiger Woods of his day. He made golf a tremendous sport, a spectator sport, and he made it into something that every American is now interested in.

He did a lot of humanitarian things. I know you mentioned his involvement with children and the March of Dimes and prostate cancer. He did all of those things. But none of that wouldn't have occurred if he didn't have the personality and charisma that he showed on the golf course all those years. We had great players like Nicklaus, Player and Trevino and a whole host of them that played with him, but Palmer was the man. He was the guy that we all watched on Sunday afternoon and couldn't wait to get to the TV set to cheer on.

I am tickled to death that you're moving this medal of honor for him,

and I am very happy to add my two cents worth. I think it's a great honor for him, and I hope he does put it in a very important place with all of his other trophies.

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. I have no further speakers and would yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would thank JUDY BIGGERT. Thank you very much for being a cosponsor of this important legislation. I want to thank TIM MURPHY and, of course, my good friend DAN BURTON, who, as well, is an excellent golfer I've had the opportunity to play golf with on many occasions. And he does hit the ball a long ways. Although we have a difficult time in getting it in the hole in three or four, whatever the course may be. Tim, I know that you had the privilege, like I, of playing with Arnold Palmer; and it's really quite a memorable experience. For those of us who have an opportunity to walk down the 18th hole, talk to him, look at his personality as a human being. He's one that's touched the life of many individuals.

For people that have watched him play golf and have played golf, and not everybody can exert and be as good as Arnold Palmer was—and is, still today—and what he has done for the game itself not only for individuals that go there that when you're playing a lot of times, he is one that was a risk taker, a challenger. He's the one that said when it was impossible to hit that kind of a shot, he would dare and hit in between woods, try to hit over trees, try to make sure that if there was a lake, he says, "I'm going to get to the tin cup of the world." He was the tin cup, except he got there and didn't have to take 12 strokes to get there.

That's one thing about Arnold Palmer is he lifted the game to another level because he believed in the challenge of it. He just didn't believe in just being that safe person and getting a par on a par 4 or getting a par on a par 5 or par 3. He always went for that birdie or that eagle because a lot of times he reached it.

As I stated before, can you imagine what he would have been today if he had the kind of equipment that we have right now in hitting the balls and in playing. He's one that excelled in terms of having the excellence, because for those of us that even get over a putt, it's very difficult to be over a putt and then all of a sudden, you have to make that putt. I happened to be playing the other day, and I had maybe a two-and-a-half-foot putt for a birdie. I missed it. Can you imagine him? He had the nerves to make sure that he not only made that putt but made every other putt. Nerves of steel. And for that, we will always remember that he touched the lives of many individuals, and I think that's important for a lot of us, to know of a human being that really cared about people, that wanted to make people a lot better, and he did it through golf.

He felt that golf was an opportunity for himself to excel and show the world that others can participate in this game and give back. He always believed in giving back to the community, and that's what he's done. That's why our lives are a lot better, and he's touched the lives of many individuals today that will always look at him, that have followed him throughout the world in Arnie's Army, now the Congressional Army that he has out here, to say, Arnie, we now realize that you did more than just golf. You did a lot for human beings in this world right now.

That's why, Mr. Speaker, I ask us all to make sure that we support H.R. 1243, to provide the award of the Gold Medal on behalf of Congress to Arnold Palmer in recognition of his service to this Nation in promoting excellence and good sportsmanship.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1243, which will award a Congressional Gold Medal; to my good friend Arnold Palmer, recognizing his service to our nation in promoting excellence and good sportsmanship in golf.

Arnold Palmer, who was born and raised in Latrobe, Pennsylvania, is an extraordinary individual who has achieved greatness. Mr. Palmer's father, Deacon Palmer, taught him to play golf at an early age and he quickly excelled at the game. He continued playing while attending Wake Forest University on a golf scholarship and while serving in the United States Coast Guard.

After winning the U.S. Amateur Championship in 1954, Mr. Palmer turned pro. Since then he has won seven major championships, including winning the U.S. Open and the Open Championship twice, and was the first golfer to win the Masters Tournament four times. In addition to winning 61 tournaments between 1954 and 1975, he represented the United States by playing in the Ryder Cup six times between 1961 and 1973 and by serving as captain in 1963 and 1975. In 1963 he was the last player to also serve simultaneously as captain. He also served as the Presidents Cup captain in 1996.

Over the course of his career, Mr. Palmer was honored with many accolades. He was the PGA Player of the Year in 1960 and 1962, he won the Vardon Trophy four times, was named Sports Illustrated magazine's Sportsman of the Year in 1960, and was inducted into the World Golf Hall of Fame in 1974. He was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 2004.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to golf, Mr. Palmer is an extraordinary businessman, a skilled aviator, and a devoted family man. He founded the Arnold Palmer Pavilion at the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, which is helping many western Pennsylvanians in their battles with cancer. Arnold Palmer is a favorite son of Latrobe, Pennsylvania, inspiring many to work hard and follow their dreams. He is truly deserving of the Congressional Gold Medal.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1243.

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. BACA. 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.

□ 1400

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT OF 2009

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 46) to provide for payment of an administrative fee to public housing agencies to cover the costs of administering family self-sufficiency programs in connection with the housing choice voucher program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 46

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 "Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. ADMINISTRATIVE FEES FOR FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY PROGRAM COSTS.

Subsection (h) of section 23 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437u(h)) is amended by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

"(1) SECTION 8 FEES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a fee under section 8(q) for the costs incurred in administering the self-sufficiency program under this section to assist families receiving voucher assistance through section 8(o).

"(B) ELIGIBILITY FOR FEE.—The fee shall provide funding for family self-sufficiency coordinators as follows:

"(i) BASE FEE.—A public housing agency serving 25 or more participants in the family self-sufficiency program under this section shall receive a fee equal to the costs of employing one full-time family self-sufficiency coordinator. An agency serving fewer than 25 such participants shall receive a prorated fee.

"(ii) ADDITIONAL FEE.—An agency that meets minimum performance standards shall receive an additional fee sufficient to cover the costs of employing a second family self-sufficiency coordinator if the agency has 75 or more participating families, and a third such coordinator if it has 125 or more participating families.

"(iii) PREVIOUSLY FUNDED AGENCIES.—An agency that received funding from the Department of Housing and Urban Development for more than three such coordinators in any of fiscal years 1999 through 2008 shall receive funding for the highest number of coordinators funded in a single fiscal year during that period, provided they meet applicable size and performance standards.

"(iv) INITIAL YEAR.—For the first year in which a public housing agency exercises its right to develop an family self-sufficiency

program for its residents, it shall be entitled to funding to cover the costs of up to one family self-sufficiency coordinator, based on the size specified in its action plan for such program.

"(v) STATE AND REGIONAL AGENCIES.—For purposes of calculating the family self-sufficiency portion of the administrative fee under this subparagraph, each administratively distinct part of a State or regional public housing agency shall be treated as a separate agency.

"(vi) DETERMINATION OF NUMBER OF COORDINATORS.—In determining whether a public housing agency meets a specific threshold for funding pursuant to this paragraph, the number of participants being served by the agency in its family self-sufficiency program shall be considered to be the average number of families enrolled in such agency's program during the course of the most recent fiscal year for which the Department of Housing and Urban Development has data.

"(C) PRORATION.—If insufficient funds are available in any fiscal year to fund all of the coordinators authorized under this section, the first priority shall be given to funding one coordinator at each agency with an existing family self-sufficiency program. The remaining funds shall be prorated based on the number of remaining coordinators to which each agency is entitled under this subparagraph.

"(D) RECAPTURE.—Any fees allocated under this subparagraph by the Secretary in a fiscal year that have not been spent by the end of the subsequent fiscal year shall be recaptured by the Secretary and shall be available for providing additional fees pursuant to subparagraph (B)(ii).

"(E) PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—Within six months after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall publish a proposed rule specifying the performance standards applicable to funding under clauses (i) and (iii) of subparagraph (B). Such standards shall include requirements applicable to the leveraging of in-kind services and other resources to support the goals of the family self-sufficiency program.

"(F) DATA COLLECTION.—Public housing agencies receiving funding under this paragraph shall collect and report to the Secretary, in such manner as the Secretary shall require, information on the performance of their family self-sufficiency programs.

"(G) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall conduct a formal and scientific evaluation of the effectiveness of well-run family self-sufficiency programs, using random assignment of participants to the extent practicable. Not later than the expiration of the 4-year period beginning upon the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall submit an interim evaluation report to the Congress. Not later than the expiration of the 8-year period beginning upon such enactment, the Secretary shall submit a final evaluation report to the Congress. There is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 to carry out the evaluation under this subparagraph.

"(H) INCENTIVES FOR INNOVATION AND HIGH PERFORMANCE.—The Secretary may reserve up to 10 percent of the amounts made available for administrative fees under this paragraph to provide support to or reward family self-sufficiency programs that are particularly innovative or highly successful in achieving the goals of the program."

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert additional materials thereon.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 46, the Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 2009. I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois, Representative BIGGERT, for introducing this critical legislation which provides housing agencies with much-needed administrative funds.

H.R. 46 provides public housing agencies with a funding source to cover the costs of administering Family Self-Sufficiency, or FSS, programs in connection with HUD's section 8 voucher program.

This legislation enhances the FSS programs by providing housing authorities with additional coordinator funding so that they can help more families participate in the programs. It establishes a minimal ratio of coordinators to participants to ensure that there is adequate assistance to provide all of the families enrolled in the FSS program.

H.R. 46 requires HUD to establish and implement performance measures, collect data on FSS programs, and report to Congress on the effectiveness of these programs.

With this additional funding, HUD will have the flexibility needed to reward innovative and successful FSS programs. And that is important for a lot of us, to have the flexibility to reward those programs that are doing a good job. Mr. Speaker, as someone who comes from a district that has been one of the hardest hit by the foreclosure crisis—and that is in the Inland Empire—I can tell you that there is greater need now than ever before for public housing.

The FSS program works. It provides struggling families with the assistance they need, while also lessening their reliance on public housing so that they can eventually become self-sufficient homeowners and renters.

In my district, the waiting list for affordable housing for some families is as long as 10 years, and that is a shame that it has to be as long as 10 years. In this time of economic difficulty, we must support legislation that provides funds for public housing agencies that put more families on the path back to economic security.

Again, I want to thank Representative BIGGERT for her hard work on H.R. 46 and her commitment to this issue. Thank you for your commitment to this issue on behalf of all the families that will be impacted.

I urge my colleagues to support the Family Self-Sufficiency Act.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as the author of H.R. 46, the Family Self-Sufficiency Act, I encourage all my colleagues to support this important legislation which will help more disadvantaged families gain independence from government assistance.

Thanks to the support of my colleague from California (Ms. WATERS) last Congress as a part of the larger section 8 voucher reform package and as a stand-alone measure, twice the House passed the Family Self-Sufficiency Act. Today, we will again consider the same measure.

The Senate didn't act on section 8 reform legislation last Congress, which is why we are moving this legislation again. The Family Self-Sufficiency Program, also called FSS, is offered in connection with the Department of Housing and Urban Development Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program.

Local public housing authorities employ FSS coordinators and administer these programs. In addition to rental housing assistance, FSS programs connect families to housing counseling, job training, child care, education, and other services to help them reduce their dependence on public assistance. FSS also helps families save for homeownership.

The FSS program is well worth it. Let me give you a quick example of an FSS success story from my congressional district.

After 6 years of service, a Navy veteran and a single mom of two secured a part-time job, and thanks to the GI Bill, enrolled as a full-time student. Despite struggling to make ends meet, she received her degree and enrolled in the DuPage County Housing Authority Family Self-Sufficiency Program. This program connected her to a résumé writing class at the University of Illinois' Employment Training Center. Within a week of posting her newly polished résumé, she secured interviews and eventually a full-time job that doubled her salary. She also worked with a financial planner to improve her budgeting and management skills. Today, this single mother and veteran is an independent and self-sufficient homeowner, a long way from public housing.

So what is the problem? Well, in fiscal year 2004, HUD changed its FSS coordinator funding process, and the result, in a 20-month period: the number of FSS coordinators dropped by about two-thirds, and 4,000 fewer families participated in the program. HUD has attempted to fix the mistake, but without success. So that is why H.R. 46 is necessary, to ensure that public housing authorities have consistent coordinator funding necessary to administer the program and serve people who choose the FSS path to independence.

H.R. 46 establishes a minimum ratio of program coordinators to participants; ensures the Public Housing Au-

thority gets funding for one coordinator for 25-plus families enrolled in its FSS program; with 75 or more families enrolled, funding for two coordinators; and with 125 or more families enrolled, funding for three coordinators. It also requires HUD to establish and implement performance measures, collect data on FSS programs, evaluate their effectiveness, and report to Congress on its findings. Finally, the bill provides some funding flexibility to reward innovative and successful programs.

FSS works. It is a helping hand, not a handout, to American families who are working to become independent of government assistance. With the challenges American families face in this economy, the Family Self-Sufficiency Program, and those like my constituent who have benefited from it, are a glimmer of hope. With this program, families can successfully make ends meet, raise children, get an education, secure a job, and achieve the dream of homeownership. It is a simple, bipartisan step that we can take now to ensure that a brief period of economic hardship doesn't turn into a lifetime of poverty and dependence for many of our Nation's most vulnerable families. It does so by addressing the lack of consistent Federal funding for administering FSS services.

Mr. Speaker, these are good, flexible programs that help put disadvantaged families on the path to independence. Public housing can be an important safety net, but it is not a permanent solution. Let's give these individuals all the support we can to help them stand on their own two feet.

As I conclude, I would like to thank everyone who made this bill possible, including John Day, president of the DuPage Housing Authority; Jeffrey Lubell, executive director of the Center for Housing Policy; and the folks at the American Association of Service Coordinators, the National Housing Conference, the New America Foundation, and the Corporation for Enterprise Development. And of course I would like to thank my constituent for her courage and willingness to let me share her success story with all of you today, and the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) for managing this bill.

At this time, I would like to insert into the RECORD a 2008 letter from the American Association of Service Coordinators.

SEPTEMBER 24, 2008.

Hon. JUDY BIGGERT,
Ranking Member, Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee of the House Financial Services Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER BIGGERT: On behalf of the undersigned organizations, we write to thank you for the introduction of the Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 2007 and for your support of stabilized funding for the HUD Family Self-Sufficiency program (FSS).

We appreciate your recognition of the importance of stable, predictable funding for the FSS program. The improvements prescribed in the FSS Act will enable agencies to run effective FSS programs and ulti-

mately provide more families with the opportunity to build assets and work toward self-sufficiency.

As you know, changes in the way Section 8 FSS funding has been allocated for FSS coordinators in recent years has caused many housing agencies to experience sudden funding cut-offs and declining enrollment. Moreover, many participants have been left without the necessary program coordinators who are critical to their access to services and support and mentorship for their progress toward self-sufficiency.

The FSS Act of 2007 addresses this problem and places the FSS program back on its original path as a proven approach for helping families in the Housing Choice Voucher program lift themselves out of poverty and achieve their dream of education, entrepreneurship or homeownership in a safe, viable way.

We also support the Section 8 Voucher Reform Act of 2007 (SEVRA), H.R. 1851, voucher reform legislation, that proposed similar changes to the FSS administrative funding process and also makes critical improvements to the overall Section 8 voucher program. By stabilizing funding for the Section 8 voucher program, SEVRA not only allows the voucher program to run more efficiently and effectively but ensures that funding is available for the asset-building escrow accounts provided through FSS.

Together, the FSS Act and SEVRA can help restore the strength to the Section 8 voucher program, the nation's leading source of housing assistance for low-income people and a critical base for the FSS program.

Again, we thank you for the introduction of the Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 2007 and for your continued support of the FSS program. We look forward to your continued leadership in support of FSS and the Section 8 voucher program.

Sincerely,

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
SERVICE COORDINATORS.
CORPORATION FOR
ENTERPRISE
DEVELOPMENT.
NATIONAL HOUSING
CONFERENCE.
NEW AMERICA FOUNDATION.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 46, "The Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 2009." This bill expresses the importance of providing payment for an administrative fee to public housing agencies to cover the cost of administering family self-sufficiency programs in connection with the housing choice voucher program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Housing choice vouchers allow low-income families to choose and lease or purchase safe, decent, and affordable privately-owned rental housing. Since housing assistance is provided on behalf of the family or individual, participants are able to find their own housing, including single-family homes, townhouses and apartments. The participant is free to choose any housing that meets the requirements of the program and is not limited to units located in subsidized housing projects. Housing choice vouchers are administered locally by public housing agencies (PHAs). The PHAs receive federal funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to administer the voucher program.

A family that is issued a housing voucher is responsible for finding a suitable housing unit of the family's choice where the owner agrees to rent under the program. This unit may include the family's present residence. Rental

units must meet minimum standards of health and safety, as determined by the PHA. A housing subsidy is paid to the landlord directly by the PHA on behalf of the participating family. The family then pays the difference between the actual rent charged by the landlord and the amount subsidized by the program. Under certain circumstances, if authorized by the PHA, a family may use its voucher to purchase a modest home.

Eligibility for a housing voucher is determined by the PHA based on the total annual gross income and family size and is limited to U.S. citizens and specified categories of non-citizens who have eligible immigration status. In general, the family's income may not exceed 50 percent of the median income for the county or metropolitan area in which the family chooses to live. By law, a PHA must provide 75 percent of its voucher to applicants whose incomes do not exceed 30 percent of the area median income.

Since the demand for housing assistance often exceeds the limited resources available to HUD and the local housing agencies, long waiting periods are common. In fact, a PHA may close its waiting list when it has more families on the list than can be assisted in the near future.

PHAs may establish local preferences for selecting applicants from its waiting list. For example, PHAs may give a preference to a family who is (1) homeless or living in substandard housing, (2) paying more than 50 percent of its income for rent, or (3) involuntarily displaced. Families who qualify for any such local preferences move ahead of other families on the list who does not qualify for any preference. Each PHA has the discretion to establish local preferences to reflect the housing needs and priorities of its particular community.

When the voucher holder finds a unit that it wishes to occupy and reaches an agreement with the landlord over the lease terms, the PHA determines a payment standard that is the amount generally needed to rent a moderately-priced dwelling unit in the local housing market and that is used to calculate the amount of housing assistance a family will receive. However, the payment standard does not limit and does not affect the amount of rent a landlord may charge or the family may pay. A family which receives a housing voucher can select a unit with a rent that is below or above the payment standard. The housing voucher family must pay 30 percent of its monthly adjusted gross income for rent and utilities, and if the unit rent is greater than the payment standard, the family is required to pay the additional amount. By law, whenever a family moves to a new unit where the rent exceeds the payment standard, the family may not pay more than 40 percent of its adjusted monthly income for rent. The PHA calculates the maximum amount of housing assistance allowable. The maximum housing assistance is generally the lesser of the payment standard minus 30 percent of the family's monthly adjusted income or the gross rent for the unit minus 30 percent of monthly adjusted income.

The family self-sufficiency (FSS) is a HUD program that encourages communities to develop local strategies to help voucher families obtain employment that will lead to economic independence and self-sufficiency. Public housing agencies work with welfare agencies, schools, businesses, and other local partners

to develop a comprehensive program that gives participating FSS family members the skills and experience to enable them to obtain employment that pays a living wage. FSS was established in 1990 by section 554 of the National Affordable Housing Act. It is a successor program to project self-sufficiency and operation bootstrap. FSS program services may include, but are not limited to: child care, transportation, education, job training and employment counseling, substance/alcohol abuse treatment or counseling, household skill training, and homeownership counseling.

For the most part, PHAs must rely on their own or other local resources to operate FSS programs. However, under the authority of annual appropriations acts, HUD has been able to provide some funding for FSS program coordinators to assist PHAs in operating housing choice voucher FSS programs. With this act, the secretary shall establish a fee for the costs incurred in administering the self-sufficiency program under this section to assist families receiving voucher assistance through section 8. A public housing agency serving 25 or more participants in the family self-sufficiency program under this section shall receive a fee equal to the costs of employing one full-time family self-sufficiency coordinator. An agency serving fewer than 25 such participants shall receive a prorated fee. An agency that meets minimum performance standards shall receive an additional fee sufficient to cover the costs of employing a second family self-sufficiency coordinator if the agency has 75 or more participating families, and a third such coordinator if it has 125 or more participating families. An agency that received funding from the Department of Housing and Urban Development for more than three such coordinators in any of fiscal years 1999 through 2008 shall receive funding for the highest number of coordinators funded in a single fiscal year during that period, provided they meet applicable size and performance standards. For the first year in which a public housing agency exercises its right to develop a family self-sufficiency program for its residents, it shall be entitled to funding to cover the costs of up to one family self-sufficiency coordinator, based on the size specified in its action plan for such program.

The family self-sufficiency program will truly benefit those who really need a helping hand out of poverty. However, there needs to be monetary assistance given to the Department of Housing and Urban Development so that they might hire the needed staff to maximize the use of federal funds and improve the lives of others. The family self-sufficiency act will ensure that these objectives are met. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting "The Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 2009."

Mrs. BIGGERT. With that, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank again JUDY BIGGERT for her leadership in preventing homelessness. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 46, the Families Self-Sufficiency Act of 2009.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 46.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RAISING THE CASE OF ROBERT LEVINSON WITH IRAN

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 36) calling on the President and the allies of the United States to engage with officials of the Government of Iran to raise the case of Robert Levinson at every opportunity, urging officials of the Government of Iran to fulfill their promises of assistance to the family of Robert Levinson, and calling on the Government of Iran to share the results of its investigation into the disappearance of Robert Levinson with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 36

Whereas United States citizen Robert Levinson is a retired agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a resident of Florida, the husband of Christine Levinson, and father of their 7 children;

Whereas Robert Levinson traveled from Dubai to Kish Island, Iran, on March 8, 2007;

Whereas, after traveling to Kish Island and checking into the Hotel Maryam, he disappeared on March 9, 2007;

Whereas neither his family nor the United States Government has received further information on his fate or whereabouts;

Whereas March 9, 2009, marks the second anniversary of the disappearance of Robert Levinson;

Whereas the Government of Switzerland, which has served as the Protecting Power for the United States in the Islamic Republic of Iran in the absence of diplomatic relations between the Government of the United States and the Government of Iran since 1980, has continuously pressed the Government of Iran on the case of Robert Levinson and lent vital assistance and support to the Levinson family during their December 2007 visit to Iran;

Whereas officials of the Government of Iran promised their continued assistance to the relatives of Robert Levinson during the visit of the family to the Islamic Republic of Iran in December 2007; and

Whereas the Government of Iran, including through a statement made during an interview with NBC News broadcast on July 28, 2008, has declared that its officials are willing to cooperate with the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the search for Robert Levinson: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) commends the Embassy of Switzerland in Tehran, Iran, and the Government of

Switzerland for the ongoing assistance to the Government of the United States and to the family of Robert Levinson, particularly during the visit by Christine Levinson and other relatives to Iran in December 2007;

(2) notes that Iranian officials ensured the safety of the family of Robert Levinson during their December 2007 visit to Iran, and have promised their continued assistance;

(3) urges the Government of Iran, as a humanitarian gesture, to intensify its cooperation on the case of Robert Levinson with the Embassy of Switzerland in Tehran and to share the results of its investigation into the disappearance of Robert Levinson with the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(4) urges the President and the allies of the United States to raise at every opportunity in all appropriate multilateral and bilateral fora the case of Robert Levinson; and

(5) expresses sympathy to the family of Robert Levinson during this trying period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this very important resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last month, President Obama delivered a very important video message to the Iranian people and to Iran's leaders, coinciding with Iran's Festival of Nowruz, a 12-day holiday marking the new year.

Mr. Speaker, I support President Obama's spirit of engagement, and I share his view that the United States and the international community should try to persuade Iran, through both diplomacy and economic sanctions, to comply with its legal obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and under numerous United Nations Security Council resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert Levinson, a retired agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, disappeared in Iran over 2 years ago. There is no better time than now, in the spirit of engagement with Iran, for the Government of Iran to share the results of its investigation into Mr. Levinson's disappearance with the FBI. Indeed, the Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, in an interview with NBC on July 28, 2008, stated that the Iranian Government was willing to cooperate with the FBI in the search for Mr. Robert Levinson. Iranian officials also promised their continued assistance to his relatives during the Levinson family's visit to Iran in December of 2007.

This resolution under consideration urges President Obama and our allies

to raise the case of Mr. Levinson with the Iranians at every opportunity. Indeed, this process has already begun. During a March 31 conference in The Hague, Ambassador Richard Holbrook handed an Iranian diplomat a diplomatic letter asking Tehran to ensure the quick and safe return of Mr. Levinson, as well as freelance journalist Roxana Saberi and student Esha Momeni, both of whom are being held in Iran. The resolution also urges the Government of Iran to fulfill its pledge to cooperate with the FBI. Both of these requests are more than fully appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out to the Levinson family. And we remain deeply committed to learning Mr. Levinson's fate in Iran and, if possible, hopefully returning him home safe and sound.

□ 1415

I strongly support this resolution, and I urge all my colleagues to do likewise. And I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) for introducing this resolution.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, over 2 years after disappearing on Kish Island in Iran, Robert Levinson, who my colleague has just described as a U.S. citizen and a resident of Florida, remains missing. During that time, the regime in Iran has continually obstructed efforts by the United States Government to investigate Mr. Levinson's disappearance. As Senator BILL NELSON stated on January 13 of this year at a hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in Iran "the door has been closed at every single turn."

Mr. Levinson is a 28-year veteran of the FBI and the Drug Enforcement Administration. He and his family, including his wife and seven children, deserve our every effort to determine his status and hopefully to secure his freedom and safe return home. Therefore, I strongly support House Concurrent Resolution 36, which urges the Iranian Government to intensify its cooperation on Mr. Levinson's case, with the Swiss Embassy in Tehran, and to share the results of its investigation with the FBI.

This legislation also urges the President and U.S. allies to raise Mr. Levinson's case in all appropriate multilateral and bilateral forums and expresses our sympathy to Mr. Levinson's family during this very difficult and trying time.

I thank my good friend and colleague Mr. WEXLER, the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, for introducing this resolution.

This is the kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, that everybody in the world ought

to be concerned about. We have a young reporter who has disappeared over there and is unaccounted for. Mr. Levinson is unaccounted for. This Government of Iran should join the family of nations and start being like everybody else and admiring and living up to the human rights that we all respect and admire.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important and timely resolution. As we have spoken to it, I think we all see its urgency, its humanitarian nature, and the very important challenge to the people of Iran and the leaders of Iran to do the right thing in this case.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 36 earlier this year to shed light on my constituent from Coral Springs, Florida, Robert Levinson, who disappeared from Iran's Kish Island on March 9, 2007. More than two years later, there are disturbingly few known details about his whereabouts.

What we do know, however, is that Mr. Levinson, a former FBI agent, was last heard from on March 8, 2007 by his wife Christine, while he was working in Dubai as a private investigator. According to his family, he checked into a hotel on Kish Island and checked out the following morning to fly back to the United States. Unfortunately, Mr. Levinson never arrived at the airport for his flight, and there is no accounting for what happened to him after he left the hotel.

In December 2007, the Levinson family, with assistance from Swiss officials in Tehran, traveled to the hotel where Mr. Levinson was last seen and passed out flyers in Farsi with his photo. They also met with local Iranian authorities to seek their assistance in gaining information about Mr. Levinson's disappearance. The authorities in Iran pledged to assist the Levinson family in their efforts to determine Robert's whereabouts and to investigate the circumstances surrounding his disappearance. Despite its pledge, the government of Iran has not followed through on its promises to the Levinson family. In fact, the Iranian government has stonewalled any effort to gain pertinent information—claiming they have zero knowledge about Mr. Levinson's whereabouts.

I want to praise the decision of the Obama Administration to raise Mr. Levinson's case directly with the Iranian government. During last week's hearing in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I raised Mr. Levinson's disappearance with Secretary of State Clinton, and she confirmed that Mr. Levinson was mentioned in a letter delivered by Ambassador Holbrooke to Iranian officials at The Hague and reiterated her unwavering commitment to press this issue at every opportunity.

While I am certain that Secretary Clinton and the Obama Administration will make every attempt to bring Mr. Levinson's home, it is critical that Congress express its unequivocal support for her efforts and send a clear statement that the Administration must employ every diplomatic tool at its disposal to locate Mr. Levinson and return him to the United States.

House Concurrent Resolution 36 calls on President Obama and allies of the United States around the world to engage with officials of the Government of Iran to raise the

case of Robert Levinson at every opportunity. It also urges officials of the Government of Iran to fulfill their promises of assistance to the family of Robert Levinson, and calls upon Iran to share the results of its investigation into his disappearance with the FBI. Passage of this resolution sends a clear signal that the Congress stands with the Levinson family and believes all efforts should be exhausted to ensure Robert Levinson is found and brought home safely.

I want to once again express my unwavering solidarity and backing for the Levinson family and offer all of my support in their efforts to return Robert Levinson home. I urge all of my colleagues to support the passage of this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 36, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "A concurrent resolution calling on the President and the allies of the United States to raise in all appropriate bilateral and multilateral fora the case of Robert Levinson at every opportunity, urging Iran to fulfill their promises of assistance to the family of Robert Levinson, and calling on Iran to share the results of its investigation into the disappearance of Robert Levinson with the Federal Bureau of Investigation".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOURNING VICTIMS OF GUATEMALA LANDSLIDE AND COSTA RICA EARTHQUAKE

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 76) mourning the horrific loss of life in January 2009 caused by a landslide in Guatemala and an earthquake in Costa Rica and expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should assist the affected people and communities, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 76

Whereas, on January 4, 2009, millions of tons of earth fell onto a road in the Alta Verapaz area north of Guatemala City, Guatemala;

Whereas it is suspected that a geological fault triggered the movement of earth, sending 10,000,000 tons of mud and rock down a hillside onto a road that runs from San Cristobal Verapaz to Chicaman, north of Guatemala City;

Whereas at least 36 people were confirmed dead and up to 60 were missing, many of whom are coffee workers in the region;

Whereas rescue organizations, volunteers, and agencies from throughout Guatemala had been working at the site until danger of another landslide shut down the operation;

Whereas, on January 8, 2009, at 1:21PM, a 6.1 magnitude earthquake shook the Capital region of San Jose, Costa Rica, including the areas of Sarapiquí, Varablanca, and Poasito;

Whereas the earthquake's epicenter was 20 miles from San Jose at a depth of 21.7 miles and the shaking continued for 40 seconds;

Whereas 23 individuals were confirmed dead, over 100 were treated for injuries, and nearly a dozen went missing, including many buried by the resulting landslides;

Whereas 518 homes were destroyed to the point where they were uninhabitable, 26 kilometers of road were unusable, and 61 communities were affected;

Whereas roads, businesses, government buildings, and the popular tourist sites at the Poas Volcano and the La Paz waterfalls were severely damaged; and

Whereas Guatemala and Costa Rica have been frequently impacted by significant natural disasters, including those in the aftermath of Hurricane Stan in Guatemala in 2005 that led to hundreds of deaths: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the House of Representatives—

(A) mourns the terrible loss of life caused by the landslide that occurred on January 4, 2009, in Guatemala and the earthquake on January 8, 2009, in Costa Rica;

(B) expresses its deepest condolences to the families of the many victims; and

(C) applauds the prompt humanitarian responses to these natural disasters by the Governments of Guatemala and Costa Rica; and

(2) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that it should be the policy of the United States to—

(A) continue technical assistance to Central American governments in order to strengthen their capacity at the national, provincial, and local levels in the area of disaster management coordination and preparedness, including implementing information and communications systems to help with the response to natural disasters; and

(B) work closely with the governments of these countries to improve disaster mitigation techniques and compliance among all key sectors of their societies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank Congressman DAN BURTON for introducing this very important and timely resolution, which mourns the terrible loss of life caused by two natural disasters that occurred 4 days apart in Cen-

tral America in January of this year. The first was a landslide that occurred on January 4, 2009, in Guatemala. The second was an earthquake on January 8, 2009, in Costa Rica.

The resolution before us conveys the deepest condolences of Congress to the families of the victims and urges that the United States Government maintain technical assistance to Central American countries regarding disaster management and mitigation.

On January 4, 2009, millions of tons of earth fell onto a road in the Alta Verapaz area, north of Guatemala City in Guatemala. Apparently, a geological fault triggered the movement of earth, sending 10 million tons of mud and rock down a hillside onto a road that runs from San Cristobal Verapaz to Chicaman, north of Guatemala City. At least 38 people were confirmed dead and up to 60 were missing, many of whom were coffee workers in the region.

Four days later, on January 8, 2009, a 6.1 magnitude earthquake shook the capital region of San Jose, Costa Rica. The earthquake's epicenter was 20 miles from San Jose at a depth of 21.7 miles, and the shaking continued for 40 seconds. Twenty-three individuals were confirmed dead, over 100 were treated for injuries, and nearly a dozen went missing, including many buried by resulting landslides.

Guatemala and Costa Rica have been frequently impacted by significant natural disasters including those in the aftermath of Hurricane Stan in Guatemala in 2005 that led to hundreds of deaths.

I agree wholeheartedly that it should be the policy of the United States to continue technical assistance to governments in the region at the national, provincial, and local levels in the area of the disaster management coordination. It is also essential that the United States take a long-term view with its regional partners and help them improve disaster mitigation techniques.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very important and necessary and timely resolution.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my colleague from Georgia, DAVID SCOTT, for cosponsoring this resolution.

I think everybody in this body is very concerned about the tragedies that befall human beings here and around the world.

As my colleague said, this past January two significant natural disasters wreaked havoc on the Central American nations of Costa Rica and Guatemala and took a terrible and destructive toll on people in these communities.

In Guatemala, as coffee workers were returning from long days of work in the Alta Verapaz region, thousands of

tons of mud and rock fell in a landslide. As a result of this catastrophe, the nation mourned the deaths of as many as 36 while over 60 are still missing.

Only 4 days later, a 6.1 magnitude earthquake shook the capital region of Costa Rica, resulting in the destruction of over 500 homes and the deaths of at least 20.

I join my colleagues today to express my sincere sympathy and our sincere sympathy and support to our Latin American friends who have suffered as a result of these disasters. I would like to commend the courage and perseverance of the Costa Rican and Guatemalan Governments, along with the private citizens and relief organizations who worked tirelessly in the rescue effort. The prompt humanitarian response carried out in the aftermath of these disasters clearly contributed to the ability of these nations to overcome the damage wrought by these two tragedies.

As I said before, I would like to thank Mr. SCOTT for cosponsoring this, and I would like to thank our chairman, Mr. BERMAN, and our ranking member, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN of Florida, for helping move this important resolution to the floor. And, again, we extend our heartfelt condolences to the Guatemalan and Costa Rican people and their families who suffered as a result of these horrible disasters.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I certainly again want to commend Mr. BURTON for showing the leadership and at the same time showing the greatness of America, which has always been the timely response to other nations in their moment of great need and crisis.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 76, "Mourning the horrific loss of life in January 2009 caused by a landslide in Guatemala and an earthquake in Costa Rica and expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should assist the affected people and communities." I would like to thank my colleague, Representative DAN BURTON, for introducing this legislation.

Natural disasters are one of the most difficult things to deal with as a nation. As a Representative of Houston, TX I have seen devastation and heartbreak come from devastating natural disasters. Our city alone has faced and returned stronger after natural disasters like tropical storm Allison, as her waters flooded our streets and entered our homes. Within the past few years the people of the 18th Congressional District of Texas dealt with damage and evacuation troubles when shortly after a storm called Katrina ripped through the homes of our neighbors, Hurricane Rita threatened our city and our lives. Most recently, we had the electricity taken from our city, roofs stripped from our houses, and windows shattered into our living rooms. Because of Hurricane Ike our city has seen the impact of horrific situations before and after natural disasters ravage through our streets. These challenges, although largely difficult to recover from, already would have been virtually impos-

sible to recover from had the Federal Government not assisted.

The landslides in Guatemala claimed the lives of more than 30 people and caused destruction to many in this small country. The unfortunate loss of these men and women shall not only be remembered here today as we acknowledge this House resolution, but should be remembered everyday as the people of Guatemala try to recover from the devastation caused by this event. These events take time to recover from and in time just as the sadness fades the recovery will begin in this region.

Just like the people of Guatemala the people in Costa Rica did not expect the ground to start shaking bringing buildings to the ground. With over 14 lives claimed and dozens of people still missing the people of Costa Rica have been devastated by the effects the earthquake has brought them. The 6.2 magnitude earthquake shook the lives of all the people living in Costa Rica and like the people of Guatemala the wounds will take time to heal.

I have experienced firsthand the devastation of events like these and understand the difficulty in recovering from them. These people deserve all the help they can get. It is our moral responsibility to assist in any way we can in helping these countries rebuild. Supporting H. Res. 76 is a big step in helping these devastated nations. That is why I support H. Res. 76, "Mourning the horrific loss of life in January 2009 caused by a landslide in Guatemala and an earthquake in Costa Rica and expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should assist the affected people and communities" and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 76, 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 was amended so as to read: "A resolution mourning the horrific loss of life in January 2009 caused by a landslide in Guatemala and an earthquake in Costa Rica."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS WEEK

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 109) supporting the mission and goals of 2009 National Crime Victims' Rights week to increase public awareness of the rights, needs, and concerns of victims and survivors of crime in the United States, and to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the enactment of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 109

Whereas 25,000,000 individuals in the United States are victims of crime each year, including over 6,000,000 victims of violent crime;

Whereas a just society acknowledges the impact of crime on individuals, families, and communities by ensuring that rights, resources, and services are available to help rebuild lives;

Whereas although our Nation has steadily expanded rights, protections, and services for victims of crime, too many victims are still not able to realize the hope and promise of these gains;

Whereas our Nation must do more to ensure that services are available for underserved segments of the population, including crime victims with disabilities, victims with mental illness, and victims who are teenagers, elderly, or from urban and rural areas or communities of color;

Whereas observing victims' rights and treating victims with dignity and respect serves the public interest by engaging victims in the justice system, inspiring respect for public authorities, and promoting confidence in public safety;

Whereas the people of the United States recognize that we make our homes, neighborhoods, and communities safer and stronger by serving victims of crime and ensuring justice for all;

Whereas 2009 marks the 25th anniversary of the enactment of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 ("VOCA"), the hallmark of the Federal Government's recognition of its commitment to supporting rights and services for victims of crime through the establishment of the Crime Victims Fund, that is paid for by criminal fines and penalties, rather than by taxpayers' dollars;

Whereas, since its inception, the Crime Victims Fund has collected more than \$9,000,000,000 from offender fines and penalties to be used exclusively to help victims of crime;

Whereas VOCA supports direct assistance and financial compensation to more than 4,000,000 victims of crime every year;

Whereas VOCA's imaginative transformation of offender fines into programs of victim rehabilitation has inspired similar programs throughout the worldwide crime victims' movement;

Whereas the theme of 2009 National Crime Victims' Right Week, celebrated April 26, 2009, through May 2, 2009, is "25 Years of Rebuilding Lives: Celebrating the Victims of Crime Act", which highlights VOCA's significant achievements and contributions in advancing rights and services for all crime victims; and

Whereas National Crime Victims' Rights Week provides an opportunity for the Nation to strive to reach the goal of justice for all by ensuring that all victims are afforded legal rights and provided with assistance to face the financial, physical, spiritual, psychological, and social impact of crime: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the mission and goals of 2009 National Crime Victims' Rights Week to increase public awareness of the impact of crime on victims and survivors, and of the constitutional and statutory rights and needs;

(2) recognizes the 25th anniversary of the enactment of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984; and

(3) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the Office for Victims of Crime within the Office of Justice Programs of the Department of Justice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Res. 109 supports the goals and mission of National Crime Victims' Rights week, which is being celebrated this week, April 26 through May 2, 2009. The 2009 National Crime Victims' Rights week theme is "25 Years of Rebuilding Lives: Celebrating the Victims of Crime Act."

Mr. Speaker, each year for the last 25 years, the Office of Victims of Crime in the Department of Justice has observed National Crime Victims' Rights week along with individuals and communities across the country. Victims' rights and crime victims are honored with rallies, candlelight vigils, and other commemorative events.

This week in April is an important time to increase public awareness about the needs and concerns of the 25 million victims and survivors of crime each year, of which over 6 million are victims of violent crimes.

During National Crime Victims' Rights week, people are asked to take time out to acknowledge the impact that crime has on families, individuals, and communities by ensuring that resources and services are available to help crime victims rebuild their lives.

We would also like to acknowledge the 25 years of contributions that the Office of Victims of Crime has made to supporting victims of both violent and nonviolent crime. A major aspect of the office's work has been the creation and supervision of the Crime Victims Fund. This fund is paid for by criminal fines and penalties and supplemented with general tax revenue as needed. Over the last 25 years, the Crime Victims Fund has collected more than \$9 billion from offender fines and penalties, which is used solely to assist crime victims. Each year these funds support direct services and financial compensation to more than 4 million victims of crime.

This week is also a time to make a commitment to providing more resources and services to crime victims who live in underserved areas such as urban and rural areas. This is also time to pay special attention to victims of crime who suffer from physical and mental disabilities in addition to child and senior citizens who may be victims of crime.

Mr. Speaker, we should be doing more to invest in crime prevention and therefore reducing the number of victims, but meanwhile this resolution gives us the opportunity to celebrate victims' rights and their dignity. We should ensure that victims are treated with the dignity and respect that they deserve, and doing that will promote a fair and just criminal justice system. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

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

□ 1430

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague and friend Mr. COSTA from California as an original sponsor of this resolution to recognize and support the mission and goals of National Crime Victims' Rights Week. Together, Mr. COSTA and myself chair the Congressional Victims' Rights Caucus. The caucus is comprised of Members from both sides of the aisle who are dedicated to protecting the interests and needs of crime victims throughout our country. Crime victim issues are not partisan. They are nonpartisan issues, Mr. Speaker, and affect everyone in this country.

In 1980, President Ronald Reagan first called for a national observance to recognize and honor the millions of crime victims and those survivors in this country. Since then, Victims' Rights Week has been proclaimed annually with ceremonies and observances here in Washington, D.C. and thousands of communities throughout the Nation.

Each April, the Office for Victims of Crime, called the OVC, organizes a weeklong series of activities and rallies to increase public awareness of the rights, the needs and concerns of crime victims in the United States. The theme of this year's National Crime Victims' Rights Week is "25 Years of Rebuilding Lives: Celebrating the Victims of Crime Act."

In 1984, the Victims of Crime Act, called VOCA, created the VOCA fund, a Federal victims compensation account funded by fines assessed in Federal criminal convictions. This is a collection of criminal fines, not taxpayer dollars.

The way it works, Mr. Speaker, criminals convicted in Federal Court contribute into a fund, as I say paying for the crimes they have committed, paying rent on the courthouse, and that fund is used exclusively for victims and victims' services throughout the United States. It is not a taxpayer-funded fund; it is a fund solely funded by criminals. What a novel idea: Make criminals pay to the victims of crime, victims that many of them have caused to be victims in the first place.

Also the Victims of Crime Act establishes the Office for Victims of Crime

to distribute those funds throughout the United States. In fact, with the help of the OVC, there are now 10,000 victim assistance programs providing emotional, financial, physical and spiritual support every day. All of these organizations owe to some extent their existence because of the VOCA funds that were established by Congress many years ago.

VOCA is the only Federal fund that caters to the needs of victims. Each year, about 4,400 agencies and almost 3.5 million victims receive support and financial compensation from this fund funded by criminals. Just to clarify, this money that is collected is used to help victims and their families.

This year, during National Crime Victims' Rights Week, we celebrate that the VOCA fund has been assisting victims for over 25 years and has distributed literally billions of dollars since its inception. Currently there are \$6.5 billion in this fund, funds that will be given to victims and victims services. It is important that we as Members of Congress make sure that the bureaucrats, however, don't see this fund and take the fund and use it for other services in the United States that have nothing to do with victims.

While the events of this week provide excellent opportunities to focus on victims' rights, this issue requires attention by Members of Congress so that the VOCA fund is not taken by the bureaucrats and used for other purposes.

Last month, four police officers in Oakland, California, Dan Sakai, 35, Mark Dunakin, 40, John Hege, 41, and Ervin Romans, 43, were shot to death by a 27-year-old parolee. Earlier this month, an armed man walked into a New York Immigration and Naturalization service center and shot 17 people, killing 13 and wounding four others.

The National Center For Victims of Crime reports that during 2008 a child was reported abused or neglected almost every 35 seconds. In my home State of Texas alone, there were more than 83,000 separate allegations of abuse or neglect confirmed by Child Protective Services.

Crime victims, Mr. Speaker, are not statistics. They are real men, women and children with families and loved ones, and those victims who manage to survive the acts of violence must not be excluded from the criminal justice system. Their voices must be heard, and in honor of every victim, we renew our commitment to protect the rights of crime victims and provide them effective assistance programs, and we also commend the countless professionals and volunteers who have dedicated literally their lives to help victims and survivors of crime.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chief sponsor of the legislation who, along with Mr. POE, introduced

this important resolution, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his leadership and his support for this important House Resolution, H. Res. 109, which I rise today to introduce.

As has been stated by my colleagues, this resolution supports the mission and goals of National Crime Victims' Rights Week, to designate this week, April 26 to May 2, as National Crime Victims' Rights Week. Congressman TED POE and I introduced this resolution on behalf of our fellow Victims' Rights Caucus members who have been supportive of our efforts over the last 4 years.

As was noted, in 1980 President Reagan first called for the national observance to recognize and honor the millions of victims and their families and survivors who have been victims, sadly, of crime in America.

This year, we mark the 25th anniversary of the enactment of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984, better known as VOCA. This legislation has supported rights and services for crime victims for the last 25 years, and quite successfully. It has done it without the use of a single dime from American taxpayer dollars.

The Victims of Crime Act, the VOCA funds, are supported by fines and penalties that come from the criminals who have perpetrated these crimes. These funds are used by State and local organizations to help people through their difficult time periods after experiencing a crime that they have been victimized by. There are over 4,400 agencies across the country which depend upon VOCA funding. These agencies serve near in excess of 3.5 million crime victims each year, sadly.

This resolution also honors the lives that have been rebuilt over the last 25 years as a result of all the good efforts by these local agencies throughout our country. These are millions of people working in victim organizations who have dedicated their lives to assisting people through these terrible, terrible time periods, and each and every one of them I think deserves a thank you from all of us as Members of Congress.

When I arrived in Washington, Congressman POE and I discovered that there was not a caucus that was dedicated for the purpose of recognizing those victims of crime. So Congressman TED POE and I decided to form a new bipartisan congressional caucus that would provide a louder voice for all the advocacy groups who advocate on behalf of victims of crime.

The Congressional Victims' Rights Caucus, of which I am proud to be a co-chair of, frankly, has done a lot of good efforts over the last 4 years, and we encourage Members who are listening and their staff who are not members of this bipartisan congressional caucus that you join our efforts.

We have three simple goals. The first is to represent crime victims in the United States through bipartisan in-

roduction of legislation that reflects the interests, rights and needs of victims of crime. Two, our goal is to provide an ongoing forum for proactive discussion between Congress and national victims' assistance organizations to enhance mutual education and legislation advocacy and initiatives which promote justice for all, including the victims of crime. Three, to seek opportunities for public education initiatives to help people in the United States understand the impact of crime on victims and to encourage their involvement in crime prevention, which is the best sort of effort we can possibly do. An ounce of prevention, as we all know, is worth a pound of cure. And also to provide victim assistance and community safety throughout our neighborhoods across this great land of ours.

I want to thank again the gentleman from Virginia. I want to thank Congressman TED POE, my cochair of the caucus, for all of your efforts on behalf of Members who work on behalf of those who are victims of crime.

Finally, my fellow colleagues, crime, as we know, knows no boundary, knows no demographic, or congressional district boundary. Sadly, crime affects in some capacity all Americans at some point in life.

When our families, when our friends and when our neighbors are in need of assistance after a crime, they should not be met with a closed door, but they should be met with open arms. We all have a responsibility. This is not simply the domain of local law enforcement agencies, which play a tremendous role, but we as Americans all have a responsibility to help out in our communities.

So I want to thank those members of the Congressional Victims' Rights Caucus, I want to thank those who support this resolution, H. Res. 109, and encourage all of my colleagues to support important legislation that we will pursue in the 111th Congress.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman from Virginia for leading this resolution, but also I do want to thank my friend from California, Mr. COSTA, for not only sponsoring this legislation, but for his hard work nationally on victims' rights and the movement. He literally started the victims' rights movement in California, the State that we owe a lot to for the victims' right movement when he was in the State legislature there in California, and he has brought his passion to help victims of crime to the United States Congress, and we are all better for that.

Last week in honor of National Crime Victims' Rights Week, the Victim's Rights Caucus, as Mr. COSTA mentioned, had several preliminary events. One was the fourth annual Victim's Rights Caucus awards ceremony.

At the awards ceremony last Wednesday night, Mr. COSTA and myself joined

other Members of the House, Mr. SHAD-EGG from Arizona, Mr. YARMUTH from Kentucky and Mr. REICHERT from Washington in honoring six outstanding victim advocates and victim programs.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the names and the awards of these six recipients.

2009 VICTIMS' RIGHTS CAUCUS AWARDS RECIPIENTS

(1) Suzanne McDaniel Public Awareness Award—Katherine Cabaniss. Ms. Cabaniss is the Executive Director of Houston Crime Stoppers. As a former Assistant District Attorney, she has a passion for preventing and fighting crime. During her time with Crime Stoppers, Ms. Cabaniss has built strategic alliances with people and organizations who assist victims of crime, including local school districts, apartment property management companies, and women's shelters. She has strengthened Crime Stoppers relationship with the media, and in doing so, has used her voice to promote safe communities and justice for victims of crime. Cabaniss was nominated by Representative Ted Poe (TX-02).

(2) Ed Stout Memorial Award for Outstanding Victim Advocacy—Alliance Against Family Violence and Sexual Assault. The Alliance represents everything that Mr. Stout worked so hard for during his work on behalf of crime victims and survivors. They are a nonprofit, grassroots organization that since 1979 has provided support and services to victims of domestic violence and sexual assault in Kern County and the surrounding area. These services are free, and are bilingual, which serves Kern County's diverse ethnic background. Their strong focus on assisting victims of violence against women in rural areas is remarkable. The Alliance Against Family Violence and Sexual Assault was nominated by Representative Jim Costa (CA-20).

(3) Ed Stout Memorial Award for Outstanding Victim Advocacy—Sheryl Cates. Ms. Cates has spent the last 25 years advocating for victims of domestic violence at all levels. As Executive Director at Women's Protective Services in Lubbock, TX, Ms. Cates worked directly with victims as well as supervising staff who provide services to victims. Also, as CEO of the Texas Council on Family Violence, National Domestic Violence Hotline and loveisrespect.org National Teen Dating Abuse Helpline, Ms. Cates is recognized nationally as an expert in the field of domestic violence and as someone who can be counted on to participate in any efforts to support the needs of victims and their families. Cates was nominated by Representative Lamar Smith (TX-21)

(4) Lois Haight Award of Excellence and Innovation—Steve Twist. Mr. Twist has worked tirelessly to ensure that every jurisdiction in America provides victims with rights in the criminal justice system and that those rights are enforceable by the individual victim. He has worked as counsel to the Navajo Nation, aiding in the drafting of various victim provisions, and is the principal author of the Arizona constitutional amendment for victims' rights and the Arizona Victims' Rights Implementation Act, which together are the strongest victims' rights legal provisions in the country. Mr. Twist was nominated by Representative John Shadegg (AZ-03)

(5) Eva Murillo Unsung Hero Award—Jenny Wieland. Ms. Wieland's 17 year old daughter and only child was murdered by another teen in 1992. She turned her pain into purpose and has worked tirelessly to reduce youth violence, in hopes that other mothers

would not have to experience the loss of a child to a violent crime. In 1994, Jenny Wieland became a founding board member of Mothers Against Violence in America (MAVIA). In early 1995, she left a career as an insurance broker to become MAVIA's Program Director and first employee. During her seven-year tenure with MAVIA, she helped create and implement MAVIA's many national and local programs, including the acclaimed Washington State model of Day of National Concern About Young People and Gun Violence, which encourages young Americans in classrooms and communities across the country to sign the Student Pledge Against Gun Violence. Currently, Wieland is serving as Executive Director of Families and Friends of Violent Crime Victims in Washington State. Wieland was nominated by Representative Dave Reichert (WA-08).

(6) Allied Profession Award—Michael Davis, President of Appriss, Inc. Mr. Davis is the cofounder and president of Appriss, the provider of local, state and federal automated victim information and notification services and automated victim protection order services. In 1994, Mary Byron was murdered on her 21st birthday by her former boyfriend who was in jail in Louisville, Kentucky. Mary and her parents asked to be notified if and when he was released, which did not happen. In response to this preventable tragedy, Davis and his partner created VINE® (Victim Information and Notification Everyday), which provides confidential, around-the-clock notifications to victims about the status of their offenders. VINE keeps crime victims and survivors informed and involved in their cases, in turn promoting personal and community safety. Today, Appriss provides VINE and related services to more than 75% of our nation. States participating in the Statewide Automated Victim Information and Notification (SAVIN) grant program have entrusted Appriss as their technology provider. Davis was nominated by Representative John Yarmuth (KY-03).

Mr. POE of Texas. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to a strong supporter of victims, a former law enforcement officer, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. COSTA, for introducing this resolution. As a former Escanaba City police officer, a Michigan State police trooper and as an attorney, I saw every day the effect of crime on our citizens. Crime leaves its victims feeling unsafe in their own communities and vulnerable to the often complicated judicial system.

As the cochairman of the Law Enforcement Caucus, I know that when a crime is committed, our law enforcement agencies work hard so the criminal is brought to justice. But there is another part to the equation. The victim of crime must be provided with assistance and support to recover from this often traumatic experience.

Our law enforcement agencies work with the court system to ensure that victims of crime are treated fairly and with respect to one's dignity and privacy. We must step up to the plate and show our strong commitment to the

criminal justice system by ensuring that victims of crimes feel safe in their own communities.

The creation of the National Crime Victims' Crime Week is a good first step to increase public awareness of the rights and needs of victims of crime. Congress should go even further by ensuring the legal protections are in place to protect victims of crime.

During the National Law Enforcement Week in May, I will introduce an amendment to the United States Constitution to protect the rights of all victims. I hope you will join me in ensuring our Constitution explicitly supports the rights of victims of crime.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of House Resolution 109 to create the National Crime Victims' Rights Week of 2009 and to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the enactment of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is because of the pioneering efforts of many, including President Reagan and his 1982 Task Force on Victims of Crime, that we are able to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Victims of Crime Act. We must remember that the same Constitution that protects the rights of offenders protects the rights of victims of crime in this country as well.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting in resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California, the gentleman from Texas, as well as the gentleman from Michigan, for their work on behalf of victims of crime, and I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 109, supporting the mission and goals of 2009 National Crime Victims' Rights week to increase public awareness of the rights, needs, an concerns of victims and survivors of crime in the United States, and to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the enactment of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984. I thank Congressman COSTA, Congressman POE, Congresswoman MATSUI, Congressman MARCHANT, and Congressman MORAN for introducing this meaningful resolution which recognizes and acknowledges the over 25 million individuals that are victims of crimes each year in this country. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. As members of Congress, we need to acknowledge the impact of crime on individuals, families, and communities and we need to ensure that rights, resources, and services are available to help rebuild lives.

This resolution is important because while our nation has steadily, and rightfully, expanded rights, protections and services for victims of crimes, too many victims are still not able to realize the hope and promise of the gains. Our country must do more to ensure that services are available for underserved segments of the population, including crime victims with disabilities, victims with mental illness, and victims who are teenagers, elderly, or from urban and rural areas or communities of color. According the National Center for Victims:

One person is murdered every 31 minutes.
One person is raped every 1.9 minutes.
One person is assaulted every 36.9 seconds.

One home is burglarized every 18 seconds.
One woman is victimized by an intimate partner every 52 seconds.

One child is reported abused or neglected every 34.9 seconds.

One person is killed in an alcohol-related crash every 40.4 minutes.

One person becomes a victim of identity theft every 4.9 seconds.

One elderly person is victimized by a violent crime every 4.2 minutes.

We must observe victims' rights and treat victims with dignity and respect and engage them in the justice system, which will also further gain respect for public authorities and promote confidence in public safety. The people of this country will be safer and stronger by serving victims of crime and ensuring justice for all.

It is necessary that we, as members of Congress, mark the anniversary of the enactment of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984. This Act is the hallmark of the Federal Government's recognition of its commitment to supporting rights and services for victims of all types of crime through the establishment of the Crime Victims Fund. This fund is paid by criminal fines and penalties, not tax payer dollars. The fund has collected more than \$9 billion from offender fines and penalties to be used exclusively to help victims of crime. These funds have aided the more than 4 million victims of crime a year. The money provides medical care, counseling and funeral costs. This act has encouraged other programs to also transfer offender fines into help for victim rehabilitation.

The theme of the 2009 National Crime Victim's right Week, celebrated April 26–May 2, 2009 is "25 years of Rebuilding Lives: Celebrating the Victims of Crime Act". This theme highlights the Act's significant achievements and contributions in advancing rights and services for all crime victims. This week will provide an opportunity for the nation to strive to reach the goal of justice for all by ensuring that all victims are afforded legal rights and provided with assistance to face the financial, physical, spiritual, psychological and social impact of crime.

I encourage my colleagues to pass this resolution so that we can increase the public awareness of the impact of crime on victims and survivors, and of the constitutional and statutory rights and needs of victims of crime. This resolution will recognize the 25th anniversary of the enactment of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984. It will also direct the clerk of the House of Representatives to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the Office for Victims of Crime within the Office of Justice Programs of the Department of Justice.

In Harris County, within the 18th District of Texas, which I proudly represent, the Houston Mayor's Crime Victims Office has a saying, "Crime victims are the only unwilling participants in our criminal justice system; everyone else chooses their own roles. Victims' rights are often a mere courtesy, while defendants' rights—and rightfully so—are protected in our Constitution. Victims' rights deserve the same protection." While Harris County is fortunate to have some of the Nation's finest victim service organizations, such as the Houston Area

Women's Center, Parents of Murdered Children, AVDA, MADD and Family Time, as well as victim liaisons staffed from our criminal justice partners it is far from immune from crime. The Harris County Victim Witness Division, alone, assisted over 30,000 victims of crime last year and helped them receive \$16.9 million in restitution.

I have been and continue to be an advocate for victims of crime most importantly with my latest legislation, H.R. 262, the David Ray Ritcheson Hate Crime Prevention Act which I also introduced in the 110th Congress. I twice sponsored a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the people of the United States should grieve for the loss of life that defined the Third Reich and celebrate the continued education efforts for tolerance and justice, reaffirming the commitment of United States to fight against intolerance and prejudice in any form, and honoring the legacy of transparent procedure, government accountability, the rule of law, the pursuit of justice, and the struggle for universal freedom and human rights. Additionally, I sponsored H.R. 5610, in the 109th Congress, the Foreign Anti-Sex Offender Protection Act of 2006. I have co-sponsored numerous bills that benefit victims of crimes.

Nobody wants, or deserves, to be a victim of crime. I urge my colleagues to pass this Resolution and acknowledge and support these unfortunate victims.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 109.

The question was taken.

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

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

The 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.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1445

SUPPORTING NATIONAL SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS AND PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 104) supporting the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 104

Whereas on average, a person is sexually assaulted in the United States every two-and-a-half minutes;

Whereas the Department of Justice reports that 191,670 people in the United States were sexually assaulted in 2005;

Whereas 1 in 6 women and 1 in 33 men have been victims of rape or attempted rape;

Whereas the Department of Defense received 2,688 reports of sexual assault involving members of the Armed Forces in fiscal year 2007;

Whereas children and young adults are most at risk of sexual assault, as 44 percent of sexual assault victims are under the age of 18, and 80 percent are under the age of 30;

Whereas sexual assault affects women, men, and children of all racial, social, religious, age, ethnic, and economic groups in the United States;

Whereas only 41 percent of sexual assault victims pursue prosecution by reporting their attack to law enforcement agencies;

Whereas two-thirds of sexual crimes are committed by persons who are not strangers to the victims;

Whereas sexual assault survivors suffer emotional scars long after the physical scars have healed;

Whereas prevention education programs carried out by rape crisis and women's health centers have the potential to reduce the prevalence of sexual assault in their communities;

Whereas because of recent advances in DNA technology, law enforcement agencies have the potential to identify the rapists in tens of thousands of unsolved rape cases;

Whereas aggressive prosecution can incarcerate rapists and therefore prevent them from committing further crimes;

Whereas free, confidential help is available to all survivors of sexual assault through the National Sexual Assault Hotline, more than 1,000 rape crisis centers across the United States, and other organizations that provide services to assist survivors of sexual assault; and

Whereas April is recognized as "National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) it is the sense of Congress that—

(A) National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month provides a special opportunity to educate the people of the United States about sexual violence and to encourage the prevention of sexual assault, the improved treatment of its survivors, and the prosecution of its perpetrators;

(B) it is appropriate to properly acknowledge the more than 20,000,000 men and women who have survived sexual assault in the United States and salute the efforts of survivors, volunteers, and professionals who combat sexual assault;

(C) national and community organizations and private sector supporters should be recognized and applauded for their work in promoting awareness about sexual assault, providing information and treatment to its survivors, and increasing the number of successful prosecutions of its perpetrators; and

(D) public safety, law enforcement, and health professionals should be recognized and applauded for their hard work and innovative strategies to increase the percentage of sexual assault cases that result in the prosecution and incarceration of the offenders;

(2) Congress strongly recommends national and community organizations, businesses in the private sector, colleges and universities, and the media to promote, through National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, awareness of sexual violence and strategies to decrease the incidence of sexual assault; and

(3) Congress supports the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gen-

tleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), as well as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), for introducing this important resolution, and I rise in support to acknowledge the impact that sexual assault has on its victims and to promote education about and prevention of sexual assault.

This resolution highlights the immense problem of sexual assault in the United States. A person is sexually assaulted in the United States every 2½ minutes. Almost 18 million women, 1 in 6, have been victims of rape or attempted rape, and almost 3 million men, 1 in 33, have also been victims.

Sexual assault also harms the society. Medical expenses, lost productivity, treatment of psychological trauma and pain and suffering cost victims roughly \$127 billion per year.

It can also lead to long-term health problems such as chronic pain and headaches and stomach problems and sexually transmitted diseases, and can leave victims with emotional issues which can lead to depression and even suicide.

Designating April to be Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month is an important step in recognizing the problem. Highlighting and focusing on this issue gives us the opportunity to educate the public and allows us to praise the survivors, as well as the volunteers and professionals who have dedicated their lives to combating sexual assault.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I'm pleased to join my Judiciary Committee colleague, the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) as an original sponsor on this resolution. I want to thank her for her efforts in presenting this to Congress. I would like to thank her for reintroducing House Concurrent Resolution 104 to recognize April as National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

Every 2½ minutes a person is sexually assaulted in the United States. Sadly, 1 in 6 women and 1 in 33 men have been victims of rape or attempted rape. Two-thirds of these assaults are committed by someone that is actually

known by the victim, and yet, only about 40 percent of sexual assaults are ever reported to law enforcement authorities.

Sexual Assault Awareness Month attempts to change these startling statistics by promoting education programs, victims support services, advances in DNA and forensics technology, and aggressive prosecution and incarceration of sexual assault offenders.

National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month helps to educate the public about sexual assault in our communities and the long-term effects that it has on its victims.

It also recognizes the work of staff and volunteers at rape crisis centers and other community organizations across the country that provide counseling and victims support services to sexual assault survivors.

With education and community support, it is my hope that more victims will pursue prosecution of their attackers by reporting their assaults to law enforcement. Once victims take this first critical step, it's up to lawmakers and law enforcement to ensure that these violent offenders are put away.

Last Congress, both the House and the Senate passed H.R. 5057, reauthorizing the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Program. The legislation was then signed into law on October 8, 2008.

The Debbie Smith program, originally authorized in 2000, awards grants to State and local governments to reduce the DNA backlogs of samples collected from crime scenes and the backlog for entry into the national DNA database. Through these grants, State and local governments received funding to test approximately 104,000 DNA cases between 2004 and 2007.

These grants have also funded the collection of 2.5 million DNA samples from convicted offenders and arrestees for inclusion in the national DNA database. The Department of Justice estimates that over 5,000 "hits" or matches are the result of this DNA backlog reduction. This is a positive step forward, but we must continue our efforts to reduce the DNA backlog to provide justice for sexual assault victims and put their attackers behind bars.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no other requests for time, and I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in this sterile environment of the Halls of Congress, sometimes we forget that sexual assault is a crime that is committed against people in this country, a crime that most of them never really get over.

In my experience as a prosecutor and a judge for 22 years, I came in contact with numerous sexual assault victims, some of which never could quite handle and cope with the fact that they had been a victim of a crime, especially

this crime, because, you see, when the offender commits a sexual assault against someone else, that offender is trying to steal the very soul of that victim. And sometimes victims cannot recover from that, emotionally or physically. That is why this legislation is important and that we, as Members of Congress, do our duty and be the advocates for those victims that have silent voices throughout this country.

And that's just the way it is.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), as well as the chief sponsor of the resolution, the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), for their hard work on the issue of sexual assault.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 104, which supports the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

I was the lead Democratic sponsor of the original legislation to designate April as National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, which was introduced by former Representative Mark Green and signed into law in 2003. I am proud to have been a part of that initial effort, which has grown into a nationwide campaign to raise public awareness regarding sexual violence, prevent future crimes, and provide crucial services to victims of rape and sexual assault.

Even as we shine a spotlight on this issue throughout the month of April, it is important to remember that preventing sexual assault must be top priority every month of the year. A 2000 study by the National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention found that 18% of women in the United States have been raped in their lifetimes, yet we know that only about 6% of women who have been raped will ever see their attacker spend a day in jail.

I have long been a champion of domestic and international women's issues, and preventing violence against women has been one of my top priorities since my very first day in Congress. That is why I wrote "The Debbie Smith Act," signed into law in 2004 to improve the investigation and prosecution of sexual assault cases with DNA evidence. DNA evidence is crucial to getting rapists off the streets, and yet across the country, thousands of unprocessed DNA evidence kits are gathering dust. Each one of these represents a victim who has been denied justice, and a rapist who is free to commit more crimes. With this legislation, the huge backlog of rape kits is finally being processed.

In 2008 I introduced H.R. 5057, "The Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act," which was signed into law, and which extends the Debbie Smith DNA Backlog Grant Program through FY 2014. The bill also reauthorizes several critical programs which provide training and education for criminal justice and medical personnel in the use of DNA evidence. I am pleased to have been joined by Chairman CONYERS and Ranking Member SMITH of the Judiciary Committee in introducing that important legislation.

It is vitally important that we continue these efforts to reduce the DNA backlog crisis in our

nation's crime labs. Equally imperative are efforts to support the Violence Against Women Act by fully funding the organizations, shelters, and counseling centers which provide the crucial victim services which help women escape dangerous situations and begin new lives free from violence and fear.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 104 "Supporting the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month." I want to thank my colleague Congresswoman, TAMMY BALDWIN of Wisconsin for introducing this legislation.

This Resolution echoes the goals and ideals of the National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, namely to increase public awareness of the occurrence and the effects of sexual assault and to improve our nation's overall ability to prevent new incidents.

This important resolution will help to bring an end to the deplorable rapes, molestations, and sexual assault that occur across America. Violent crime and sex offenses are a fact of life which can be targeted for prevention through a combination of education, public awareness, as well as identifying and monitoring known offenders in the community.

Mr. Speaker, there are no greater crimes that an individual can commit than the crimes of sexual molestation and sexual assault. The perpetrators of these crimes rob victims of their innocence. Moreover, victims of sexual assault are profoundly affected for the rest of their lives. As elected officials, we have an obligation to condemn this violence, work for stronger enforcement of the law and provide adequate funding for programs to assist individuals who may have experienced such abuse.

I urge my colleagues to fight against these heinous crimes. Sexual assault can be verbal, visual, or anything that forces a person to join in unwanted sexual contact or attention. Examples of this are voyeurism (when someone watches private sexual acts), exhibitionism (when someone exposes him/herself in public), incest (sexual contact between family members), and sexual harassment. It can happen in different situations, by a stranger in an isolated place, on a date, or in the home by someone you know.

The negative impacts of sexual assault go beyond the physical trauma of the attack itself. The victims suffer psychological trauma, emotional scarring, shame, the stigma of being victimized, and the destruction of their dignity.

Unfortunately, sexual assault is an issue that has plagued the nation. In my home state of Texas, nearly 2 million adult Texans, or 12.6% of the population, have been sexually assaulted, and more than half of all sexual assaults are committed against children under age 18. An estimated 82% of rapes go unreported. The vast majority of rape victims—nearly 80%—know the person who rapes them.

In Texas, 6 out of 10 adults and more than half of teenagers say sexual assault is a personal worry. A third of Texan adults say sexual assault is one of their biggest worries. While a majority of Texans says the state takes sexual assault seriously, 76% believe the state should take the issue more seriously.

Many Americans have only a surface understanding of what constitutes sexual assault,

and more than a quarter of Americans are very misinformed about its parameters. It will take more than just stronger prevention and enforcement of the law to prevent sexual molestation and other forms of sexual assault. In order to end this serious epidemic that has plagued America, all segments of the community such as parents, educators, religious leaders, and community leaders must create a nurturing environment us to live comfortably.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 104 "Supporting the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month."

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 104.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 365 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 365

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of April 28, 2009, providing for consideration or disposition of a conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2010, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2011 through 2014.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 365 permits same-day consideration of a rule providing for consideration of the conference report on the budget resolution, S. Con. Res. 13.

This budget is a critical document and comes at a critical time in our country. We all know this budget is a blueprint of the priorities of the Obama administration and this Democratic Congress. This budget sets the framework for most of the legislation that we will consider this year—everything from the annual spending bills to improvements in education to health care reform to deficit control.

I'm not surprised that my friends on the other side of the aisle aren't pleased with this budget. Republicans voted against the recovery package, and now they are going to oppose this budget.

It's no secret that the Republicans have fundamental differences in the way they would govern this country. But that's why we have elections, Madam Speaker, and the American people spoke loud and clear about what they want their country to stand for. And those principles are set in this budget.

Madam Speaker, this budget must be adopted in order for this Congress to start working on the agenda the American people want us to enact. I am proud to support this budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my very good friend from Worcester for yielding me this customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I have to say that I am really somewhat puzzled as to why it is that we are here debating a same-day rule for consideration of the Federal budget's conference report. As we all know, a same-day rule is a mechanism to circumvent House rules in order to hastily cram through legislation.

Why in the world would the Democratic leadership want to rush through passage of the Federal budget? I recognize that same-day rules have taken place when either party has been in the majority, but why in the world would the Democratic leadership want to do this, Madam Speaker, for the Federal budget?

As I say, we often use this procedure when the government might run out of money. Well, although we know, as of last Sunday, April 26, we saw the deficit day actually created, Debt Day created, as of Sunday, we ran out of money. We now are in deficit spending as of today.

Last year that date was August 4. We spent all of our money up until August 4 of last year. This was last Sunday, the 26th of April. So we are now into borrowed money. But as we all know, Madam Speaker, our appropriations bills that we have passed for this cal-

endar year exist until the next fiscal year begins.

Is there some hard and fast deadline that needs to be met under the Budget Act? The budget resolution should have been completed by April 15. The Democratic leadership wasn't in a hurry when that deadline came and went, and there is no new deadline at all that needs to be met right now.

Maybe, Madam Speaker, Congress is getting ready for a prolonged congressional recess, a district work period. Well, the next recess, as we all know, is about a month away. We are supposed to be working here for another 4 weeks.

Now, Madam Speaker, I ask maybe, just maybe it's the end of a very long, hard workweek of ours here, and we want to complete action before a long 3-day weekend, except today is Tuesday, and there is plenty of time to get this done before we finish legislative business on Thursday. So why, Madam Speaker, are we denying Members and the public the chance to read this budget, a budget, which as we all know now, at least we know the outside numbers, spends \$17.8 trillion.

We have been listening to people over the past several weeks talk about what the number a trillion is. Somebody was saying it totals 31,000 years, longer than recorded history, in seconds. I mean, it's just amazing to contemplate that in this budget it is \$17.8 trillion over a 5-year period of time.

The only thing that I can figure out, Madam Speaker, is that tomorrow marks the conclusion of the President's first 100 days. Now, this is a milestone the press has observed since Franklin Delano's Roosevelt's presidency. It's a very symbolic moment that every President understandably likes to highlight.

The problem rises, Madam Speaker, when his party cares more about symbolism and photo opportunities than taking the power of the purse, our constitutional responsibility here in the people's House, and taking that seriously. We have a profound responsibility to spend the taxpayers' money wisely.

During a time of great economic challenges, when every working family is trying to make every penny count, the responsibility here for us to deal with those tax dollars as wisely as possible is even greater. I would hope that the Democratic leadership would care more about fiscal responsibility than a photo opportunity.

Unfortunately, this is not a new pattern for the House Democratic leadership. Just a few weeks ago we turned the process upside down to try to pass the GIVE Act so that it could be signed by the President just before he left for Europe.

Now, cooler heads did prevail, but it looks like we are headed down that exact same path now. This photo opportunity deadline in the first 100 days is leading us to not go through the regular order for consideration of this budget conference report.

Now I understand why they would like to pass their budget prior to the completion of the first 100 days. And in many ways, Madam Speaker, it is a very, very clear definition of what it's about.

My friend from Worcester talked about the fact that elections have consequences, the people have spoken, and this is what they want? Well, I have got to say that from what I have heard from my constituents and from what I have seen in polling that has been done across the country, and as I have participated in telephone town hall meetings and heard my colleagues from both sides of the aisle talking about this, including the President's cabinet meeting, when he has now been referring to the fact that we need to focus on restraining spending, I clearly don't believe that a budget that is \$17.8 trillion of spending over the next 5 years is what the American people want or wanted when they cast their votes last November.

But I will say that if you look at the first 100 days, this is a clear, clear signal of what it is that we have gotten in this 100 days. And it would make a very nice press story, I know, to have this accomplished from their perspective by the completion of the 100 days.

I do believe that there are things that are much more important than press conferences and photo opportunities. The Federal budget happens to be one of them. The Democratic majority should, I believe, take taxpayers' money and the spending of that more seriously than has been done in this budget or what we have seen with the stimulus bill, the 1,100-page bill that we dropped on a table around here and pointed out very widely that people hadn't read.

Both the President and the majority promised that Members would be able to read the bills we are voting on. I remember when candidate Obama talked about that throughout the campaign. We have had the Speaker of the House regularly point to that.

Nowhere, Madam Speaker, is that more important than when we are in the midst of debating the Federal budget. The last time, we all know this very well, because we have seen amazing gymnastics take place around here, the last time we rushed through a major piece of legislation like this is the one I just referred to, and it was the so-called economic stimulus bill. And that was when we discovered the Federal Government was enabling bonuses for companies funded by the U.S. taxpayer.

Now, I ask, as we look at this \$17.8 trillion package over the next 5 years, what's in this budget, Madam Speaker, that the Democratic leadership does not want us to read?

So, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this same-day rule. We need to proceed under regular order for consideration of this budget process, and I personally believe that we should do everything within our power to completely overhaul this badly flawed budget structure that we have.

So reject this rule, go at least through regular order, and I hope very much the Democratic leadership will fulfill its constitutional obligations with both responsibility and accountability.

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

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

Madam Speaker, it's a little difficult to hear lectures from a member of the other party, the party that inherited from Bill Clinton a record surplus and then over the next 8 years presided over an economy that turned that surplus into a record deficit, that ruined, that forced this economy into the ditch that we are now trying to dig ourselves out of.

I want to apologize to the gentleman for the Democratic leadership's desire to actually accomplish something, to get things done. That's exactly what we are trying to do here. We have done enough talking. There has been enough speechifying. The American people voted for action. They voted for change. They voted for a new direction.

They didn't vote for more speeches. They didn't vote for more obstructionism. They didn't vote for more of the same of what we had over the last 8 years.

On this budget, just so it's clear, we had more than 14 hours of markup in the Budget Committee. I was there, because I am also on the Budget Committee.

We had a full debate on the House floor. Four substitute amendments were made in order. People had an opportunity to vote for budgets to the left and to the right and everything in between. So there was ample time for discussion. We had an open conference meeting.

The gentleman is going to have over 24 hours to read the budget. Now, for someone who hasn't read the budget, he is spouting out a lot of facts and figures. But he is going to have over 24 hours to read what the conference committee produced, because we are not going to vote on the budget until tomorrow.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me make a couple of points here. First, as my friend began, he said that it was difficult for someone who was part of increasing deficits over the past 8 years under President Bush to stand here lecturing on this issue.

Well, I have to stay, Madam Speaker, that it's very, very convoluted, I believe, to say that we criticized the spending that took place under President Bush. And I will acknowledge we could have done better, even though, with the exception of Defense and Homeland Security, we were able to bring about real dollar spending cuts in

every appropriation bill for the last few years.

But I will say that it's convoluted to conclude that if we want to criticize what took place then, we quadruple the size of the deficit and the national debt, which is exactly what this budget does.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reclaim my time, Madam Speaker.

I appreciate the gentleman's commentary. The fact of the matter is that we are in such trouble right now that in order to get out of this ditch, in order to get out of this terrible debt that we are in, we are going to have to grow our economy, which means in the short term we are going to have to invest in our people and invest in our country.

That is the rationale behind the Democratic budget, behind the budget that President Obama has put forward. But, look, one thing is clear, Madam Speaker, the same old, same old is not what the people want. And for the last 8 years, the Republicans and President Bush have driven this economy into a direction that people have rejected soundly during this last election.

□ 1515

At this time, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts mentioned the fact that, over the last few years, we'd gotten ourselves into the ditch. This shows the ditch that we're actually in.

In 1993, we passed a budget that dug ourselves out of a ditch and created surpluses, as far as I could see. In fact, in 2001, when we came into session, we had a surplus sufficient to put us on track to paying off the entire national debt held by the public by last year. Instead, we had a complete collapse of the budget beginning in 2001, and there is no telling where this line is going to end up. It took 8 years to get into this ditch.

During the good years when we had fiscal responsibility, not only were we on the way to paying off the national debt, but we created record numbers of jobs. We had a median income increase of about \$7,000 per family, and the Dow Jones Industrial Average more than tripled. Now we have a situation where we have had the worst job performance since the Great Depression, where the median income is actually down when adjusted for inflation and where the Dow Jones Industrial Average is worse than it was when it started. It took us 8 years to get into this ditch.

We have an urgent situation. This budget will cut the deficit in half in 4 years. Now, that is not the end of it. That's not enough. Cutting the deficit in half is not enough, but for one year's work, that is certainly a good step toward getting us out of a ditch that took 8 years to get us into.

Now we have a situation where the new budget will restore PAYGO, that

is, that any new program will have to be paid for. The reason we could get it in this kind of ditch was we passed tax cuts that we hadn't paid for, and we had spending that wasn't paid for. But under this budget, any new initiative will have to be paid for, and that's going to be hard. We're talking about energy initiatives. We're talking about health care initiatives and education initiatives that will be very expensive, but none of them can go into effect unless they're paid for with other spending cuts or with tax increases. Everything will be paid for. This is in stark contrast to what happened in 2001 when we didn't pay for anything. We went right into a ditch, and we didn't create any jobs.

It is urgent that we pass this budget to get back on the track that we were on in 1993 when the budget created jobs, when the median income was up, when the economy was good, and when we were on the way to paying off the national debt, instead of the ditch we're in today where we have had, in the last 8 years, the worst job performance since the Great Depression and huge deficits as far as the eye can see. We're taking a major step in the right direction.

So, Madam Speaker, I would hope that we would adopt the budget so we could get on to the job of restoring the economy and of balancing this budget.

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

I would like to congratulate my good friend from Virginia, Mr. SCOTT, for in the chart that he had before us it illustrated the fact that the economic downturn actually began in the last quarter of the Clinton administration, and that chart correctly points to that. So I congratulate my friend for recognizing that. It was the policies put into place in 2001 and in 2003 that brought about 55 months of uninterrupted job creation and economic growth and a dramatic increase in the flow of revenues because of the growth-oriented tax policies that we did, in fact, implement.

I also would point to the fact, and while my friend proceeds to malign the Bush administration, that it's obviously very clear, too, that we as Republicans had the majority when we saw the economic growth that took place in the late 1990s.

I'd be happy to yield to my friend Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Thank you. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is it not a fact that the job performance during the 8 years of the Bush administration was the worst since the Great Depression?

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, the answer to that is "no." The answer to that is "no." To say that job creation during President Bush's administration was the worst since the Great Depression, I have no idea where that number comes from. I do know this: We saw 55 months of continued job creation and economic growth be-

cause of the policies that were implemented in 2001 and in 2003, which were growth-oriented tax cuts.

With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to my very good friend from Lafayette, Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I stand in opposition to the rule that led to this budget proposal.

Let me just say that, first of all, this Congress is facing some very grave challenges, along with the President, and I think the President has rightfully singled out health care, energy and education as areas that have to be addressed with substantive reform, but I have to say that I vehemently disagree with the prescribed approach. Let's look at a couple of points here.

First of all, let's take energy. This energy proposal lays out a prescription for singling out a number of serious oil and gas tax increases, at the very minimum, totaling \$31.5 billion. Now, this is going to devastate an industry, a domestic oil and gas industry— independent companies, not the big companies like ExxonMobil and Shell and others that do work overseas but, rather, those independent companies that work in the Gulf of Mexico and that supply a major source of oil and gas energy for the United States and for every single American family.

What does this mean for the average family? They're going to pay higher gas prices at the pump. They're going to pay higher costs in electricity. Also, we're going to see massive job loss.

Now, we did have hearings, yes. Oh, we had hearings. I sit on the Ways and Means Committee. I remember Secretary Geithner coming in front of us. I asked him: How many jobs will this budget kill? He could not answer the question. I asked: Do you realize that the oil and gas industry employs about 1.8 million people in the United States with about 6 million additional jobs associated with this industry? A lot of these jobs are going to be killed; we're going to lose them, and they don't come back right away. This is at a time when our energy dependence on foreign oil is serious.

What is our transition strategy as we try to get to a green economy? Well, it's natural gas. Well, guess what? Thirty-five percent of the natural gas used in this country comes from wells that were drilled within the last 2 years. The rig count is now down over 50 percent since September. Do the math. We're going to see higher gas prices.

So I have to say, if the Secretary comes before the committee and offers this budget proposal but cannot answer simple questions such as "What is going to be the impact on unemployment across multiple sectors?" that's a serious concern.

The CBO. I asked the same questions of the Director of the CBO and got the same answer. They have not done the analysis. Well, I think that's incomplete work.

Don't you think we need more information as to what the impact of this budget is going to be on unemployment and on jobs if it's implemented in its entirety? We're talking about good, high-paying jobs. I'm not talking about white-collar executive jobs. I'm talking about pipe fitters, electricians, painters, people who work on boats, across-the-board manufacturing jobs, small manufacturing companies that do fabrication and so forth. These are serious jobs.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield my friend 1 additional minute.

Mr. BOUSTANY. This is a serious issue. It needs to be well-thought-out. Throw on top of those specific tax increases that are proposed on the oil and gas industry this massive cap-and-trade proposal which is still not well-thought-out, and of course, we have more work to do on it, obviously.

I have to say the American people deserve to know what this is going to do in terms of job loss. They really deserve to know, and they deserve to know what this is going to do to the cost of electricity in their hometowns and what it's going to do to the cost of gasoline at the pump and what it's going to cost in heating oil and so forth. That is information we ought to have.

So, before we start proposing these types of expansions of taxes that are going to kill jobs, that are going to create higher unemployment and that are going to run up the costs, we're talking about a recipe for more borrowing, for more spending and higher taxes.

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

Just so that the record is clear—and this is according to *The Wall Street Journal*—as for jobs created per year in Office, George W. Bush was the worst since the Great Depression. Let me read them.

Jobs Created Per Year in Office: Truman, 1.1 million; Eisenhower, 438,000; Kennedy, 1.2 million; Lyndon Johnson, 2.3 million; Nixon, 1.7 million; Ford, 745,000; Carter, 2.6 million; Reagan, 2 million; Bush I, 625,000; Clinton, 2.9 million; George W. Bush, 375,000.

This is the very conservative *Wall Street Journal*, hardly a paper of liberal ideas and thoughts.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I suspect that that was a news story and not necessarily an editorial. I seriously question those numbers, but I would ask my friend the following:

As we look at this issue of accountability and responsibility, I would remind him that this economic downturn, the slowing economy that we've

witnessed, began after my friend's party won the majority. I would ask my friend, if I might, Madam Speaker, if he feels that accountability and responsibility should lie not solely with the President of the United States but also with the party in power here in this institution.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I reclaim my time.

I would say to the gentleman that I not only hold President Bush accountable for the last 8 years and for the disastrous economy that we now have, but I also hold accountable the Republican leadership in Congress, which voted for some of the worst economic policies that have literally driven this country into debt and into a ditch.

At this time, Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), a member of the Budget Committee.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding.

First, Madam Speaker, the consistent reference to the so-called "cap-and-trade policy" from the other side is not in the budget. That will be debated another day. It is not here.

My friend from California talks about the number of months that there was job growth in the prior administration. Madam Speaker, I think most Americans are worried about the number of months they've been out of work and about the number of months until their unemployment benefits expire, and this budget is a part of addressing that concern.

Shortly after taking office, this President signed an economic stimulus law, the benefits of which are now being seen in communities around the United States as construction workers go to work, as first-time home buyers get help with their down payments, hopefully as more cars and trucks are sold, as people can deduct their sales tax, as schools are given more opportunities not to lay off teachers, lunch aides and other personnel.

The President also put forth a long-term economic proposal that we're addressing today in this budget. It's not the number of months that President Bush did this or that. It's other questions about how many months people have been without health insurance. This budget puts us on a track to finally deal with that problem and to get health care costs under control for all Americans and to get coverage for the 47 million who do not have it. This budget, in a very robust way, talks about helping to pay for college education. It will make the largest investment in college and technical training in the Nation's history as a result of what is in this budget.

The gentleman is concerned about the process by which this is being done. We're concerned about the process by

which it wasn't done in the previous 8 years.

Now, having said that, if anyone wants to read the budget, it's on the Internet. Read it. If someone is concerned about the lack of alternatives from the minority, there were dozens of amendments when the committee worked on this budget. Mr. McGOVERN and I were part of that. There were two full alternatives from the minority that were debated on the floor a couple of weeks ago when the minority had a chance to set forth its views, and those views were considered.

So we think there is a problem with the timing of these plans. We think the American public shouldn't have to wait 8 years for someone to finally address health care and education and the budget deficit, which is cut by two-thirds under this budget. The process is right. The plan is right. The right thing to do is to vote "yes."

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

I would say to my very good friend from New Jersey that it's interesting to listen to his argument. I've heard the President of the United States. I've heard the Democratic leadership—Speaker PELOSI and Leader REID—and Democrats all the way across the board say that the Republican Party is simply the party of "no," that they have no ideas, that they have no proposals that they come forward with. I do appreciate the fact that my friend has acknowledged that, in the markup in the Budget Committee and here on the House floor, there were both amendments and alternatives brought forward.

Now, it is true that those ideas were rejected by a vote here in this House, but what we're debating right now is whether or not we should have a same-day rule which proceeds with the consideration of a measure that does not, in fact, give the appropriate amount of time. This package, this conference report, was filed at 11:37 p.m.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Of course I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the vote on this is tomorrow?

Mr. DREIER. I do understand that the vote on this is scheduled for tomorrow, but right now, we are debating a same-day rule that allows for the consideration of this.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, the fact is that this measure was filed at 11:37 p.m., and we were told, up until just a short time ago, that we had to do this same-day rule because we were going to be voting on this measure today. So it was not until just the last moment that we found that the debate will take place throughout today and this evening but that the actual vote will take place tomorrow.

So I don't know exactly what has led to this, if it's an awakening about the

notion of some kind of fairness and about the idea of allowing for greater deliberation; but I've got to say, Madam Speaker, that this budget, which dramatically increases, as we all know, the size of the deficit is a budget which, I don't believe, the majority of the American people supported or wanted when they came forward.

□ 1530

The American people are hurting.

I will say, Madam Speaker, that I represent the Los Angeles area part of San Bernardino County. We have an unemployment rate that is well into double digits now both in the Los Angeles area, the Inland Empire. People are hurting. They very much want us to take action to get the economy back on track.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I will yield in just a moment if I can complete my thought.

There are many Democrats who I know in southern California who have indicated to me that when they voted for President Obama, for Barack Obama to become President of the United States, they had no idea that we would see this kind of dramatic transformation—which is something that he talked about—of government that is tripling, quadrupling the size of the government and the national debt.

And it is not just my constituents. There are a number of very thoughtful people who have come forward in the past 4 weeks. They include the likes of Stuart Taylor who writes regularly for the National Journal. He describes himself as an Obama-friendly centrist, and what he has said is that this dramatic surge to the left—which is exactly what this Obama budget does which is being supported by Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leadership—is really beyond the pale. And there are a number of other people who have been very supportive of the President up to this point who have demonstrated clear disappointment in this kind of direction.

With that, I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend.

So my friend is acknowledging, is he not, that Members who wish to read the budget will have over tonight to do that before there is a vote tomorrow, correct?

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Madam Speaker, the answer to that is no. When is it that the debate will take place on this issue?

I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. ANDREWS. The debate is starting today and concluding tomorrow. The conclusion of debate will be tomorrow.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, this bill was filed at 11:37 p.m. last night, just about midnight, and we are standing here at this moment debating something that I guess really isn't necessary.

The fact is what we have done is we've thrown out standard procedure

for one reason and one reason only: not because the government is about to run out of money, not because we've got an important recess upon us, not because it's the end of the week, but simply because we want a photo opportunity for the completion of the first 100 days of this Presidency.

I understand that optics are important. I recognize that. But I do believe that since we have begun already at this moment the debate on this budget conference report, merely hours—12, 13, 14 hours—after it was filed last night, you can say that the vote is going to take place tomorrow but Members who might want to have the chance to debate, deliberate and think about this issue are not going to have the allocated time to read this.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Of course I am happy to yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many of the gentleman's Members from his side are here to deliberate and debate this right now, out of curiosity?

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Madam Speaker, we are at this moment debating this convoluted, unnecessary same-day rule. We are here to debate whether or not we should proceed with consideration of the budget conference report under a totally unnecessary same-day rule.

We have had some very thoughtful remarks by my friend from Lafayette, and I know if my friend would like me to send someone to the cloakroom to call the lode of Republicans to come over and engage in this debate, I know that there would be many more who would join us.

The fact is we have begun this process prematurely. We are not being provided what was promised by the Speaker of the House on her opening day and promised by Barack Obama when he was a candidate to be President of the United States, and that is an adequate amount of time to deliberate over this process.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me apologize to the gentleman, again, for him getting what he wants. The Democratic leadership promised 24 hours for Members to be able to review this bill before there was a vote. They are going to get more than 24 hours. Let me also point out to the gentleman when he talks about this kind of unpopularity of President Barack Obama's ideas and his budget, maybe he hasn't seen the recent polls. By a 56 percent to 32 percent margin, Americans believe that the Obama budget sets the right priorities.

I think what is difficult for the gentleman to accept and members of his party is that the people have spoken. The people have had it with Bush economics. They've had it with the Republican priorities of the last 8 years. They want a change. This budget rep-

resents a change, and they are going to get it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes at this time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report for the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010. The previous administration left us with a tremendous challenge to overcome the largest budget deficit ever, the highest unemployment rate in 25 years, housing values in freefall, consumer confidence at record lows. This budget encapsulates a bold vision for making crucial investments in righting our economy and helping our working families.

I am pleased that, at my request, the budget reflects an investment in our Federal workforce, including parity between civilian and military Federal employees. Pay parity ensures equitable treatment for all Federal employees.

I applaud the conference report's increase in the level of funding for international affairs, Madam Speaker. Defense Secretary Robert Gates said in July, under the Bush administration, "It has become clear that America's civilian institutions of diplomacy and development have been chronically undermanned and underfunded for far too long." Secretary Gates understands, and understood then, the value of diplomacy as a national security tool and we would be well served to support that critical investment. I am delighted the conference report has added back funds for the 150 Function.

This budget is transformative and provides for the critical investments in America that have been neglected for too long. Deficit reduction, middle-income tax relief, health care reform, education and energy independence are the linchpins of this budget.

With this budget, we will cut in half the current deficit of more than \$1 trillion, most of it inherited from President Bush. It would further reduce that deficit by 2014 by two-thirds. This budget reduces non-defense discretionary spending over the next 10 years to its lowest level as a percentage of the gross domestic product in almost a half a century.

This budget supports the middle class by expanding the child tax credit, maintaining the elimination of the marriage tax penalty, carrying forward the Making Work Pay tax credit, maintaining the estate tax and capital gains tax reductions and ensuring that the alternative minimum tax does not hit the millions of working Americans in danger otherwise of being affected.

This budget supports meaningful health care reform. During the last 8 years, the number of Americans without health insurance increased from 13.7 percent to 15.3 percent of the population at the same time health care costs were skyrocketing. Under this

budget, Madam Speaker, we will be able to offer health care to the 46 million Americans currently without insurance.

This budget invests in energy independence and promotes a clean energy economy creating jobs. Increasing our investment in energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies will promote America's energy independence and safeguard our environment.

In recognition of the critical role that education plays in our economic productivity, this budget also builds upon the classroom support provided in the Recovery Act. From enhancing Head Start and other early childhood learning opportunities to making college more affordable through Pell Grants, this budget will prepare our children to become productive, contributing members of the global economy.

This budget is the product of the hard work of Chairman SPRATT, Chairman CONRAD in the other body, and the budget conferees; and it carries forward the bold investments in America that President Obama has promised this country.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

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

I am glad my friend from New Jersey has remained here on the floor.

First of all, I have just got to say that on this notion that we somehow are doing this in a very fair way, my time travel skills have become a little rusty of late, and I will say that the bill was filed at 11:37 last night, and a number of us are just starting to read it, the conference report, that is. I don't know whether we're going to have the vote today or tomorrow, but the fact is we are debating it today. So Members should have an opportunity to do that.

Now my friend began his remarks in the well by saying that this conference report has no mention whatsoever of the issue of cap-and-trade.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Of course I am happy to yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is not what I said. I said that the conference report does not enact cap-and-trade.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, Madam Speaker, I will say that during the debate that we had on the budget process, we regularly had Members say that there was no mention of this whatsoever. I know. I managed the rule when we had the first budget. I am just saying that a number of Members did, in fact, on the other side of the aisle make that very clear during debate.

What I would like to do is commend to my colleagues sections 302 and 323 of this conference report, both of which make mention of that.

I would like to yield 30 seconds to the hardworking member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Lafayette, Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I think it's important to recognize that this budget proposes to enact cap-and-trade legislation. It's one of the assumptions in the budget.

The gentleman from Massachusetts mentioned that the American people have spoken about this, but I want to remind him that, again, there are a lot of unanswered questions about the inherent proposals in the budget, such as the impact on unemployment based on some of the assumptions in this budget.

I've got data from the oil and gas industry that shows pretty devastating results across the board on the gulf coast and in manufacturing in other States around the country as a result of the assumptions in this budget.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend.

Madam Chair, let me just say that as interesting as we regularly have the finger of blame pointed at Bush, what President Obama has inherited came from President George W. Bush and, Madam Speaker, as you know very well, a Democratic majority here in the House of Representatives.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

I would say to my friend from California that the Democratic majority with a Democratic President will demonstrate to the gentleman what we believe in and will enact it.

With respect to the issue of cap-and-trade, the two sections that are referenced in the budget conference report say this: If the Congress enacts cap-and-trade legislation, then the budget numbers will be adjusted to reflect that being enacted. If this conference report passes, there will be no limit on carbon enacted. There will be no revenues raised to enforce that limit. It simply says that if the Congress in subsequent consideration does that, then, in fact, the budget would be adjusted.

The minority has consistently frankly used a number of tax increase per household that the authors of the study on which they rely have said was a misrepresentation.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Speaker, for too many years, administrations of Congress honored our veterans with speeches on Veterans Day, yet dishonored them with inadequate

budgets every other day. Then 2 years ago, when the gentlewoman from California, Ms. PELOSI, became Speaker of the House, she promised it would be a new day for America's veterans. Speaker PELOSI has kept her promise to those who have kept their promise to serve our Nation in uniform.

The results are historic and unprecedented. In just 2 years, the Democratic Congress has increased veterans' health care and benefits funding by over \$17 billion. That is a larger increase than the Republican-controlled House passed cumulatively over 12 years. This Democratic funding increase for veterans means better quality health care for 5.8 million veterans and shorter waiting times for doctor appointments and earned benefits for combat wounded veterans. It means more extensive mental health care services for veterans suffering from PTSD.

□ 1545

Then, candidate Obama last year said he would, if elected President, keep our Nation's sacred trust with our veterans. President Obama fulfilled that promise when earlier this year he asked for a larger increase in the VA budget than any President in American history.

This budget resolution on the floor of the House right now reflects the President's priority for honoring our veterans. It increases VA discretionary spending for veterans' health care and benefits by \$5.6 billion in fiscal year 2010, and by \$27 billion over the next 5 years. And at the President's request, it allows forward funding for the VA health care system, the highest of priorities for our veteran service organizations.

Listen to what respected veterans' organizations have said about this budget resolution. The American Legion said—

Mr. BOUSTANY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. No. I would rather quote the American Legion.

The American Legion said "it applauds the Conference Committee." It goes on to say, "This funding will help cover the ongoing cost of war to care for the men and women of the United States Armed Forces and their families."

The Veterans of Foreign Wars said this, in a letter to Chairmen SPRATT and CONRAD, "The VFW salutes your strong leadership in quickly coming to an agreement, especially one that makes so many meaningful and valuable improvements to the Department of Veterans Affairs. We strongly encourage all in Congress to follow your lead and adopt this conference report." Those are the words of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

They went on to say, "An advanced appropriation for veterans' medical care is among the VFW's highest priorities, and we sincerely appreciate that you brought this excellent proposal

forward." That is the proposal that we will vote yes or no on in this House.

The Disabled American Veterans said this spending blueprint "is good news for our Nation's veterans. Not only does it provide a record increase for the Department of Veterans Affairs, this resolution clears the way for much-needed legislation to ensure sufficient, timely, and predictable funding for veterans' health care." Those are the words of the DAV.

By significantly increasing funding for the VA and by allowing for the first time advanced appropriations for VA medical care, this resolution meets the highest priorities of America's heroes, our veterans.

A vote for this budget resolution is a vote to honor and respect America's veterans. They deserve that vote. They have earned that vote with their service and their sacrifice.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, my friend refused to yield to the gentleman from Lafayette, who wanted to engage in debate, which is what this is all about, so I am happy to yield 1 minute to my friend from Lafayette.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the gentleman.

I think it is a mischaracterization to say that we cut veteran spending. We actually raised veteran spending each year we were in the majority. But I want to point out something else, and that is—

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOUSTANY. No, I am not going to yield to the gentleman. I want to complete a thought.

The gentleman was standing here at the podium saying that we are going to spend this and we are going to spend that on veterans; but at the same time, my friend from New Jersey was earlier saying that this is a budget proposal that doesn't enact anything. So I think we are seeing a double standard being discussed over here.

We all recognize this is a proposal, it is a political document, but I have to say that we oppose it because it proposes to borrow too much, it proposes to spend too much, and it proposes to tax too much.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Madam Speaker, first let me say to the gentleman, if he had listened to my words, he would have heard I didn't accuse the Republicans of cutting the VA budget. I did accuse them—rightfully so, and the veterans organizations would agree with me—of underfunding VA health care and benefit needs during the 12 years. You had the ability to increase the VA budget to adequate levels, and you never did it. And the fact is that this budget resolution authorizes an historic increase in VA health care and benefit spending. If the gentleman disagrees with that increase, then he certainly has a right to vote "no." For

me, I am going to stand on the side of the DAV, the American Legion, and the VFW, who strongly support this budget resolution and its support of America's veterans.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time. We are standing here today doing something that is absolutely unnecessary. As I said in my opening remarks, why would we throw the rules out the window and have consideration of what is on occasion needed to rush through legislation, a same-day rule?

The notion of a same-day rule undermines what was promised by candidate Obama, by Speaker PELOSI, and others in the Democratic leadership, and that is, that we would have a higher degree of deliberation. This conference report was, as I said, filed at 11:37 p.m. last night, some 15, 16 hours ago.

We are in the midst of beginning the debate, and we are going to proceed to debate this. And now we have heard, in the last hour or so, that a decision was made that we will vote tomorrow, and that somehow will allow this to look as if it's fair. Well, again, Madam Speaker, we are in the midst of debating a document which Members have not had an adequate enough time to see.

Now, that aside, it is clear that the American people are hurting. I mentioned the fact that I just got back last night from Los Angeles. We have serious problems in our city, in our county, and in the State of California. We have serious problems all across this country. People are losing their homes, people are losing their jobs.

And what we hear from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle is the finger of blame is pointed at George W. Bush, in large part because of deficit spending. And now, what was, as I said, inherited by President Obama from President Bush, yes—and a Congress that has been controlled by Democrats for the last 2 years—they have inherited an economy which is facing serious problems, an economy that is clearly in recession. Madam Speaker, the solution is to do what economists across the board, Democrats and Republicans, not Republican political operatives, but many Democratic economists have said is not the right solution.

My friend from St. Louis, Mr. AKIN, has come to quote the Treasury Secretary under Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Henry Morgenthau, who, in testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee, said, "We've tried spending money. We've spent more money than we've ever spent before. Now, after 8 years of this Roosevelt administration, we have an unemployment rate that is just as high as when we started and an enormous debt to boot."

We know what the economic answer is to the challenges that we have. And I have regularly talked about it here, Madam Speaker, and that is, we need to take what has been promised by our friends on the other side of the aisle, but is totally ignored on a regular basis, and that is a bipartisan approach. And when I say a bipartisan approach, I believe we should take the ideas that were put forth by President John F. Kennedy in the early 1960s and Ronald Reagan in the early 1980s, and what we need to do, Madam Speaker, is we need to have a growth-oriented tax rate reduction that will stimulate the economy and generate the kind of revenue flow that is needed.

We need to pursue market opening opportunities for us around the world rather than sticking our head in the sand and ignoring things like the Colombia Free Trade Agreement and the South Korea Free Trade Agreement. That would go a long way towards creating jobs, good jobs right here in the United States of America if we can again pry open those markets. Those are the kinds of things we should be doing. And all we are getting, Madam Speaker, is a package that dramatically increases the size of the annual deficit and the national debt.

Madam Speaker, in this budget, the deficit alone for the next year is larger than the entire budget was a mere 10 years ago.

So Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to work hard to get the economy back on track. The best way that we can do that is to reject this same-day rule and reject this conference report and get back to the table with something that will get our economy back on track.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me first begin by saying something about the process. The Democratic leadership promised that Members would have 24 hours to review the budget before it was voted on. There will be more than 24 hours to view this budget.

This budget has gone through a long process. We had more than 14 hours of markup in the Budget Committee. I've lost count of how many amendments were offered. Again, there were four substitutes that were made in order and debated and voted on this floor. We had an open conference committee meeting that produced this final product. We are going to have over 24 hours to review it.

So I guess if people want to complain for the sake of complaining, there is not much we can do on this side to deal with that. But the fact of the matter is this has been a fair process and this has been a good process. I want to commend Chairman SPRATT and Ranking Member RYAN and the staffs, both Democratic and Republican staffs, for their incredible work, their tireless work on this budget.

I am proud of the budget we are going to vote on. This is a budget with

a conscience for a change. This is something that our constituents from the east coast to the west coast, I think, are going to find things in here that they can cheer about.

This is a budget that creates jobs with targeted investments in affordable health care, clean energy, and education. It cuts taxes for middle-income families by more than \$1.7 trillion over 10 years. It cuts the deficit by nearly two-thirds in 4 years. And it cuts non-defense discretionary spending as a percent of the economy.

We are going to deal with health care. For years, ever since I came to Congress—I got elected in 1996—the number one issue that every poll shows that Americans want us to deal with is health care. We are going to be able to deal with it, I believe, this year. We are going to deal with college affordability so that everybody who wants to get a college education can get one, and nobody is denied a college education because they can't afford to get one.

We are going to deal with the issue of clean energy. We are going to actually begin to invest in renewable, clean, alternative sources of energy so we are not reliant solely on the oil industry or on foreign imports for our energy. So there is a lot in this budget I think that we all can be very proud of.

You are going to have 24 hours to review the budget. Even if you had 124 hours, my guess is that my friends on the other side of the aisle would be against this budget. They have been against virtually everything this new President has proposed. I think their kind of rationale there, their philosophy for regaining political power is to deny this new President any victory, any accomplishment.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am not going to yield at this time. I didn't interrupt you during your closing statement.

The fact of the matter is that people are tired of a party that says "no" to everything. That was demonstrated loud and clear in the last election. We need to move in a new direction.

I think what the American people are hearing, quite frankly, is they are hearing that help is on the way. That is why 56 percent of the Americans polled agree with the priorities in this budget. They are hearing that help is on the way for all Americans, not just the wealthy few, the wealthy few who have benefited greatly over the last 8 years.

Things are different. Change is happening here in Washington, and I am proud to be part of this process.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the previous question and on the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1913, LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT OF 2009

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-91) on the resolution (H. Res. 372) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1913) to provide Federal assistance to States, local jurisdictions, and Indian tribes to prosecute hate crimes, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1626. An act to make technical amendments to laws containing time periods affecting judicial proceedings.

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

S. 386. An act to improve enforcement of mortgage fraud, securities fraud, financial institution fraud, and other frauds related to federal assistance and relief programs, for the recovery of funds lost to these frauds, and for other purposes.

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:

Suspending the rules with respect to H.R. 1243 and House Resolution 344, and adopting House Resolution 365.

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

AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO ARNOLD PALMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1243, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1243.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 1, answered “present” 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

YEAS—422

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bocchieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
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
Clarke
Clever
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar

Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLaHunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter

Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovich
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latita
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
McMorris
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)

Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert

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
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder

Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
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
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Paul

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Slaughter

NOT VOTING—8

Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Clay

Jackson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Lofgren, Zoe

Stark
Wu

□ 1629

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Ms. SLAUGHTER changed her vote from “yea” to “present.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 344.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 344.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 425, nays 0, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]
YEAS—425

Abercrombie Conaway Hastings (FL)
Ackerman Connolly (VA) Hastings (WA)
Aderholt Conyers Heinrich
Adler (NJ) Cooper Heller
Akin Costa Hensarling
Alexander Costello Herger
Altmire Courtney Herseth Sandlin
Andrews Crenshaw Higgins
Arcuri Crowley Hill
Austria Cuellar Himes
Baca Culberson Hinchey
Bachmann Cummings Hinojosa
Bachus Dahlkemper Hirono
Baird Davis (AL) Hodes
Baldwin Davis (CA) Hoekstra
Barrett (SC) Davis (IL) Holden
Barrow Davis (KY) Holt
Bartlett Davis (TN) Honda
Barton (TX) Deal (GA) Hoyer
Bean DeFazio Hunter
Becerra DeGette Inglis
Berkley Delahunt Inslee
Berman DeLauro Israel
Berry Dent Issa
Biggert Diaz-Balart, L. Jackson-Lee
Bilbray Diaz-Balart, M. (TX)
Bilirakis Dicks Jenkins
Bishop (GA) Dingell Johnson (GA)
Bishop (NY) Doggett Johnson (IL)
Bishop (UT) Donnelly (IN) Johnson, E. B.
Blackburn Doyle Jones
Blumenauer Dreier Jordan (OH)
Blunt Driehaus Kagen
Bocchieri Duncan Kanjorski
Boehner Edwards (MD) Kaptur
Bonner Kennedy
Bono Mack Ehlers Kildee
Boozman Ellison Kilpatrick (MI)
Boren Ellsworth Kilroy
Boswell Emerson Kind
Boucher Engel King (IA)
Boustany Eshoo King (NY)
Boyd Etheridge Kingston
Brady (PA) Fallin Kirk
Brady (TX) Farr Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Braley (IA) Fattah Kissell
Bright Filner Klein (FL)
Broun (GA) Flake Kline (MN)
Brown (SC) Fleming Kosmas
Brown-Waite, Forbes Kratovil
Ginny Fortenberry Kucinich
Buchanan Foster Lamborn
Burton (IN) Foxx Lance
Butterfield Frank (MA) Langevin
Buyer Franks (AZ) Larsen (WA)
Calvert Frelinghuysen Larson (CT)
Camp Fudge Latham
Campbell Gallegly LaTourette
Cantor Garrett (NJ) Latta
Cao Gerlach Lee (CA)
Capito Giffords Lee (NY)
Capps Gingrey (GA) Levin
Capuano Gohmert Lewis (CA)
Cardoza Gonzalez Lewis (GA)
Carnahan Goodlatte Linder
Carney Gordon (TN) Lipinski
Carson (IN) Granger LoBiondo
Carter Graves Loeb sack
Cassidy Grayson Lofgren, Zoe
Castle Green, Al Lowey
Castor (FL) Green, Gene Lucas
Chaffetz Griffith Luetkemeyer
Chandler Grijalva Lujan
Childers Guthrie Lummis
Clarke Gutierrez Lungren, Daniel
Cleaver Hall (NY) E.
Clyburn Hall (TX) Lynch
Coble Halvorson Mack
Coffman (CO) Hare Maffei
Cohen Harman Maloney
Cole Harper Manzullo

Marchant Perlmutter Shuler
Markey (CO) Perriello Shuster
Markey (MA) Peters Simpson
Marshall Peterson Sires
Massa Petri Skelton
Matheson Pingree (ME) Slaughter
Matsui Pitts Smith (NE)
McCarthy (CA) Platts Smith (NJ)
McCarthy (NY) Poe (TX) Smith (TX)
McCaul Polis (CO) Smith (WA)
McClintock Pomeroy Snyder
McCollum Posey Souder
McCotter Price (GA) Space
McDermott Price (NC) Speier
McGovern Putnam Spratt
McHenry Quigley Stearns
McHugh Radanovich Stupak
McIntyre Rahall Sullivan
McKeon Rangel Sutton
McMahon Rehberg Tanner
McMorris Reichert Tauscher
Rodgers Reyes Taylor
McNerney Richardson Teague
Meek (FL) Rodriguez Terry
Meeks (NY) Roe (TN) Thompson (CA)
Melancon Rogers (AL) Thompson (MS)
Mica Rogers (KY) Thompson (PA)
Michaud Rogers (MI) Thornberry
Miller (FL) Rohrabacher Tiahrt
Miller (MI) Rooney Ros-Lehtinen
Miller (NC) Roskam Tiberi
Miller, Gary Roskam Tierney
Miller, George Ross Titus
Minnick Rothman (NJ) Tonko
Mitchell Roybal-Allard Towns
Mollohan Royce Tsongas
Moore (KS) Ruppertsberger Turner
Moore (WI) Rush Upton
Moran (KS) Ryan (OH) Van Hollen
Moran (VA) Ryan (WI) Velázquez
Murphy (CT) Salazar Visclosky
Murphy, Patrick Sánchez, Linda Walden
Murphy, Tim T. Walz
Murtha Sanchez, Loretta Wamp
Myrick Sarbanes Wasserman
Nadler (NY) Scalise Schultz
Napolitano Schakowsky Waters
Neal (MA) Schauer Watson
Neugebauer Schiff Watt
Nunes Schmidt Waxman
Nye Schock Weiner
Oberstar Schrader Welch
Obey Schwartz Westmoreland
Olson Scott (GA) Wexler
Olver Scott (VA) Whitfield
Ortiz Sensenbrenner Wilson (OH)
Pallone Serrano Wilson (SC)
Pascarell Sessions Wittman
Pastor (AZ) Sestak Wolf
Paul Shadegg Woolsey
Paulsen Shea-Porter Yarmuth
Payne Sherman Young (AK)
Pence Shimkus Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Brown, Corrine Jackson (IL) Wu
Burgess Johnson, Sam
Clay Stark

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1637

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.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution 365, 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 resolution.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 191, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]
YEAS—233

Abercrombie Grijalva Olver
Ackerman Gutierrez Ortiz
Adler (NJ) Hall (NY) Pallone
Altmire Halvorson Pascarell
Andrews Hare Pastor (AZ)
Arcuri Harman Payne
Baca Hastings (FL) Perlmutter
Baldwin Heinrich Perriello
Barrow Herseth Sandlin Peters
Bartlett Higgins Peterson
Bean Himes Pingree (ME)
Becerra Hinchey Polis (CO)
Berkley Hinojosa Pomeroy
Berman Hirono Price (NC)
Berry Hodes Quigley
Bishop (GA) Holden Rahall
Bishop (NY) Holt Rangel
Blumenauer Honda Reyes
Bocchieri Hoyer Richardson
Boren Inslee Rodriguez
Boswell Israel Ross
Boucher Jackson-Lee
Boyd (TX) Rothman (NJ)
Brady (PA) Johnson (GA) Roybal-Allard
Braley (IA) Johnson, E. B. Ruppertsberger
Butterfield Kagen Rush
Capps Kanjorski Ryan (OH)
Capuano Kaptur Salazar
Cardoza Kennedy Sánchez, Linda
Carnahan Kildee T.
Carson (IN) Kilpatrick (MI) Sanchez, Loretta
Castor (FL) Kind Sarbanes
Chandler Kissell Schakowsky
Clarke Klein (FL) Schauer
Cleaver Kosmas Schiff
Clyburn Kucinich Schrader
Cohen Langevin Schwartz
Connolly (VA) Larsen (WA) Scott (GA)
Conyers Larson (CT) Scott (VA)
Cooper Lee (CA) Serrano
Costa Levin Sestak
Costello Lewis (GA) Shea-Porter
Courtney Lipinski Sherman
Crowley Loeb sack Sires
Cuellar Lofgren, Zoe Skelton
Cummings Lowey Slaughter
Dahlkemper Lujan Smith (WA)
Davis (AL) Lynch Snyder
Davis (CA) Maffei Space
Davis (IL) Maloney Speier
Davis (TN) Markey (CO) Spratt
DeFazio Markey (MA) Stupak
DeGette Massa Sutton
Delahunt Matheson Tanner
DeLauro Matsui Tauscher
Dicks McCarthy (NY) Teague
Dingell McCollum Thompson (CA)
Doggett McDermott Thompson (MS)
Donnelly (IN) McGovern Tierney
Doyle McIntyre Titus
Edwards (MD) McMahon Tonko
Edwards (TX) McNerney Towns
Ellison Meek (FL) Tsongas
Ellsworth Meeks (NY) Van Hollen
Engel Melancon Velázquez
Eshoo Miller (NC) Velázquez
Etheridge Miller, George Visclosky
Farr Mollohan Walz
Fattah Moore (KS) Wasserman
Filner Moore (WI) Schultz
Foster Moran (VA) Waters
Frank (MA) Murphy (CT) Watson
Fudge Murphy, Patrick Watt
Giffords Murtha Waxman
Gonzalez Nadler (NY) Weiner
Gordon (TN) Napolitano Welch
Grayson Neal (MA) Wexler
Green, Al Oberstar Wilson (OH)
Green, Gene Obey Woolsey
Yarmuth

NAYS—191

Aderholt Barrett (SC) Blunt
Akin Barton (TX) Boehner
Biggert Bonner
Bilbray Bono Mack
Bachmann Bilirakis Boozman
Bachus Bishop (UT) Boustany
Baird Blackburn Brady (TX)

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------|
| Bright | Hensarling | Nye |
| Broun (GA) | Herger | Olson |
| Brown (SC) | Hill | Paul |
| Brown-Waite, | Hoekstra | Paulsen |
| Ginny | Hunter | Pence |
| Buchanan | Inglis | Petri |
| Burton (IN) | Issa | Pitts |
| Buyer | Jenkins | Platts |
| Calvert | Johnson (IL) | Poe (TX) |
| Camp | Jones | Posey |
| Campbell | Jordan (OH) | Price (GA) |
| Cantor | Kilroy | Putnam |
| Cao | King (IA) | Radanovich |
| Capito | King (NY) | Rehberg |
| Carney | Kingston | Reichert |
| Carter | Kirk | Roe (TN) |
| Cassidy | Kirkpatrick (AZ) | Rogers (AL) |
| Castle | Kline (MN) | Rogers (KY) |
| Chaffetz | Kratovil | Rohrabacher |
| Childers | Lamborn | Rooney |
| Coble | Lance | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Coffman (CO) | Latham | Roskam |
| Cole | LaTourette | Royce |
| Conaway | Latta | Ryan (WI) |
| Crenshaw | Lee (NY) | Scalise |
| Culberson | Lewis (CA) | Schmidt |
| Davis (KY) | Linder | Schock |
| Deal (GA) | LoBiondo | Sensenbrenner |
| Dent | Lucas | Sessions |
| Diaz-Balart, L. | Luetkemeyer | Shadegg |
| Diaz-Balart, M. | Lummis | Shimkus |
| Dreier | Lungren, Daniel | Shuler |
| Driehaus | E. | Shuster |
| Duncan | Mack | Simpson |
| Ehlers | Manzullo | Smith (NE) |
| Emerson | Marchant | Smith (NJ) |
| Fallin | Marshall | Smith (TX) |
| Flake | McCarthy (CA) | Souder |
| Fleming | McCaul | Stearns |
| Forbes | McClintock | Sullivan |
| Fortenberry | McCotter | Taylor |
| Foxo | McHenry | Terry |
| Franks (AZ) | McHugh | Thompson (PA) |
| Frelinghuysen | McKeon | Thornberry |
| Gallely | McMorris | Tiahrt |
| Garrett (NJ) | Rodgers | Tiberi |
| Gerlach | Mica | Turner |
| Gingrey (GA) | Michaud | Upton |
| Gohmert | Miller (FL) | Walden |
| Goodlatte | Miller (MI) | Wamp |
| Granger | Miller, Gary | Westmoreland |
| Graves | Minnick | Whitfield |
| Griffith | Mitchell | Wilson (SC) |
| Guthrie | Moran (KS) | Wittman |
| Hall (TX) | Murphy, Tim | Wolf |
| Harper | Myrick | Young (AK) |
| Hastings (WA) | Neugebauer | Young (FL) |
| Heller | Nunes | |

NOT VOTING—8

| | | |
|----------------|--------------|-------|
| Brown, Corrine | Jackson (IL) | Stark |
| Burgess | Johnson, Sam | Wu |
| Clay | Rogers (MI) | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1646

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam Speaker, on rollcall 212, I intended to vote "no."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 13, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 371 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 371

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2010, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2011 through 2014. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The conference report shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I am honored to stand here today in support of the fiscal year 2010 budget resolution conference report.

I want to thank my friend, the Budget Committee Chairman, JOHN SPRATT, for his incredible work on this budget. He is smart, he is fair, and no one cares more about these issues.

I also want to thank Ranking Member PAUL RYAN. I believe he is a thoughtful and bright Member of this House, even though we usually disagree on most of the issues of the Budget Committee.

I also want to thank the staff of the Budget Committee, Democratic and Republican, for their tireless effort and their commitment to public service.

Madam Speaker, the budget conference report that we are considering today represents so much more than a clean break from the past. It is a blueprint for the future. It is a roadmap for economic recovery and for investing in national priorities that will provide the American people with shared prosperity in the years and decades to come.

The conference report lays the groundwork for health care reform, clean energy and quality education. It will create jobs, support working families, strengthen our national defense and renew America's global leadership.

By cutting taxes for the middle class, \$1.5 trillion in tax cuts for over 95 percent of the American people, Madam Speaker, and investing in affordable

health care, education and clean energy in a fiscally responsible way, we are taking the first critical steps to lifting our economy out of recession and creating good jobs for America's workers. For the last 8 years, President Bush flat out mismanaged the Federal budget. How? By enacting huge tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans that led to skyrocketing deficits, by spending hundreds of billions of dollars on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan without paying for them, and by refusing to invest in the American people.

This budget cuts the deficit by more than half by 2013. And in order to get us back on a fiscally sustainable path, the budget provides a realistic assessment of our fiscal outlook. Unlike the Bush administration, we actually budget for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan instead of hiding them under the emergency spending categories. We budget for natural disasters that inevitably will occur.

This conference report cuts taxes for 95 percent of Americans. Let me repeat that, because we will hear a lot of rhetoric from the other side about taxes.

This budget cuts taxes for 95 percent of Americans. It provides immediate relief from the alternative minimum tax, it eliminates the estate tax on nearly all estates, and works to close corporate tax loopholes.

You see, all of us believe in altering the Tax Code. We believe that we should reduce the tax burden on the middle class and those trying to get into the middle. We believe that corporations shouldn't be allowed to shirk their responsibility by hiding their profits in offshore tax havens.

The other side believes we should reduce taxes for the very wealthiest. It's a simple difference in philosophy. Most importantly, this budget, the Democratic budget, actually invests in the American people. What a welcome change from the past 8 years.

We invest in health care reform, not just to improve health care quality and improve coverage, but to reduce the crushing burden of health care costs on American businesses. Everybody likes to talk about health care reform. This budget actually lays the groundwork to get it done.

We invest in clean energy in order to create jobs, improve the environment and reduce our dependence on foreign oil. We invest in renewable energy and energy efficiency. Everybody likes to talk about energy independence, but this budget actually lays the groundwork to get it done.

And we invest in education to reclaim our place as the best-educated workforce in the world. We work to expand early childhood education and to make college more affordable. Everybody likes to talk about improving education. This budget actually provides the basis to get it done.

And this is a budget that will allow Congress, if and when the time comes, to vote up or down on health care reform and education reform and avoid

the infamous obstructionism so characteristic of the other body and the other side of the aisle. It certainly doesn't guarantee passage of such reforms, but it will allow for and require a straight up-or-down vote in each Chamber.

Now I know that change is hard. I know some of my colleagues want to cling desperately to the failed policies of the past. But the good news is that despite all the nasty press releases and television ads and talk radio attacks on the President, the American people still support President Obama's vision for America.

That's why this budget is so very important. This is a budget with a conscience. It is a budget that believes in the American spirit, and it's a budget that fulfills the promises that the President made to the American people.

Madam Speaker, we are at a crucial moment. Our country can meet its potential, our children can have a better future, our economy can once again create good-paying jobs. But in order to make that happen, we need change. We need to move in a bold, innovative new direction. We need to pass this budget.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, while my colleagues didn't need to listen to the remarks of my distinguished colleague, I know that they will very much want to hear my remarks. And so I would like to make a point of order that the House is not in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman makes a point of order that the House is not in order.

The gentleman will suspend. The House will come to order. Members and staff standing and engaging in conversations will take their seats.

Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. DREIER. I just made it. I mean, you determine whether or not the House is in order, Madam Speaker. It didn't seem to me that it was.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will answer the question.

Do you withdraw your point of order?

Mr. DREIER. Sure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will proceed.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend from Worcester for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

It sort of feels like Groundhog Day. We just completed debate on this same-day rule and now here we are proceeding with the rule on the budget conference report itself.

When we ended the debate just a little while ago, my friend was saying

that those of us on this side of the aisle have no interest or desire to work with President Obama, that all we say is "no" time and time again. I have got to say that repeatedly we have come forward with alternatives, and we very much want to work in a bipartisan way. And so this notion of trying to claim that we as Republicans are saying "no" is preposterous. Everyone is aware of the fact in this House and in the executive branch that we have come forward with proposals, which is exactly what we did. We had two alternatives that were considered here on the House floor when we considered the budget, itself, and now we have this conference report.

I have got to say that the underlying budget conference report, itself, Madam Speaker, that is before us, to quote my friend from Worcester, is really the same old, same old, a term that he loves to use, as, really, it's the same package that we looked at just 4 weeks ago. Democratic leadership, I know, has tweaked a few things on the margins, but the exact same failed policies are still fully intact on this budget.

My friend correctly points to the fact that the American people are hurting. We know very well that we have a shared goal, but it's how we do it. Unfortunately, this budget recklessly spends money that we don't have, and it sets the stage for tax increases that we can't afford. It makes the fundamental mistake that led to our economic crisis in the first place—profligate, unaccountable and irresponsible behavior. And it allows the Democratic majority to ram through massive, complex legislation down the road without any pretense of consensus building.

My friend said again that we just say "no" to the President. We want to have what the President talked about in his campaign, what the Speaker has repeatedly talked about. We want to work to build a consensus here, but, unfortunately, the budget itself lays the groundwork to completely obliterate any notion of bipartisanship.

Apparently they are not content with merely shutting out Republicans from the legislative process. They are finding moderates within their own party, those who are interested in reaching across the aisle and finding common-sense solutions, and those people who want to do that apparently are being ignored in this process as well. They want to be able to steamroll any effort whatsoever to reach a responsible, bipartisan compromise on some of the most important challenges like health care and energy.

This conference report will let them do just that, to ignore the prospect of bipartisanship. The Federal budget may be a very complicated thing. We all know that. But the principles that should govern that budget are not. They are not complicated at all.

The budget should responsibly spend the taxpayers' money. Every program, Madam Speaker, should be held ac-

countable to cut out waste, fraud and abuse. The budget should assume responsibility for today's challenges rather than pushing the hard choices and mountains of debt off into the future to our children and grandchildren. The budget fails on all these counts.

The longer that the American public has time to examine the level of wasteful spending in this budget, the more deeply concerned they are. They wonder how we can afford this right now, how much debt will be left to our children and grandchildren, and will our taxes be raised to pay for this?

Just a few weeks ago The Hill, the newspaper here, ran a story on the emerging consensus among economists of all stripes that the numbers just don't add up and taxes are going to have to be raised dramatically to pay for all of this government spending. According to these independent analysts, as reported by The Hill, this will mean taxes on the middle class. On middle-income wage earners, these analysts are saying that taxes will be imposed.

Martin Sullivan, a contributing editor at Tax Analyst publications, is quoted as saying, "You just simply can't tax the rich enough to make this all up."

□ 1700

Another economist, Leonard Burman, director of the Tax Policy Center, said that, under the current tax structure, "there's no way we're going to be able to pay for government."

Now, Madam Speaker, these are not Republican operatives. These are independent economists, many of whom openly supported the President during the campaign, who were looking at the numbers and who are saying that this budget will make tax increases on middle-income working Americans, who are trying to make ends meet, inevitable.

This course of action is especially dangerous given our current economic crisis and its causes. Anyone with a little common sense can understand that reckless borrowing and lending led to our economic downturn. A little common sense is also all it takes to understand that raising taxes, including on middle-income wage earners, would be a disaster during tough economic times. Even Keynesian economists and economists of all stripes recognize that, Madam Speaker. Yet this budget continues that very reckless behavior and puts us on the path toward those middle class tax increases.

The most dangerous impact of this budget will come further down the road. This bill employs an arcane legislative trick that will allow the Democratic leadership to cram through massive health care legislation with little scrutiny and, as I said earlier, with zero bipartisanship. This provision we all know called "reconciliation" may be a very technical Beltway issue, but we can all understand its implications by simply considering that iconic

American image, Jimmy Stewart, as he played the role of Jefferson Smith, defiant on the floor of the other body on the other side of the Capitol in that movie "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington."

For many Americans, this is the classic image of public service at its principled best. However, had the Democratic leadership's budgetary gimmicks been in place, Mr. Smith would never have been able to make the stand that he did in that famous movie.

Instead, this budget ensures, Madam Speaker, that critical legislation can be rushed through without the hassle of principled debate. We've already seen what happens when 1,000-page legislation on very complicated issues gets crammed through the Congress. Look no further than to the hundreds of billions of dollars of bailout money that this majority has doled out, to the billions wasted, to the billions unaccounted for and with nothing to show for it.

The Democratic leadership's hasty and partisan approach has a very poor track record. Now they want to ensure that they will be able to approach health care reform in the exact same way, health care accounts for nearly one-fifth of our entire economy, and is one of the single, most important factors in an individual's and in a family's quality of life.

Will Americans be able to continue to choose what doctors they go to? Will they be able to consult their doctors on which treatments are best for them? Can we make health care more accessible and affordable without compromising quality and personal choice? These, Madam Speaker, are the incredibly critical questions that should be addressed in the health care reform debate.

You know, if the Democratic leadership has its way, there won't even be a debate. They want to be able to handle it like they've handled nearly every other important bill: written behind closed doors and crammed through without an open debate. Madam Speaker, this budget puts the rules in place that will allow them to do that. It will also allow them to attach dramatic new energy taxes on every household in America in order to pay for their health care proposals.

The Democratic leadership, when confronted with a question of a new cap-and-tax program, insisted that it is not contained in this budget. What they are hoping the American people will not find out until it's too late is that this budget will allow new energy taxes to be attached to the Democrats' health care legislation. Their energy tax proposal would mean hundreds and even thousands of new taxes each year on each and every single household in this country, and it's all made possible by this budget conference report that we're going to be voting on tomorrow.

The Democratic leadership likes to defend their procedural tricks by saying that Republicans used the same

tactics to enact welfare reform and tax rate reduction. I'm very proud of the fact that we were able to reduce the size and scope and reach of government; that we were able to make welfare programs more accountable; that we were able to let the taxpayers keep more of their own, hard-earned money; and that we were able to implement growth policies that gave us 55 months of job creation and sustained economic expansion. That was the right thing to do. The Democrats, on the other hand, would like to use this procedure to dramatically expand government bureaucracy and tax the American people during an economic recession. This is an absolutely disastrous budget under any circumstances, but it is equally and especially dangerous during challenging economic times.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject reckless, wasteful spending; to reject tax increases for the middle class; to reject a hasty and partisan process for crafting health care and energy legislation. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying conference report.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I just want to point out, Madam Speaker, that, notwithstanding the constant attacks on President Obama that have come from the other side of the aisle on this floor since he was elected, since he was sworn in as President of the United States, notwithstanding the constant attacks by the patron saint of the Republican Party, Rush Limbaugh, and notwithstanding the attacks by former Speaker Gingrich on every TV show that will allow him on, a poll done by CBS recently showed that, by a 56-32 percent margin, the American people believe that President Obama's budget sets the right priorities.

I believe in the American people. I believe in their instincts. I think they know what they want better than my friends on the other side of the aisle.

I will also point out—and my friend admitted to this because, when it comes to reconciliation, they like to cherry-pick—that their budgets in 2001 and in 2003, which allowed for these massive Bush tax cuts and which nearly bankrupted us—the tax cuts that went to the wealthiest Americans—had reconciliation instructions. In 2005, with reconciliation instructions that allowed them to make deep cuts in Medicare, they increased the deficit by an aggregate of \$1.8 trillion. That's what they did to the economy. That's what they did to the American people. So we don't want the same old, same old.

Madam Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for

yielding. I want to start by thanking Chairman SPRATT and his colleagues on the Budget Committee and the conferees for so quickly coming to an agreement on the conference report.

I rise to support the rule and the underlying conference report.

This budget resolution begins the long and painful process of digging out of the very deep hole that we have inherited. It makes good on President Obama's promise to cut in half the deficits he inherited in 5 years. In fact, it cuts the deficits by two-thirds, and it does so even while we are cutting taxes for 95 percent of Americans to the tune of \$1.7 trillion worth of tax cuts. We also invest in priorities that are absolutely vital to our future.

I'd like to be specific about one of those priorities, and that is the investment made in higher education and in education in general that is accommodated by the conference report. There are significant investments in higher ed and an increase in the Pell Grant maximum, which will make it easier for hard-pressed students and their families to achieve their slice of the American dream. The moving from the Federal Family Education Loan program, the so-called "FFEL program," to direct lending will save \$97 billion over 10 years, and it will put money in the hands of needy students as opposed to having that money added to the bottom line of banks and of other loan providers. It will restructure the Perkins Loan Program to make it more readily available to students. It will create a college access and completion fund that will enable colleges to emulate best practices across the country so that students really do succeed, and it will make permanent the American Opportunity Tax Credit. All of these are the kinds of investments we need to make if we are going to have the prosperous future that we all want.

With specific reference to education, Mr. DREIER made reference to the various alternatives that Republicans have offered to our budget resolution. The alternative that the Republicans offered made absolutely no mention of education.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. There is no mention of education. There is no plan to invest in higher education. There is no plan to invest in job training. There is no plan to invest in any of the vital services that our children need to put them on a path to success.

Instead, that budget resolution made a series of very deep, unallocated cuts that could easily fall on education. We cannot have the bright future we need to have if we don't invest in our children's education. Our budget resolution does that.

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

I would like to simply say to my colleague who brought up this issue of

reconciliation that we were very proud of the fact that we were able to get people from welfare rolls to the working side of the economy in the mid-1990s, and we did use this procedure. I can time and time again remember instances of people who were saying they were so proud to be able to have a job. In the mid-1990s, the Republican Congress did bring about a bold reform of our welfare system, and it was a great, great accomplishment as it was in the early part of this decade when it was used to allow people to keep more of their own, hard-earned money in 2001 and in 2003.

At the same time, we were doing everything that we could to ensure that we had pro-growth economic policies because we were dealing with an economic recession then, of course with the aftermath of September 11 of 2001, with corporate scandals, and as I said, with an economic recession. We did put into place pro-growth policies, and yes, we used that procedure.

The really difficult thing for us to fathom is the fact that we're now seeing this process utilized to dramatically expand government to the point where this budget has, itself, got a deficit that is larger than what the entire Federal budget was just 10 years ago.

I would very much like to yield to my friend. I told the gentleman from Springfield I would.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Okay. I would be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I just want the gentleman to know there are 40 million Americans without health insurance, and if we can get a health care reform package that covers them, I would be proud to cast a vote for that.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, I totally agree on the issue of health care reform. That is a very high priority for us, and my friend knows that we have a solutions working group that is focusing on this issue, and it is a priority that does need to be addressed.

With that, I am happy to yield 4 minutes to my friend from Springfield, Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Here we are. We just had a same-day rule on a bill that was available 3 minutes till midnight last night. We're now on the rule on the budget, the supposed blueprint for the future, and we're going to hear in this debate and in the other debate that this is a budget that spends too much, that borrows too much and that taxes too much because it spends too much, it borrows too much, and it taxes too much.

I want to talk principally about health care for a few minutes. That has been a topic here of the discussion already. "Reconciliation," by definition, defines a partisan victory. I would just advance to my friends that health care is the worst possible place to achieve that victory if you can achieve something differently than that.

There is broad agreement on what we ought to do in health care. We're all working hard to make that agreement become a reality. We've talked about tax policy. We've talked about welfare policy. Frankly, we did use reconciliation, but it was always to restructure something that government was doing. I don't think there is an example of where we used reconciliation to restructure the overall private economy. Both health care and energy would restructure an economy that will never come back to where they were, and that is not something you should be doing without lots of thought and without lots of support in a bipartisan way.

I would advance to my friends that that is a huge mistake. Certainly, if you restructure energy for 5 or 10 years or you restructure health care for 5 or 10 years, we're never coming back to the competitive marketplace that needs to be improved but not tossed aside, and I'm fearful that that's what happened.

Here we are. We're at the end of April. If there is a Secretary of HHS, that's only because she will be confirmed this week. I don't think there is a Secretary there. Even if there is, the others in that Department who support the Secretary are not there. No Secretary. No bill. No plan to get this done within the calendar. The calendar makes it virtually impossible to get this done before that reconciliation instruction has to be used.

Frankly, for those who want to go to a single-payer, government-run system, having reconciliation out there is every reason in the world not to have a bipartisan compromise. This is an area where we need to have two-thirds of the Members of the House and two-thirds of the Members of the Senate going from that vote, saying we believe the country is headed in the right direction.

□ 1715

If we have a 51-49 sort of victory and we have a 5-year debate on whether we have health care rationing or government-run health care, that is a bad thing for America, Madam Speaker. We need a health care system that's affordable, that's accessible, that has better quality. I think we can all reach agreement on those issues. But not, I would advance, if we have this option out there of one party doing it one way.

This is a blueprint that doesn't work the way it should work. The budget doesn't. The taxes, the inflation, the interest rates that are absolutely in the country's future in the way of recovering the economy are part of the problem of the future. They will stand in the way of that recovery.

I urge that we vote against this rule and against this budget.

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

First of all, when people talk about partisanship, I recall my friends on the

other side of the aisle giving us the prescription drug bill, which was probably one of the most partisan health care votes I can recall ever having here. Our hope is not to have a partisan health care bill. President Obama has already had a summit at the White House where he invited not just Democratic leaders but Republican leaders to come and to provide their input to try to figure out how we can do this together.

But the deal is we are going to get health care reform this year. My friends on the other side of the aisle, they have had 8 years. If it's such a priority, why haven't they done it in 8 years? The number of people that have fallen into the ranks of the uninsured has increased dramatically while they were in control of the Congress and the White House. So no one's talking about trying to create a partisan vote.

What we're trying to do is get what the American people want accomplished. And, quite frankly, I think the onus is on the other side of the aisle to demonstrate that they are, in fact, sincere about working in a bipartisan way. I think this President has done everything humanly possible to reach out the hand of friendship and bipartisanship to try to work with the other side of the aisle.

I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I just wanted to follow up on the previous speaker.

It is absolutely clear, and hopefully we will pass this budget this week, but the budget sets out a process by which we can work and should work in a bipartisan way. It is simply not good enough for the other side of the aisle to say, "We would love to work with you on health care reform. We just can't guarantee that we can do it before October 15 and therefore we aren't sure we're going to do it at all." That is not what the American people are asking us to do. What they're asking us to do is get to work.

The fact is that we did more on health care in the first 8 weeks of this administration than we did for 8 years before. That's what the American people are asking us to do. That's what this budget does. It says we're going to get to work on health care. We're going to look to do it in a bipartisan way. It's going to be public-private partnership. That's what the President wants. That's what we're going to do. It is not going to be a wholly public system. They can keep saying so on the other side of the aisle, but that's not what's going to happen.

Let's get to work. This is a moment when the American people are saying one of the major challenges before us in this country is for economic competitive reasons and because every family is demanding it, is to do health care reform. Let's get it done. This budget puts us on a path to do it.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding to me.

I rise, Madam Speaker, today in support of this rule and fully support the fiscal year 2010 budget as well.

President Obama has laid out an extremely ambitious budget this year that will resonate for decades to come. From health care to climate change to education, this budget will improve our Nation in significant ways, and I am proud to support it.

For health, this lays the groundwork for health care reform. Forty-seven million people living without any health insurance is a national disgrace. For energy, this goes towards the way of reducing our dependence on foreign oil. This budget would increase funding for renewables by nearly 20 percent over the '09 budget. And for education, Mr. BISHOP spoke about all the things. I agree with him. It builds upon the funding we provided for education in the recent stimulus package.

Now, as any large bill, it's not perfect, and it can be improved. And I just want to highlight a few areas that I hope we can improve on in the future.

One is foreign aid. I am disappointed at the level of the funding for international relations and foreign aid. As the chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, I've seen firsthand the benefits of foreign aid. This budget is a lot better. The conference report is a lot better than the initial budget. The Senate budget included the entire \$53.4 billion of the President's request. This compromise is \$51 billion, better than the original House \$48.5 billion, but I hope we can up it in the future.

I want to talk about the \$250,000 income threshold. The budget resolution uses this \$250,000 threshold as a way to raise revenue. I think it's too low and needs to be raised. If you come from a high-cost-of-living State as I do, this \$250,000 threshold is inappropriate. Raising taxes on these people, I believe, is not good at this time. But I think overall the budget is good.

Finally, I want to talk about the AMT, because in New York, you cannot deduct anything if you're caught in the AMT. I am happy this budget includes a 1-year AMT patch. Without this patch, 2.8 million middle-class families in New York alone would be swept into it. But every year, we're going to run into difficulty. We need a permanent AMT fix, and I hope we can do that.

But I do support the budget. It's a good budget. It calls for the change that President Obama spoke about, and I hope we vote for it.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the un-

derlying budget conference report that we are considering today.

As a member of the Budget Committee and a budget conferee, I was proud to have worked with Chairman SPRATT and the other members of the committee on a 2010 budget resolution that reinvests in America and reinvests in hardworking middle-class families that make up the backbone of this country.

As we all know, the voters spoke this fall overwhelmingly, voting for change and a reorientation of our priorities so that, in fact, we are strengthening the middle class and making the critical investments needed to build a better tomorrow.

We began to bring that desired change with the economic recovery program, and we continue on that path by providing a blueprint in this budget that will bring tax relief to hardworking families across this Nation and make investments in health care, education, energy, and elsewhere that are needed to move this economy from recovery to long-term growth.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle will decry this budget claiming that it will burden future generations with crippling debt. But let's be clear. It was under their leadership that a \$5.6 trillion surplus turned into the historic budget deficit that President Obama and this Congress inherited, a deficit of well over \$1 trillion in 2009. If you listen to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they were missing in action over this last 8 years. It is hard to believe that they were in charge. It is a little bit like "see no evil, hear no evil, and speak no evil." They were gone from the playing field over these last 8 years.

We will also hear the other side rail against the instructions that are included in this resolution—to bring about what? Education and long-awaited health care reform, despite the fact that they used this same procedure to pass massive tax cuts for the wealthiest people in this Nation.

When it comes to health care reform, the American people have watched as Congress has failed since 1993 to make a serious attempt to fix our broken system. Health care reform, making health care coverage affordable, available to all, improving safety and quality, and providing Americans with a choice of health plans and physicians, including the choice of keeping their current health plan, is long, long overdue.

We will work to craft bipartisan legislation, but the American people are not interested in process. They are interested in results. We will not let a party of "no" stand in the way of a reformed health care system that the majority of Americans so desperately want.

Along with health care, this budget also invests in education by expanding access and increasing funds for early childhood education, creating a new tax credit to help cover college costs, and raising the Pell Grant award.

It invests in energy, builds a framework for developing and producing new energy and jobs, modernizing the electricity grid to make it more efficient, secure and reliable, increasing the efficiency of Federal buildings, and helping to make State and local governments more energy efficient.

This conference agreement invests in rebuilding America, including the establishment of a national infrastructure bank which would allow the government to objectively consider a wide range of infrastructure projects and leverage the private sector to fund those with the most significant economic, social and environmental benefits.

Finally, this budget plan reflects on the economic recovery program that we passed, including its provisions to provide tax relief to middle-income families. This includes room to expand the refundable child tax credit. By lowering the eligibility threshold to \$3,000 in the Recovery Act, we provided relief to the hardworking families of nearly 16 million children, including 5.5 million newly eligible children.

This budget builds on our efforts to create jobs and rebuild the economy through the economic recovery plan by providing a forward-looking economic blueprint that makes the strategic investments necessary to move from recovery to long-term economic growth while putting us back on a path to fiscal sustainability.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, to support the underlying resolution and do not let our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who had 8 years—and what did they do in those 8 years? They brought this Nation to its economic knees. It's time to look to the future. Support this resolution.

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

I say to my very good friend from Connecticut that it's fascinating that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to talk about nothing but the last 8 years. And I find it interesting because no one seems to be willing to talk about what it is that's before us: a budget that is dealing with the next 5 years. It's a \$17.8 trillion budget over the next 5 years. That's what we need to focus on. That's what this debate is all about.

With that, I am very happy to yield 3 minutes to our hardworking and very thoughtful chair of the Republican Conference, the gentleman from Columbus, Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today in the midst of a debate and rise in opposition to the conference report on the Democratic budget.

I do so following after the quite typically forceful remarks of the gentleman from Connecticut, whom I respect as a colleague. She, as the gentleman from California just said, focused a

great deal on the last 8 years. As someone who in this body through the course of the last 8 years was, as my colleagues know, a harsh and public and consistent critic of runaway Federal spending under Republican control, allow me to stipulate that the gentlelady makes a point.

The truth is in the 8 years of the Bush administration's tenure, under Republican control 6 of those years, we did manage to double the national debt. And that was a disappointment to millions of Americans, me included. And I believe it was part and parcel why the American people in 2006 showed us the door because they know we can't borrow and spend our way to a healthy America. So I will stipulate to that point, Madam Speaker.

But it doesn't follow or stand to reason that coming to the floor as the gentlelady from Connecticut did and as others have today and complaining about overspending under Republican control of Congress, that the answer would be this budget which would—on top of what has already happened—double the national debt in 5 years and triple the national debt in 10.

□ 1730

It just simply doesn't make sense.

I would expect, Madam Speaker, that anyone that is looking in, that in the midst of these difficult times—a time when the American people are hurting, when every family and small business and family farmer across this country are sitting down around kitchen tables and metal desks and offices and figuring out how to make ends meet, they are making sacrifices, they are putting off until tomorrow what they don't have to spend today—here they see Democrat majorities in the House and the Senate bringing to the floor the most fiscally irresponsible budget in American history. And I say again, according to the numbers—and we can get lost in the numbers—outlays of \$3.5 trillion for fiscal year 2010, \$1.2 trillion in deficits in 2010. The deficits over this period never fall below \$500 billion. A number that was roundly criticized when the Bush administration and Republicans hit that number is now accepted to be the norm.

As I mentioned, public debt by the year 2014 will rise to more than two-thirds as a share of the economy. It is astonishing to point out that the European Union requires countries to keep their debt below 60 percent of their economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DREIER. I yield my friend an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. If this administration and the Democrat majority have their way, the United States of America, by 2014, wouldn't even qualify under the criteria of the European Union—not that I would ever want to join. It just gives a perspective here, Madam Speaker, that what we have before us today is a budget that is out of step

with the American people. It is a budget that does not embrace the sacrifice and the resilience and the demonstrated virtue that millions of American families and millions of small businesses are practicing today.

The truth is, we can do better. The truth is, the American people know that this Congress has the capacity, even during these difficult times, to do the right thing, to take our jackets off, to roll our sleeves up, to do the hard work.

I look across the aisle and I see a gentleman with whom I serve that I personally and deeply respect. And I have to believe there are many colleagues on the other side of the aisle that also know this we ought not to do. After a so-called stimulus bill that spent \$1 trillion, an omnibus bill that increased spending by 8 percent for last year's business, and now the most fiscally irresponsible budget in American history, enough is enough.

The American people want this Congress to begin to practice fiscal discipline and reform. We ought to do so by rejecting this conference report, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

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

Let me say to the gentleman from Indiana, whom I respect, I agree with half of what he said. I agree that his party did mess up and leave us with a terrible economy at this particular juncture. But I think here's where we may disagree philosophically. The question is, how do you dig yourself out of this ditch? Is it more cuts? Is it throwing more people off the health care rolls? Is it creating more joblessness? Is it cutting back on educational programs? Is it cutting back on infrastructure programs? I mean, is that how we get out of this? Or, as I think we are suggesting, is it that maybe in the short term there needs to be some investment upfront to try to stimulate and resuscitate this economy, to create more jobs, to create more revenue, to try to get this economy back on the right track?

We are in deep trouble. We have inherited the worst economy since the Great Depression. Now, the gentleman and others have spoken as if we are not concerned about the deficit or the debt. First of all, we have joined with the gentleman from Indiana over the last 8 years complaining about the size of the debt. And we were told repeatedly by some of my friends on the other side of the aisle that the deficits don't matter, the debt doesn't matter; well, now all of a sudden it does.

The fact of the matter is, in the budget that we are proposing, we cut the deficit by nearly two-thirds in 4 years. That is our promise. That is our pledge in this budget.

I will briefly yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, Mr. MCGOVERN went through this litany of options and the

challenges that we have faced and things that should be done. He never mentioned that the solution that is being put before us is to dramatically increase the size and scope and reach of government, to impose taxes that will—as these independent economists about whom I referred earlier have said—will impose this tax burden on middle-income wage earners.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reclaim my time. First of all, there is not a single tax increase in the budget. The budget that we propose cuts taxes for middle-income families by more than \$1.7 trillion over 10 years. And again, our budget cuts the deficit by nearly two-thirds in 4 years.

I am proud to defend our budget. I have talked about how it is going to create jobs. I have talked about how it is going to cut taxes. I have talked about how it is cutting nondefense discretionary spending. I have talked about how it is going to invest in affordable health care and college affordability and clean energy. I am out here very proudly defending this budget that we have.

So all I am simply saying is that what the other side has proposed, quite frankly, in our opinion, is unacceptable. It will hurt more middle-income families. It will cause more people to fall into the ranks of poverty, more people without health care. It will cut back on education, on investments in our infrastructure. Those were the proposals that were presented. I think that is the wrong way to go.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOCCIERI).

Mr. BOCCIERI. "Johnny, what have you done?" I remember my mom asking me that as a young boy, "What have you done?" Well, she asked me this weekend, "Johnny, what have you done to help middle class families? What are you doing in Congress to put the middle class first for a change?" And I said, Mom, some great things are happening in Washington, D.C. Can you imagine this? The Democratic Party is about to enact the largest tax reduction in our country's history for middle class families. Imagine that. Can you imagine that Democrats are going to cut the budget in half, by two-thirds by 2013? And can you believe that we are finally going to have an honest accounting for all the mess that we have inherited over the last decade, the mess that includes bailing out banks, bailing out Freddie and Fannie, and also dishonest war funding, money that should be included in the budget but yet we were not strong enough to put that in the President's budget? Can you believe that the Bush tax reduction was for the wealthiest Americans, and that our tax reduction is going to be for middle class families?

Madam Speaker, this House is in order. And we are investing in America. We are investing in our country and in our jobs. Do you remember in 2004, when President Bush's Secretary

of Health and Human Services, Tommy Thompson, flew to Iraq with one of many billion dollar checks in hand to make sure that every man, woman, and child in Iraq had universal health care coverage? And all we hear now from our opponents on the other side is that Americans don't deserve health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BOCCIERI. But all we hear from those detractors is that Americans are not worthy of having health care that works for every family and for every child.

I say enough is enough. We need to invest in our country, in our people, in our future. And that is exactly what this budget does; it invests in education, in green energy jobs, and cuts the budget deficit.

Are we going to be leaders or are we going to be blockers? Are we going to say "yes," or are we going to say "no?" Are we going to invest in American families or Iraqis?

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this juncture I am happy to yield 3 minutes to our hardworking friend from Savannah, Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I must say that if I had just arrived here from out of town, I would think I was in a college literature class listening to Orwellian doublespeak at its best and examples thereof.

When they talk about investments, this new big government order, that really means tax increases and increases in spending. When they talk about bold, swift action, that means more "big government" power grabs. When they talk about probusiness regulation and modernization of energy, that is just more government dictating to the private sector. When they talk about rebuilding America and new modern job creation, those jobs are coming from the government. Those are government jobs. They talk about health care reform. That is just plain old socialized medicine.

And then they talk about cutting the deficit, but they don't tell you it is their own deficit. If the gentleman from Massachusetts can tell me what the deficit is today, as I sit here and listen, then all I have to do is divide that by half. But that is not true at all. What you are doing is increasing spending and then, based on some phony "we're going to grow the government next year by 4 percent, then we're going to cut the deficit," come on, guys, that doesn't sell and you know it.

And we hear over and over again this is George Bush, Dick Cheney, Halliburton, Blackwater, and everybody else's fault but the Democrat Party. But who has been in charge for 2 years? It was you guys, that under your watch, \$29 billion spent on AIG; \$200 billion last year on Fannie Mae and

Freddie Mac; \$168 billion for a stimulus bill last year, a year ago; \$85 billion going up to \$140 billion for AIG in September; \$700 billion in October for Wall Street; and then, just in January, \$790 billion for a stimulus bill followed by a \$410 billion omnibus bill which had over 9,000 earmarks—which the new President was going to cut every earmark out and not accept any.

At what point are Democrats going to go ahead and admit, you own the House, you own the Senate and the White House? This stuff all happened under your watch. Get over George Bush. You are now in charge.

And I want to say this, as an Appropriations Committee member during the period of time when George Bush was President and we were in the majority—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield my friend 1 additional minute.

Mr. KINGSTON. We never had one appropriation bill that spent enough money for you guys. And you know it. And the records show it in the appropriations debate over and over again; it didn't spend enough money.

So now we are hearing that your fiscal discipline—I just think it is laughable to think about this—your budget spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much. We will be borrowing more money from the Chinese. Indeed, the new Secretary of State's first trip was over to China to say, please continue to lend us money. The deficits that go on will never fall below \$500 billion. But I understand you are going to jack up spending so you can say you have cut it in half, and that's the way you want to do business.

Tax increases; \$1.5 trillion in tax increases. And a lot of it will fall on the backs of farmers and small businesses, the very people you have the nerve to say that you are trying to help. And the total spending outlay of \$3.5 trillion in the year 2010.

This budget should be rejected. It spends too much, borrows too much, and taxes too much.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, you have had your chance. We did it your way for 8 years, and we have the worst economy since the Great Depression. We have more people in poverty, we have the worst job creation since the Great Depression, we have more people who are hungry in America, we have more people without health insurance. I mean, give me a break.

The bottom line is we have tried it your way for 8 years, and you have failed. And the American people sent my friends a message loud and clear on Election Day that enough is enough.

Mr. KINGSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KINGSTON. Who took over the Congress in 2006?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Reclaiming my time. Yes, the Democrats did, but unfortunately with a President who vetoed every decent piece of legislation that we tried to pass, vetoing children's health care, and a whole bunch of other things that would have helped the economy.

Right now we have a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President, and we are going to pass a budget that reflects what the American people want, the values of the American people. We are going to get this economy back on the right track. Enough. Eight years of failed policies is enough. The same old, same old doesn't work anymore.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my friend from Savannah.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman from California.

I was going to ask my friend from Massachusetts, is it not true that the President vetoed Democrat spending, and did come to compromise on things like children's health care, but the first go-round you guys spent too much money, and that is why he was vetoing it? I mean, I can see, blame it on the President and Republicans for 6 years, fair and square. But you guys have been in charge for 2 years now, and the only vetoing that he did was when you were spending too much money.

I just think it is time to go ahead and say, you know, we are in charge, we are going to take responsibility. And, if anything, we need to start talking checks and balances in this town because I don't think we have any with all this runaway spending.

Again, I think this budget spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much. And I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4½ minutes. The gentleman from California has 3½ minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. That is all I need to respond, just very briefly, to my good friend from Savannah/Brunswick when he asked and says that too much money was what the previous President vetoed.

□ 1745

I wonder how much, Madam Speaker, is too much money to care for sick children in America or to ensure that children do not get sick in America?

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute

to our colleague from Mesa, Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, a lot has been said about the last 8 years. And just to make it known, there were a lot of us who weren't happy with the level of spending that went on during that time. We were headed for a fiscal cliff. We knew that. A lot of us knew that, and a lot of us weren't shy in saying it. A lot of us voted against a lot of appropriations bills because they spent too much money.

But when you're headed toward a fiscal cliff, you don't step on the accelerator. And that's what this budget does. We all know or we should know, or we'll claim we knew it when it happens, that the next crisis will be when we try to auction off some Treasury bills that nobody buys. What do we do then? What do we do when nobody wants to lend us money? And we're going to get there, we know we are, because this budget puts us on the track to get there a lot sooner than we would have been otherwise.

That's why this budget needs to be rejected. It's simply too big. I think people know that. And as we go through the appropriations process, I think that will become even clearer.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this is an interesting debate that has preceded, and I have to say that I believe that there is great bipartisan concern about where this country is headed. Democrats and Republicans alike both want to get our economy back on track.

As I look at small businesses in Southern California, it's not a Democratic or Republican issue. Small businesses are closing down and people are suffering. As I look at homeowners who are losing their homes, it's not a Democratic or Republican issue. They very much want to be able to enjoy the American dream of owning their home. As I look at people who have lost their jobs, it's not a Democratic or Republican issue. So I believe that Democrats and Republicans alike want us to make sure we get this economy growing again. The question is how do we do it?

It's fascinating as I listen to my friends on the other side of the aisle decry deficit spending under President Bush and then argue that we should dramatically increase the size and scope and reach of government. And very sincerely that is what they've done. As I listened to my friend from Ft. Lauderdale, that is what he has just advocated. I congratulate him for being consistent in making that argument. But there are others who say that the policies of the past 8 years have created the problem that we have right now.

I also want to clarify the record on issues that were raised. I have argued that we could have done better during the time that we were in the majority.

But, Madam Speaker, I think it's important to note that with the exception of the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, and veterans, there were real dollar spending cuts that took place in appropriations bills over the last few years when we were in the majority. I think that the record needs to show that. We did work to try to reduce spending. We could have done better than we did. I will acknowledge that.

But, again, here we are looking at a proposal which dramatically increases the size and scope and reach of the Federal Government.

And I know that President Obama is popular. I like President Obama. I've been enjoying working with him on things in the past. But I'm very troubled in seeing the implementation of what he calls the "transformation," the "transformation of government." I don't believe that it's what the American people want. What they want to do is they want to see us implement policies that will create jobs, that will allow them to keep their homes, that will keep small businesses thriving. That's what they want to see happen. The best way to do that is to use the model that was put forth by John F. Kennedy when, in 1961, he said, you can't encourage economic growth by increasing public expenditures; you can only do it by increasing private investment.

Reject this rule and reject the underlying conference report.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, President Kennedy also said if a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich. And that's been the problem over the last 8 years is that the emphasis has been on the rich. The tax cuts, the extravagant tax cuts, for the wealthiest individuals that have contributed to our deficit; spending on the war that they wouldn't even pay for that was covered up under emergency spending procedures so it would mask the size of our growing debt. Yes, they made cuts in programs that helped kids and veterans and our elderly and investments in job creation and things that would help stimulate this economy. I don't think that's a record to be proud of.

So we're turning the page. We're actually going to a new chapter here. We have a budget before us that I am proud to defend. This is a budget that creates jobs with targeted investments in affordable health care, clean energy, education. It cuts taxes for middle-income families by more than \$1.7 trillion over 10 years. It cuts the deficit by nearly two-thirds in 4 years, and it paves the way for an affordable health care plan.

Forty million of our fellow citizens are without health care. That's a national scandal. And you know what? That reality is one of the reasons why health care costs are soaring. We need to get that under control. We need to

deal with the issue of college affordability so we have the best trained, best educated workforce in the entire world. We need to invest in clean energy so we can actually make this transition to clean, renewable sources of energy so we're not dependent on foreign oil, we're not dependent on the same old, same old kind of energy that we have here, that we have relied on for so many years in this country.

So we can either do what my friends on the other side of the aisle have done for 8 years or we can go in a very different direction. And I urge my colleagues that it's time to move in a different direction.

Madam Speaker, I will be offering an amendment to the rule. The amendment provides for timeout authority in this rule which will allow the debate on this conference report to take place over 2 days, giving Members adequate time to read this important report before voting. I hope Members will vote "yes" on the amendment and on the previous question and on the rule.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment to the rule at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Insert at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 2. The Chair may postpone further consideration of the conference report to such time as may be designated by the Speaker."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 371, if ordered; and motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 1595, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 179, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 213]

YEAS—240

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Abercrombie | Berkley | Braley (IA) |
| Ackerman | Berman | Bright |
| Adler (NJ) | Berry | Butterfield |
| Altmire | Bishop (GA) | Capps |
| Andrews | Bishop (NY) | Capuano |
| Arcuri | Blumenauer | Cardoza |
| Baca | Bocchieri | Carnahan |
| Baird | Boren | Carney |
| Baldwin | Boswell | Carson (IN) |
| Barrow | Boucher | Castor (FL) |
| Bean | Boyd | Chandler |
| Becerra | Brady (PA) | Childers |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| Miller, Gary | Roe (TN) | Smith (TX) | Brown (SC) | Grayson | McCarthy (CA) | Sarbanes | Smith (TX) | Turner |
| Minnick | Rogers (AL) | Souder | Brown-Waite, | Green, Al | McCarthy (NY) | Scalise | Smith (WA) | Upton |
| Moran (KS) | Rogers (KY) | Stearns | Ginny | Green, Gene | McCaul | Schakowsky | Snyder | Van Hollen |
| Murphy, Tim | Rogers (MI) | Sullivan | Buchanan | Griffith | McClintock | Schauer | Souder | Velázquez |
| Myrick | Rohrabacher | Taylor | Burton (IN) | Grijalva | McCollum | Schiff | Space | Vislosky |
| Neugebauer | Rooney | Terry | Butterfield | Guthrie | McCotter | Schmidt | Speier | Walden |
| Nunes | Ros-Lehtinen | Thompson (PA) | Buyer | Gutiérrez | McDermott | Schock | Spratt | Walz |
| Nye | Roskam | Thornberry | Calvert | Hall (NY) | McGovern | Schrader | Stearns | Wamp |
| Olson | Royce | Tiahrt | Camp | Hall (TX) | McHenry | Schwartz | Stupak | Wasserman |
| Paul | Ryan (WI) | Tiberi | Campbell | Halvorson | McHugh | Scott (GA) | Sullivan | Schultz |
| Paulsen | Scalise | Turner | Cantor | Hare | McIntyre | Scott (VA) | Sutton | Waters |
| Pence | Schmidt | Upton | Cao | Harman | McMahon | Sensenbrenner | Tanner | Watson |
| Petri | Schock | Walden | Capito | Harper | McMorris | Serrano | Tauscher | Watt |
| Pitts | Sensenbrenner | Wamp | Capps | Hastings (FL) | Rodgers | Sessions | Taylor | Waxman |
| Platts | Sessions | Westmoreland | Cardoza | Hastings (WA) | McNerney | Sestak | Teague | Weiner |
| Poe (TX) | Shadegg | Whitfield | Cardoza | Heinrich | Meek (FL) | Shadegg | Terry | Welch |
| Posey | Shimkus | Wilson (SC) | Carney | Heller | Meeks (NY) | Shea-Porter | Thompson (CA) | Westmoreland |
| Price (GA) | Shuler | Wittman | Carson (IN) | Hensarling | Melancon | Sherman | Thompson (MS) | Wexler |
| Putnam | Shuster | Wolf | Carter | Herger | Mica | Shimkus | Thompson (PA) | Whitfield |
| Radanovich | Simpson | Young (AK) | Hereth Sandlin | Herseth Sandlin | Michaud | Shuler | Thornberry | Wilson (OH) |
| Rehberg | Smith (NE) | Young (FL) | Higgins | Hill | Miller (FL) | Shuster | Tiahrt | Wilson (SC) |
| Reichert | Smith (NJ) | | Castle | Castor (FL) | Miller (MI) | Simpson | Tiberi | Wittman |
| | | | Castor (FL) | Himes | Miller (NC) | Sires | Tierney | Wolf |
| | | | Chaffetz | Hinchev | Miller, Gary | Skelton | Titus | Woolsey |
| | | | Chandler | Hinojosa | Miller, George | Slaughter | Tonko | Yarmuth |
| | | | Childers | Hirono | Minnick | Smith (NE) | Towns | Young (AK) |
| | | | Clarke | Hodes | Mitchell | Smith (NJ) | Tsongas | Young (FL) |
| | | | Cleaver | Hoekstra | Mollohan | | | |
| | | | Clyburn | Holden | Moore (KS) | | | |
| | | | Coble | Holt | Moore (WI) | | | |
| | | | Coffman (CO) | Honda | Moran (KS) | | | |
| | | | Cohen | Hoyer | Moran (VA) | | | |
| | | | Cole | Hunter | Murphy (CT) | | | |
| | | | Conaway | Inglis | Murphy, Patrick | | | |
| | | | Connolly (VA) | Inslee | Murphy, Tim | | | |
| | | | Conyers | Israel | Murtha | | | |
| | | | Cooper | Issa | Myrick | | | |
| | | | Costa | Jackson-Lee | Nadler (NY) | | | |
| | | | Costello | (TX) | Napolitano | | | |
| | | | Courtney | Jenkins | Neal (MA) | | | |
| | | | Crenshaw | Johnson (GA) | Neugebauer | | | |
| | | | Crowley | Johnson (IL) | Nunes | | | |
| | | | Cuellar | Johnson, E. B. | Nye | | | |
| | | | Culberson | Jones | Oberstar | | | |
| | | | Cummings | Jordan (OH) | Obey | | | |
| | | | Dahlkemper | Kagen | Olson | | | |
| | | | Davis (AL) | Kanjorski | Olver | | | |
| | | | Davis (CA) | Kaptur | Ortiz | | | |
| | | | Davis (IL) | Kennedy | Pallone | | | |
| | | | Davis (KY) | Kildee | Pascrell | | | |
| | | | Davis (TN) | Kilpatrick (MI) | Pastor (AZ) | | | |
| | | | Deal (GA) | Kilroy | Paul | | | |
| | | | DeFazio | Kind | Paulsen | | | |
| | | | DeGette | King (IA) | Payne | | | |
| | | | DeLauro | King (NY) | Pence | | | |
| | | | Dent | Kingston | Perlmutter | | | |
| | | | Diaz-Balart, L. | Kirk | Perriello | | | |
| | | | Diaz-Balart, M. | Kirkpatrick (AZ) | Peters | | | |
| | | | Dicks | Kissell | Peterson | | | |
| | | | Dingell | Klein (FL) | Petri | | | |
| | | | Doggett | Kline (MN) | Pingree (ME) | | | |
| | | | Donnelly (IN) | Kosmas | Pitts | | | |
| | | | Doyle | Kratovil | Platts | | | |
| | | | Dreier | Kucinich | Poe (TX) | | | |
| | | | Driehaus | Lamborn | Polis (CO) | | | |
| | | | Duncan | Lance | Pomeroy | | | |
| | | | Edwards (MD) | Langevin | Posey | | | |
| | | | Ehlers | Larsen (WA) | Price (GA) | | | |
| | | | Ellison | Larson (CT) | Price (NC) | | | |
| | | | Ellsworth | Latham | Putnam | | | |
| | | | Emerson | LaTourrette | Quigley | | | |
| | | | Engel | Latta | Radanovich | | | |
| | | | Eshoo | Lee (CA) | Rahall | | | |
| | | | Etheridge | Lee (NY) | Rangel | | | |
| | | | Fallin | Levin | Rehberg | | | |
| | | | Farr | Lewis (CA) | Reichert | | | |
| | | | Fattah | Lewis (GA) | Reyes | | | |
| | | | Filner | Linder | Richardson | | | |
| | | | Flake | Lipinski | Rodriguez | | | |
| | | | Fleming | LoBiondo | Roe (TN) | | | |
| | | | Forbes | Loebsack | Rogers (AL) | | | |
| | | | Fortenberry | Lofgren, Zoe | Rogers (KY) | | | |
| | | | Foster | Lucas | Rogers (MI) | | | |
| | | | Fox | Luettkemeyer | Rohrabacher | | | |
| | | | Frank (MA) | Luján | Rogers (NJ) | | | |
| | | | Franks (AZ) | Lummis | Roybal-Allard | | | |
| | | | Frelinghuysen | Lungren, Daniel | Royce | | | |
| | | | Fudge | E. | Ruppersberger | | | |
| | | | Gallegly | Lynch | Rush | | | |
| | | | Garrett (NJ) | Mack | Ryan (OH) | | | |
| | | | Gerrach | Maffei | Ryan (WI) | | | |
| | | | Giffords | Maloney | Salazar | | | |
| | | | Gingrey (GA) | Manzullo | Sánchez, Linda | | | |
| | | | Gomert | Markey (CO) | T. | | | |
| | | | Gonzalez | Markey (MA) | Sánchez, Loretta | | | |
| | | | Goodlatte | Marshall | | | | |
| | | | Gordon (TN) | Matheson | | | | |
| | | | Graves | Matsui | | | | |

NOT VOTING—13

| | | |
|----------------|--------------|-------|
| Brown, Corrine | Jackson (IL) | Stark |
| Burgess | Johnson, Sam | Watt |
| Clay | Massa | Wu |
| Edwards (TX) | McKeon | |
| Granger | Melancon | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1828

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIAN K. SCHRAMM POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1595.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1595.

The question was taken.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 420, noes 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 215]

AYES—420

| | | |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Abercrombie | Barrow | Blunt |
| Ackerman | Bartlett | Bocieri |
| Aderholt | Barton (TX) | Boehner |
| Adler (NJ) | Bean | Bonner |
| Akin | Becerra | Bono Mack |
| Alexander | Berkley | Boozman |
| Altmire | Berman | Boren |
| Andrews | Berry | Boswell |
| Arcuri | Biggert | Boucher |
| Austria | Bilbray | Boustany |
| Baca | Bilirakis | Boyd |
| Bachmann | Bishop (GA) | Brady (PA) |
| Bachus | Bishop (NY) | Brady (TX) |
| Baird | Bishop (UT) | Braley (IA) |
| Baldwin | Blackburn | Bright |
| Barrett (SC) | Blumenauer | Broun (GA) |

| | | |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Castor (FL) | Himes | Miller, Gary |
| Chaffetz | Hinchev | Miller, George |
| Chandler | Hinojosa | Minnick |
| Childers | Hirono | Mitchell |
| Clarke | Hodes | Mollohan |
| Cleaver | Hoekstra | Moore (KS) |
| Clyburn | Holden | Moore (WI) |
| Coble | Holt | Moran (KS) |
| Coffman (CO) | Honda | Moran (VA) |
| Cohen | Hoyer | Murphy (CT) |
| Cole | Hunter | Murphy, Patrick |
| Conaway | Inglis | Murphy, Tim |
| Connolly (VA) | Inslee | Murtha |
| Conyers | Israel | Myrick |
| Cooper | Issa | Nadler (NY) |
| Costa | Jackson-Lee | Napolitano |
| Costello | (TX) | Neal (MA) |
| Courtney | Jenkins | Neugebauer |
| Crenshaw | Johnson (GA) | Nunes |
| Crowley | Johnson (IL) | Nye |
| Cuellar | Johnson, E. B. | Oberstar |
| Culberson | Jones | Obey |
| Cummings | Jordan (OH) | Olson |
| Dahlkemper | Kagen | Olver |
| Davis (AL) | Kanjorski | Ortiz |
| Davis (CA) | Kaptur | Pallone |
| Davis (IL) | Kennedy | Pascrell |
| Davis (KY) | Kildee | Pastor (AZ) |
| Davis (TN) | Kilpatrick (MI) | Paul |
| Deal (GA) | Kilroy | Paulsen |
| DeFazio | Kind | Payne |
| DeGette | King (IA) | Pence |
| DeLauro | King (NY) | Perlmutter |
| DeLauro | Kingston | Perriello |
| Dent | Kirk | Peters |
| Diaz-Balart, L. | Kirkpatrick (AZ) | Peterson |
| Diaz-Balart, M. | Kissell | Petri |
| Dicks | Klein (FL) | Pingree (ME) |
| Dingell | Kline (MN) | Pitts |
| Doggett | Kosmas | Platts |
| Donnelly (IN) | Kratovil | Poe (TX) |
| Doyle | Kucinich | Polis (CO) |
| Dreier | Lamborn | Pomeroy |
| Driehaus | Lance | Posey |
| Duncan | Langevin | Price (GA) |
| Edwards (MD) | Larsen (WA) | Price (NC) |
| Ehlers | Larson (CT) | Putnam |
| Ellison | Latham | Quigley |
| Ellsworth | LaTourrette | Radanovich |
| Emerson | Latta | Rahall |
| Engel | Lee (CA) | Rangel |
| Eshoo | Lee (NY) | Rehberg |
| Etheridge | Levin | Reichert |
| Fallin | Lewis (CA) | Reyes |
| Farr | Lewis (GA) | Richardson |
| Fattah | Linder | Rodriguez |
| Filner | Lipinski | Roe (TN) |
| Flake | LoBiondo | Rogers (AL) |
| Fleming | Loebsack | Rogers (KY) |
| Forbes | Lofgren, Zoe | Rogers (MI) |
| Fortenberry | Lucas | Rohrabacher |
| Foster | Luettkemeyer | Rogers (NJ) |
| Fox | Luján | Roybal-Allard |
| Frank (MA) | Lummis | Royce |
| Franks (AZ) | Lungren, Daniel | Ruppersberger |
| Frelinghuysen | E. | Rush |
| Fudge | Lynch | Ryan (OH) |
| Gallegly | Mack | Ryan (WI) |
| Garrett (NJ) | Maffei | Salazar |
| Gerrach | Maloney | Sánchez, Linda |
| Giffords | Manzullo | T. |
| Gingrey (GA) | Markey (CO) | Sánchez, Loretta |
| Gomert | Markey (MA) | |
| Gonzalez | Marshall | |
| Goodlatte | Matheson | |
| Gordon (TN) | Matsui | |
| Graves | | |

NOT VOTING—12

| | | |
|----------------|--------------|--------|
| Brown, Corrine | Granger | Massa |
| Burgess | Jackson (IL) | McKeon |
| Clay | Johnson, Sam | Stark |
| Edwards (TX) | Marchant | Wu |

□ 1835

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, on yesterday, Monday, April 27, 2009, I was unavoidably detained by airline flight problems and missed the following votes:

Rollcall vote 207, H. Res. 329, recognizing the anniversary of the tragic accident of the steamboat ship SS Sultana, I would have voted “aye”;

Rollcall vote 208, H.R. 1746, Pre-Disaster Mitigation Act of 2009, I would have voted “aye”;

Rollcall vote 209, H. Res. 335, supporting the goals and ideals of National Volunteer Week, I would have voted “aye.”

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 13, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 371, I call up the conference report to accompany the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2010, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 371, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of April 27, 2009, at page H4774.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

In resolving the conference this year, we have had a hard hand to play. In the backwash of the Bush administration, we have had to struggle with an economy that is reeling, if not receding. The deficit is deep and the end is nowhere in sight.

President Obama has responded to these challenges head-on, and we have followed his lead with a conference agreement that reflects most of his policies and most of his proposals.

The President has recognized that we have not one but two deficits. The first is an economy running at about 7 percent below its full employment level, or \$1 trillion below its potential. To move our economy closer to its capacity, the President signed into law a package of stimulus measures totaling \$787 billion in tax cuts and spending increases.

Here is what the Congressional Budget Office says in its analysis of the President's budget: "The adoption of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and very aggressive actions by the Fed and the Treasury will help end the recession this fall."

Let's hope CBO is right, because it's all but impossible to balance the budget when the economy is in recession. Nevertheless, this year's deficit constitutes 12.3 percent of our gross domestic product. At least two-thirds of that stems from the tax and spending policies undertaken by the Bush administration. Much of the enormous swell in this year's deficit is due to some extraordinary expenditures, such as the Troubled Asset Relief Program, and the consolidation of Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae in the Federal budget, and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The good news is these expenditures are nonrecurring so long as the economy recovers.

The President sent us a budget that will cut the deficit by two-thirds by 2013, from \$1.752 trillion this year to \$523 billion in 2014. \$523 billion is roughly 3 percent of GDP in 2014, and in that sense, it is sustainable, because that's roughly the growth rate in 2014.

The budget embodied in our resolution uses CBO projections, which are less optimistic. Yet it reduces the deficit to \$523 billion in 2014, which is 3 percent of GDP, a bit less than the rate of growth in the economy for that year.

Our budget can rightly be called a deficit reduction budget, because it lowers the deficit by \$1.2 trillion over 5 years. On the other hand, our budget is not so committed to deficit reduction that it overrides or overlooks other needs. In fact, it takes on topics that previous budgets have found too tough

to face, such as health care for millions of Americans who do not have insurance. On top of that it slows down defense spending with an increase of 4 percent and makes a moderate adjustment to non-defense discretionary spending, taking it a bit above this year.

In spite of deficits, the President's budget and our conference report launch some bold initiatives to make our economy more productive and our people more productive. First, in higher education, with an increase in Pell Grants to \$5,550; next in health care for the millions, 46 million by one estimate, who are uninsured; and, finally, in alternative energies to lessen our dependence on foreign oil and the depletion of our environment.

As the Budget Committee, we do not make tax policies or write tax bills, but we do set revenue levels with certain assumptions in mind. We have provided revenues sufficient to renew the middle-income tax cuts adopted in 2001 and 2003. These include the 10 percent bracket, the child tax credit and the marital penalty relief bill. We have also assumed revenue levels that allow for the AMT to be patched for 3 years to keep it from burdening middle-income taxpayers for whom it was never intended. We have also assumed in our revenue estimates that the estate tax will be extended at the 2009 levels, leaving exemptions of \$3.5 million per decedent in place, in force, in law.

Our Republican colleagues nevertheless complained about our tax policies. Let me read from CBO's nonpartisan analysis of the President's budget, which is very much like our budget: "Proposed changes in tax policy would reduce revenues by an estimated \$1.7 trillion over the next 10 years." That's the CBO talking.

The President's major initiatives—health care, energy, education, environment—are all implemented by way of reserve funds, and, let me stress, these reserve funds are all deficit-neutral. They are yet to be funded, and they only become operative to the extent that they are actually funded.

The resolution before us sounds all of these themes, and with a few exceptions, supports the principles underlying the President's budget.

Our resolution is laid out in the form of a 5-year budget using CBO's stricter scoring and CBO's projections of the economy.

□ 1845

OMB has run out its budget over 10 years, but a 5-year budget is not at all unusual.

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

Mr. SPRATT. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

It's the customary time frame for budgeting, and we think that the 5-year budget is particularly appropriate in a year when no one can adequately foresee the future or can even foresee a few years over the horizon.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this is a big moment. This is a moment where Congress is now about to decide the passage of the final conference report of this year's budget. It's the budget of our new President with this new Democratic majority. It's a budget that encapsulates their values, the issues that the majority party ran on, the issues that the majority party did say in their campaigns that they were going to pass.

I did 25 listening sessions in the First Congressional District over the Easter recess, and a lot of constituents were concerned and complained about all of this new government and about all of this spending as if it's something they didn't see coming, to which I answered to most of my constituents: You know what? The President did run on these ideas. The Democrats who took the majority did run on these ideas. These are the things they said that they would do, and now this budget shows that they're doing it.

So honesty and candor are being had with this budget. The description of what it does, however, I would say, is not being candidly handled. It is not being done honestly. If you take a look at an honest accounting of this budget that is now before the floor, there is an additional \$1.172 trillion in deficit spending that's occurring here that had been masked away from it.

You've seen the kinds of quotes from some who would describe the enormous vision of this budget as one that will bring a new day in America, where we will look more like a European kind of an economy, like more of a European type of social welfare state. I know a lot of people don't like that description, and in some ways, that description that this converts the American Government into a European welfare state government is not a fair description.

The reason that that's not a fair description is it's not fair to Europe. Under the Maastricht treaty, under which the Europeans allow entrance, this budget would be in violation of it. If you take an honest accounting of this budget, then the deficit never falls below 5 percent of the GDP. We couldn't be allowed into the European Union if this budget passes, which we know the majority has the votes, and it will pass.

This budget doubles the national debt held by the public in about 5½ years, and it triples it in about 10½ years. This budget recreates a whole new system, a whole new precedence. This new precedence changes the whole notion of budgets, the whole concept of what we refer to as the 1974 Budget Act. That budget act was an idea that we've got to get spending under control, that we've got to get our fiscal house in order, that we've got to get the deficit down.

We've got to work on our borrowing. We need to bring fiscal discipline and some limits and some control to the process of taxing and spending in Congress. This doesn't do that. This takes a whole new precedence, and it uses the budget. It perverts the tools within the budget, not to lower the level of spending, not to lower the level of taxing, not to work on reducing the national debt. It uses the budget to increase these things—to engage in an absolute gusher of new spending, of more taxing and of more borrowing.

In fact, the order occurs like this: a huge gusher of new spending, chased by ever-higher taxes which never actually catch up with that spending, which results in a record level of new borrowing. More debt will accumulate under this coming Presidency than under all prior Presidencies combined. That's the budget that we have here before us today.

The chairman talked about the Congressional Budget Office saying taxes are being cut in this budget. That's really an interesting statement. You have to go through so much mental gymnastics to actually rationalize that statement. What this budget does, to be fair, is it takes some current tax rates and keeps them current—the Child Tax Credit, the Marriage Penalty Relief, some of the lower income tax brackets. So it doesn't cut those taxes. It just keeps them where they are.

Under this budget, the alternative minimum tax kicks in in full force in 3 years, hitting at that time about 30 million families with an average of \$2,000 of more taxes.

It raises the tax rates on income that most small businesses pay, so they'll pay a tax rate higher than that of the largest corporations. It raises the tax rates on the very investments, capital gains and dividends that make up our pension funds, our 401(k) plans, our college savings plans that are now down by 40 percent. So it has not only the largest tax increase in American history and not only the largest spending increase in American history but the largest debt increase ever. That's not budgeting. That's irresponsibility.

So we, obviously, have a difference of opinion with this budget. While we criticize this, we brought to the floor our own budget to say how we would do things differently, and we've got to get our taxes low to grow this economy. We've got to control spending so that we can have government live within its means so that we can get our debt paid off.

At the end of the day, the question is whether or not we're going to do good in this generation by the next generation, whether or not we're going to take on the fiscal challenges that are confronting this country and this generation today so that future generations of Americans can continue to enjoy the high standards of living that we have enjoyed, whether Americans can still test the boundaries of prosperity and society or whether we're

going to go down that sliding scale, that slippery slope of giving the next generation an inferior standard of living.

It is a quantifiable, irrefutable fact that this budget puts us on that glide path to giving the next generation an inferior standard of living, an ocean of debt, a sea of higher taxes and spending as far as the eye can see. This budget should not pass. Unfortunately, this budget will pass.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the 2010 budget resolution conference report, and I commend the chairman for his diligent work, as well as the other conferees, to produce a budget to grow our economy and to restore discipline, finally, to America's accounts.

The key to our Nation's future is a strong, robust economy, and this budget leads us in that direction. It also meets our commitments to our veterans by including a substantial increase from the 2009 veterans' services.

I ask my colleagues to support this resolution. Again, I thank the very able Budget chairman, Congressman SPRATT of South Carolina, for his incredible work.

I rise today in support of the 2010 Budget Resolution Conference Report. I wish to applaud Chairmman SPRATT and the other conferees for their diligent work on behalf of our nation.

The key to our nation's future is a strong, robust economy built on the foundation of resilient citizens working hard to produce goods and services. The Budget Resolution supports revitalization of our economy through investing in education and energy independence, both of which keep us competitive globally while protecting our national interests.

In addition, this Budget Resolution aims to cut the deficit by nearly two-thirds while maintaining our commitment to our nation's veterans by including an 11.7 percent increase from 2009 for veteran's services. This is critical as we address our aging veterans and those who struggle with PTSD and other war-related injuries.

I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in strong support today of this conference report for the fiscal year 2010 budget resolution.

I want to commend Chairman SPRATT and the members of the committee for bringing us a budget which will put America on a path toward fis-

cal health and a competitive future by investing in our key priorities of education, health care and energy.

This budget resolution will put us on a track to a stronger, fairer 21st century economy that can benefit all Americans. It will help us rebuild our middle class and turn our looming crises—energy, health care and education—into opportunities for prosperity, and it will create a new era of accountability, honesty and transparency for taxpayers.

This budget will allow us to make dramatic changes in two areas that could not be more critical to working families and our economy's recovery, and that is expanding access to affordable health care and coverage and leveraging a more competitive workforce by making college more affordable. For too long, our broken health care system has threatened both our fiscal and our medical health. Millions of Americans currently lack health care coverage, a figure that is growing daily as more workers lose their jobs and, therefore, their health care benefits. Millions of Americans who do not have coverage too often have to choose between quality and affordability, any health care at all or bankruptcy.

This conference report will also give us the opportunity to give much needed relief to families who are finding it harder and harder to pay for college while losing jobs and income. Some families have done everything right—saving, working hard, giving their children a good education—only to find out that their plans have changed by the economic downturn.

In this legislation, because of the reconciliation instructions, we will be able to take and recycle the money that now goes to banks for fees and commissions to the student loan program, and we will be able to use that to improve and to increase the Pell Grant scholarship program so that we'll be able to make sure that that keeps track with the cost of education. For those young people who are in the most financial need and who are fully qualified to go to college, we will be sure that they will be able to do that. That's all because of this budget resolution put together by this committee, and we should support this conference report.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, tonight I rise in opposition to this budget, a budget that will hurt the American people. People who live in the real world, people who work for a living understand that you can't spend money that you don't have. These people don't need to hear from us about sacrifice. They sacrifice every day—the mother and father who sacrifice by cutting back at home to make sure their daughter has the school supplies that she needs, the business

owner who sacrifices to make sure that she can meet this month's payroll. They're making tough decisions and are living off bare bones budgets, but they look up here to Washington, and they see we're spending more money than we ever have.

So it's no wonder that they're angry. It's no wonder that they're fed up with wasteful spending. They should be mad. They know it and so do we.

This budget taxes too much, borrows too much and spends too much. This budget is just another example of how Democrats fail to understand the commonsense values that Americans use every day. The worst thing you can do in a recession is raise taxes. John F. Kennedy knew it and Ronald Reagan knew it. Apparently, the current President doesn't get it because raising taxes is exactly what President Obama's budget does to the tune of well over \$1.5 trillion, much of which will be placed squarely on the shoulders of my State's number 1 job creator—the small businessperson.

The truth is that, despite all the claims to the contrary, this budget won't create new jobs back home. It won't grow our economy. It will pass on debt to children because of bad decisions and bad debt. People back home deserve better, Madam Speaker. My children, as do yours, deserve better, Madam Speaker. I urge my colleagues to vote against this Democrat budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Before yielding to Mr. BECERRA of California, I would like simply to make two or three clarifications.

You've heard it repeatedly said in this debate that this is a big spending bill, and it is, but it brings spending down from \$3.9 trillion outlays this year to \$3.6 trillion outlays next year—a reduction in spending of \$300 billion. As for revenues, we don't raise revenues. We cut revenues by \$764 billion over 5 years and by \$1.7 trillion over 10 years. Those are the facts. That's the truth.

I now recognize for 2 minutes the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the chairman for yielding, and I congratulate him on his work, once again, in putting forth a budget that America can be proud of.

Madam Speaker, when President Barack Obama took office, he inherited a plane that was in a fast nosedive into the ground. He said we're going to pick up America and do the best we can. Many Americans have recognized that, but some haven't. I would like to give you the words of a couple of Americans who have recognized that. President Obama, in working with this Congress, is trying to make a difference.

In the words of Commander Raymond Dempsey of the Disabled American Veterans, "This is all good news for our Nation's veterans. The budget agreement signals that veterans are, indeed, a national priority" or in the words of Mr. Robert Wallace, the executive director of the Veterans of For-

eign Wars of the United States, who says, "On behalf of the 2.2 million men and women of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its auxiliaries, I would like to offer the VFW's strongest possible support for the conference agreement for the FY 2010 budget. The VFW salutes your strong leadership in quickly coming to this agreement, especially one that makes so many meaningful and valuable improvements to the Department of Veterans Affairs. We strongly encourage all in Congress to follow your lead and adopt this conference report."

Is it a perfect budget? No, it's not. It's difficult to be perfect when you inherit a \$1.3 trillion deficit and when the plane is going down into the ditch, but the President, in working with this Congress, is trying to make a difference. There are some people, including our veterans, who recognize that.

For that reason, Madam Speaker, I hope that every single Member of this Congress recognizes that people who have given in many different ways recognize it's time to put our money where our mouth is and to vote for this budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) from the Budget Committee.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Madam Speaker, ever since I came here I've been hearing the majority party say that they inherited this deficit, and so they have no recourse except to double it in 5 years and then to triple it in 10. That is not a grown-up response to inheriting a deficit. The grown-up response is to be responsible with discretionary spending and taxes.

□ 1900

With regard to taxes, Madam Speaker, if the government increased the top tax rate from the current rate of 35 percent to 100 percent, it would only collect an extra \$400 billion this year. In other words, confiscating all of the income that is currently taxed at 35 percent, the highest tax rate, would not raise enough revenue to cover any of the annual deficits projected in the next 10 years.

There is no way the tax hikes on the rich alone can pay for the proposed spending in the current budget. The tax hikes are going to fall on working-class Americans and on poor Americans. This is no way to run a household, and Madam Speaker, it is no way to run this House.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the question before the Congress and before the country is how do we get the economy to recover, how do we put people back to work and see their retirement savings grow again, their home equity rise again.

One of the ways that needs to be done is to stop our addiction to imported foreign oil, and this budget takes an important step forward.

It's important to understand what the budget does and does not do.

What the budget does not do is make a judgment on the so-called cap-and-trade proposals. At another time, on another piece of legislation, the House will debate and decide what to do about that. What the budget does, however, is to increase by about 10 percent our investment in ridding ourselves of that addiction to imported oil.

What we say is building on the work in the economic recovery law, let's put Americans back to work building a smart grid that can take wind energy and other energy and spread it throughout our system. Let's put Americans to work building a hydrogen plant, solar farms, other forms of clean renewable energy and create green collar jobs. Let's retrofit existing buildings so they have a smaller carbon footprint and costs the owners and operators less to do.

This budget represents the most significant investment in green technology and green jobs in the history of the country, and it does so because we recognize that an important part of the answer to the question of how to restore prosperity and create jobs for our constituents is to invest in clean energy and green collar jobs. So whether it is tax credits, loans, or other investments, this budget takes us a very long way towards that very laudable goal.

A "yes" vote for this budget is a "yes" vote for a new strategy that will liberate us from the addiction of imported oil and grow jobs in our families and our communities.

I would urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this budget conference report.

Tomorrow, the President will have completed 100 days in office. The American people look back on these 100 days and what do they see from this Congress but a blizzard of spending. We've seen an over \$1 trillion stimulus package, an omnibus appropriations bill that we called for a freeze on that, instead, will spend over \$400 billion in spending. The stimulus package, we called for something that spent half as much money and would have created twice as many jobs according to the economic projections that were relied upon.

Now, the capstone of this first 100 days is an unbelievable budget conference report that projects to spend more than \$3.5 trillion this coming year and which forecasts budget deficits as far as the eye can see.

Much has been made about the fact that this year, the budget deficit will be approximately \$1.7 trillion, but that includes the \$1 trillion in spending. It includes the omnibus appropriations

bill that we talked about here. And yet at the end of this time, the majority feels that it is worth boasting that we will have cut that deficit by two-thirds, to more than \$500 billion. In the entire history of this country, our budget deficit has exceeded \$500 billion only once or twice to this point. Yet this budget plan projects \$500 billion budget deficits for as far as the eye can see and raises our national debt over the next decade to more than \$23 trillion.

We talk about these numbers like they are abstract concepts. A million dollars is a stack of thousand dollar bills 4 inches high. A trillion dollars is a stack of thousand dollar bills 63 miles high. For just this next year, we project a deficit of more than \$1.2 trillion, 75 miles high up into outer space. And that's where this budget belongs.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your great work on this budget.

The budget is more than numbers on a page. It is a statement of priorities and values and goals of our President, the Congress, and our Nation. The budget embraces the President's goals of rebuilding the economy and creating new jobs, restoring fiscal integrity and making investments for our future prosperity and security.

Simply put, we will not be economically competitive unless we meet these economic and fiscal challenges and make these essential investments. This budget meets these goals. It sets us on a path towards health care reform with a goal of containing costs, improving quality, and expanding access to coverage.

We hear about the 47 million Americans without insurance. But they are also more than numbers. When I was back in the district a couple weeks ago, I was visiting a local college, Penn State Abington. It's a commuter campus of Penn State in my district. I met with a panel of young people, all articulate, all bright, all working hard at school.

One young woman, 21 years old, said she was a daughter of a single mother who makes about \$20,000 a year. She's not an only child. She had been covered by CHIP, the Children's Health Insurance Program, until she was too old. She is now a full-time student. She works almost full time to make ends meet. She tried to get health insurance, and she simply couldn't afford it. She recently got sick and went to the hospital and now has a bill for \$7,000, a bill she worries about every day, a debt she doesn't know how she will ever repay, and, of course, she worries about getting sick again in the future.

This budget enables Congress to develop a uniquely American solution to both coverage and costs so that that young woman and the millions like her without health coverage will be able to get it, a plan that will include and be

built on innovation, technology, incentives for an effective delivery system, renewed commitment to prevention and consumer protections in a private and public marketplace.

We cannot sustain the status quo, nor should we. It's about time for us to pass this budget resolution and get to the task ahead.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I would yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, let's cut right to the chase. This budget is an attack on freedom. It's an assault on fundamental liberties. I mean, you just go down the line. Tax increases, record tax increases in this bill which deny opportunities to Americans to use their money to spend on their goals, their dreams, their kids, their grandkids—the largest tax increase in history.

Spending. Unprecedented levels of spending. We've heard all the stats, but this budget piles up more spending over the next decade than the previous 43 Presidents combined. We've heard it "from George to George," from Washington to Bush, we don't pile up as much deficit as we do over the next decade with this budget—denying future Americans the opportunities they need to achieve their goals and their dreams, to reach what we would all call the American Dream.

Third, further nationalizes health care. Think about this. The ability to make health care decisions should be between you and your family and your physician, you and your family and your personal doctor, not some board in Washington, not some bureaucrats in D.C. who think they know all the answers. Again, denial of freedom and liberty for Americans across the board.

Then finally, let me finish with this. Cap-and-trade, the largest energy tax in history. It will require every single American, all 304 million Americans, to pay more because now energy is going to cost more, which means everything we produce will cost more. Every single American will pay more, hurting us at a time when we're trying to get out of a recession.

Any four of these are bad anytime. But to do all four when we're trying to recover from a recession just makes no sense. This cap-and-trade, the Heritage Foundation did a study released 1 month ago. Districts that are heavy in manufacturing—like the one I have the privilege of representing—are so hard hit because you have got to have energy to produce the goods and services that our economy requires. If you want to be the leading economy in the world, you have to have energy. This thing is going to lead to an energy tax that will be unprecedented.

Again, up and down the line we deny liberty, we deny opportunity to Americans with this budget. That's why I would urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Five-and-a-half. Five-and-a-half.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, the House deserves an accurate record before it renders judgment on this budget. It's important that we know that accurate record.

We've heard that the budget imposes "the largest energy tax in history." That is not so. The budget does not refer to cap-and-trade. It doesn't impose energy taxes on families the way that it was described. It simply isn't the case.

We've heard that the budget "nationalizes health care." The fact of the matter is that the budget sets up a process where this House will consider and debate legislation that will help to reduce costs for covered Americans and extend insurance to Americans who do not have coverage. There is nothing about nationalization of health care.

We've heard consistently that this has a significant tax increase on small businesses. The fact of the matter is that any tax change that is contemplated in the health care plan will be limited to a repeal of the tax breaks the prior administration gave the wealthiest Americans. The record shows that 98 percent of small business filers will not be included in any such consideration.

Finally, we hear that the budget doubles the deficit, one of the Members on the other side said. Not so. This budget reduces the deficit by two-thirds, but more importantly and profoundly, it puts us back on a path to the economic growth and prosperity which preceded the prior administration.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have got a letter here I would like to read to my colleagues that lets you know exactly what we're doing to the American people.

This is a letter from some people in Carmel, Indiana. They start off:

"Dear Congressman BURTON:

"As an 82-year-old retired secondary teacher and athletics coach, I am writing you this letter to let you know that I have never received a personal response from a legislative representative of local, State, or Nation." And he just got a letter from me.

Then he says, "In my original letter I was not able to express totally the depth of my hurt from the current economic environment sweeping our beloved country. Beyond the economic pressures of the day, we are faced with the collapse of capitalism and the inroads of socialism into our government. My wife and I, celebrating our

60th wedding anniversary in 2009, have lived through the thirties depression and skimped and clawed our way from earning \$2,900 annually to a magnificent dollar amount of \$45,000 annually at retirement in 1990.

"It all started in the late fall of 2007. We had invested and saved a considerable amount of money for a satisfactory retirement. Since that date, our conservative living, and a very modest budget, has seen the national economy lose more than \$250,000 of our retirement savings. Frankly, at this point in time, we're scared to death.

"You may, and we wish that you would, send copies of this letter to President Obama, Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader REID. They have no idea what they are doing to we constituents.

"I am sorry to cry on your shoulders, but my wife and I in concurrence do thank you for your wonderful letter of response. You touched our hearts deeply."

□ 1915

"They have no idea what they are doing to America and your constituents."

This is a big problem. This is the largest budget in history, the largest tax increase in history. You really need to know what you are doing to the American people, and here is a perfect example. And the people's names are Mr. and Mrs. Shipley.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the chairman very much.

To my good friend from Indiana, we do respect the individuality of Americans. We are the pull ourselves up by the bootstraps, and we are the fighting and the tough; and we get going when it gets tough.

This budget is an American budget. It respects the uniqueness of America. And we don't take away from people who have theirs, but what we do recognize is that we will not be the greatest country that we want to be if we don't bring everyone up at the same time. And so this legislation reflects that.

And in particular, I think it is important to note that we do address rising costs in health care. It is going up. We are going to address the question of physician/patient relationship. We are going to set us on a path to increased coverage and to provide a pay-for.

We recognize that this is an element of the American psyche; I have been working hard, I want to see others working hard. But Madam Speaker, it is important that this budget reflect the fact that people are hurting, people are in need.

We need an economic recovery to get this economy right-side up and allow it to turn and then allow us to invent and build. That is why I am supporting this budget, because even in Texas, the oil capital of the Nation in Houston, Texas, we are looking toward increas-

ing energy programs, providing for alternative energies. This legislation accommodates promoting energy independence, also a seamless energy policy.

I believe this is the right direction to go. This is a budget that respects America and Americans, and it believes in getting us on the right track.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the vice ranking member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have listened very carefully to this debate, as short as it is, Madam Speaker. I have listened to my friend, the distinguished vice chairman, the gentlelady from Pennsylvania, say that these budgets are about values more than numbers. I couldn't agree with her more. It is clear that the Democratic budget values spending. It is clear that the Democratic budget values taxing. It is clear that the Democratic budget values debt, debt as far as the eye can see, Madam Speaker.

Now, almost without exception, Democrat after Democrat Member have come to issue a history lesson to Members of this body. Well, I have a history lesson of my own. When Republicans were in control of Congress and budget deficits were \$300 billion and falling, the gentleman from Maryland, who is now our majority leader, said, "They have instigated a dangerous spiral of deficits and debt that constitute nothing less than fiscal child abuse." The gentlelady from California, who is now our Speaker—again, when the Republicans controlled the body, we had deficits \$300 billion and falling—said, "This is immoral, irresponsible and just totally immoral to ask for my children and grandchildren to pay for it." And now, Madam Speaker, on their watch, the deficit has gone from roughly \$160 billion to \$1.8 trillion, and there is silence, stone cold silence. Where are the accusations now of fiscal child abuse?

This is a budget that will place more debt on our children than has ever been placed before. This is a budget that in 10 years will triple the national debt, create more debt in the next 10 years than in the previous 220 years of our history. Yet, where are my Democratic colleagues to talk about the fiscal child abuse?

Spending. Increasing spending almost 9 percent. Almost every family budget that pays for the Federal budget is having to cut back, but not the government, no, no, no, no, no, not the government budget.

You know, Madam Speaker, there was a time in our Nation's history where people believed that you work hard today so your children could have a better tomorrow. And this Democratic budget takes that ethic, turns it on its head and says, we will let government live easier today so our children have to work harder tomorrow.

That is not the America I grew up in. It is not the America I want to leave to

my 7-year-old daughter and my 5-year-old son. There is a better way.

Madam Speaker, you cannot borrow and spend your way into prosperity. This is a budget that is not solving the Nation's economic crisis; it is exploiting the Nation's economic crisis. It must be rejected.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlelady from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. I just want to make it very clear—not only on behalf of myself, but all of my colleagues. We have spoken quite a bit about, yes, the values and the investments we are making in this budget, but we have also spoken about our deep concern and our responsibility going forward on the debt.

Let's be clear; this administration and this Congress inherited a \$1.3 trillion deficit for this year. And yes, there were some additions made because of the terrible economy we are in, the need to respond to this economic situation and to create those new jobs. And this budget makes a commitment to reduce the annual deficit by two-thirds in 5 years, an ambitious goal, and one we are determined to meet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from South Carolina has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I will consume my 1½ minutes.

Madam Speaker, let me just address what has been said here. This President inherited a terrible fiscal crisis. Well, you know what this President inherited? It inherited a Democratic majority that ran Congress for the last 2 years that gave us all of this spending and these higher deficits.

But here is the question; yes, there is a bad fiscal situation on our hands in this country. Yes, the President inherited a difficult situation. The question is, is he making it better or is he making it worse? All of these complaints about the higher deficit that has been inherited, about this spending that has occurred over the last 8 years, and what is the response? More of it. More spending, more deficits, more debt.

One of the reasons why the majority decided not to follow the President's lead with a 10-year budget and go with a 5-year budget is because the day after the 5-year budget, the deficit goes right back on up. One of the reasons why they put all these gimmicks in this bill was to try and make that deficit look as if it were smaller than it actually is. You take the gimmicks away, it is another \$1.127 trillion in deficit spending. The deficit never gets to 3 percent of GDP, which all economists from the right and left think is unsustainable. This budget puts us on an unsustainable course.

Madam Speaker, we are going to be back here again talking about what to do to fix the budget because this budget will need fixing, and that's going to happen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The gentleman from Texas said this was not the America he grew up in, but he grew up in Mr. Bush's America. During the 8 years of the Bush administration, the President came into office, we had a debt in this country of a little over \$5 trillion. When he left office, the debt was a little over \$12 trillion, and a deficit of \$1.845 trillion. So a lot of last year's deficit becomes this year's debt. A lot of that debt was attributable to what happened in the last administration, too.

He said it continually, we increase spending. Once again, in terms of outlays, this bill will decrease spending by \$300 billion, from \$3.9 trillion—which is way too much—to \$3.6 trillion. That is a \$300 billion reduction.

As for taxes, raising taxes, this bill cuts taxes by \$764 billion over 5 years and by \$1.7 trillion over 10 years. Those are the facts. It can't be refuted. And that is why I think you can fairly and rightly say this is a deficit reduction bill which nevertheless accommodates values that we consider good for the country.

We will pick up tomorrow, I suppose, Madam Speaker.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2 of House Resolution 371, further consideration on the conference report is postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPRATT. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert material relevant to consideration of S. Con. Res. 13.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAYSON). Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, in addition to Mr. TANNER of Tennessee, Chairman, appointed on February 13, 2009:

- Mrs. TAUSCHER, California, Vice Chairman
- Mr. ROSS, Arkansas
- Mr. CHANDLER, Kentucky
- Mr. LARSON, Connecticut
- Mr. MEEK, Florida
- Mr. SCOTT, Georgia
- Ms. BEAN, Illinois

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Mexico-United States Inter-parliamentary Group:

- Mr. PASTOR, Arizona, Chairman
- Ms. GIFFORDS, Arizona, Vice Chairman
- Ms. LINDA SÁNCHEZ, California
- Mr. FILNER, California
- Mr. REYES, Texas
- Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Texas
- Mr. GENE GREEN, Texas

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy:

- Mr. HINCHEY, New York
- Mr. HALL, New York

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF CONGRESSIONAL HUNGER FELLOWS PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4404(c)(2) of the Congressional Hunger Fellows Act of 2002 (2 U.S.C. 1161), and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member to the Board of Trustees of the Congressional Hunger Fellows Program for a term of 4 years:

- Mr. JAMES P. MCGOVERN, Worcester, Massachusetts

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4303, and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Trustees of Gallaudet University:

- Ms. WOOLSEY, California

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 2004(b), and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Trustees of the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation:

- Mr. SKELTON, Missouri

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 431 note, and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission:

- Mr. MOORE, Kansas
- Mr. BOSWELL, Iowa

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2501, and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission:

- Mr. LARSON, Connecticut

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO JAPAN-UNITED STATES FRIENDSHIP COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2903, and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Japan-United States Friendship Commission:

- Mr. MCDERMOTT, Washington

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO ABRAHAM LINCOLN BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5(a) of the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission Act (36 U.S.C. 101 note), and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission:

- Mr. JACKSON, Illinois

□ 1930

JASON'S LAW

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, tragically on March 5 of 2009, one of Schoharie County's citizens from my congressional district, Jason Rivenburg, pulled his truck into an abandoned gas station frequently used by truckers in South Carolina as a rest stop, and was then and there violently and senselessly shot and murdered, robbed for a meager \$7. At the time of his death, Jason was a mere 12 miles from his destination but was unable to make his delivery because he was too early.

Jason Rivenburg was 35 years old, leaving behind his wife, Hope, and son,

Josh. They had just moved into a new home. As if that stress was not enough, shortly after his death, Jason's widow delivered two healthy twins, a boy named Hezekiah, after his grandfather, and a girl named Logan.

Rivenburg's death sparked outrage and an outpouring of support for the family across our country. Truckers and family members are demanding that the government do more to protect truckers who risk their lives following rules that require that they pull over and rest after a certain amount of driving time.

There are few resources telling truck drivers, who are often unfamiliar with a local area, where a safe place to rest might be. Moreover, there are few safe places to rest in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, we must do more to support these incredibly important men and women. Moving our freight and goods is essential to keeping this country and our economy progressing. We must ensure that as we demand mandatory stops and on-time delivery that we provide adequate support systems for our Nation's truck drivers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues support the life and memory of a truly hardworking American man and support Jason's Law, which I am sponsoring.

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 California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. HUNTER 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 Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOODLATTE 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 (Ms. JENKINS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JENKINS 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. CONAWAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONAWAY 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 Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

HEALTH CARE FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be back here on the House floor this evening to join you and our colleagues in talking about an issue that is of rising importance to millions of Americans, and that is the issue of guaranteeing a seamless and affordable and quality health care system for the American public.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to talk about health care for America. It's a pretty simple concept, and over a number of years, the desire and the call from the American public has become more and more acute. I'm glad to be here with my good friend from Wisconsin, Representative KAGEN, and others who may join us here throughout our hour or a portion thereof to talk about both the need for reform and some of the ideas that are floating around this Chamber to get us there.

I stand here with new evidence from the American public that they are more desirous of change than ever, not a preservation of the status quo, not incremental reform, not a Band-Aid fix to the problem, but real reform.

A recent survey of Americans by the Kaiser Health Foundation showed that over 60 percent of Americans believe it is more important now than ever, than ever, to pass comprehensive health care reform. Those same individuals reported that they are having more problems than ever, more problems than ever, accessing care.

Forty-two percent of Americans in that recent poll said they relied on home remedies or over-the-counter drugs to take care of their illnesses because they couldn't afford the prescription. Thirty-six percent of people reported that they skipped dental care or a visit to the dentist because they couldn't afford it. Thirty-three percent of Americans said they put off or postponed care that they knew they needed because they could not afford it. Twenty-nine percent said they didn't fill a prescription because they couldn't afford it. And 18 percent of Americans, nearly one in five, said that they cut pills in half that they were due to take because they wanted the prescription to last longer.

Mr. KAGEN, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, this is the most affluent country in the Nation, the most free, the most powerful. What does it say about the conscience of a nation that one in five Americans are sitting at their kitchen table, sitting and standing next to their bathroom sink, cutting prescription drugs in half because they

can't afford to pay for the full prescription? And what does it say in this country that forces so many Americans, most of whom are playing by the rules, doing everything we ask? We know that study after study tells us that of the nearly 50 million uninsured in this country, five out of six are a member of a family with a full-time worker. More and more often you're working, you're doing everything you're supposed to, and you can't get insurance or the insurance plan that your employer presents you puts more and more of the burden on paying it onto the employee. We know that for all these people that are playing by the rules, for all these people that don't have health care insurance, they live amidst a health care system that spends more on health care than any other country in the world. We spent \$2.2 trillion on health care last year, Mr. KAGEN, about an average of \$7,400 per person, nearly double what every other country in the First World spends. And what do we get for it? We get a system that leaves almost 50 million without health care insurance, and we get a system that by and large ranks in the middle to lower tier with regard to health care outcomes in the world.

In fact, another new study that just came out suggests that the United States amongst industrial nations ranks last, ranks last, in addressing the issue of preventable mortality; that in preventable deaths, this health care system does worse than every other industrialized nation in the world.

The facts are clear. For too many people out there, health care has become unattainable. For too many that have health care insurance, they're going bankrupt just trying to pay their portion of the bills. And the system overall is bankrupting not just this government but is bankrupting and putting out of business too many businesses, both small and large, throughout this country. Big businesses, small businesses, families, individuals, all asking with voices louder than ever that this year right now this Congress step up and fix this problem. It's the right thing to do. It's the right thing to do from the perspective of conscience. It's the right thing to do from the perspective of health care, and it's the right thing to do from the perspective of economic recovery and revitalization. So we are here tonight to talk about this challenge that's laid before and presented to this government.

Mr. KAGEN and I came here in the same class, and we got here amidst probably a record degree of cynicism about what government can accomplish but in particular what Washington can accomplish. Now, it's gotten a little bit better since the election of President Obama, but there are still far too many people out there who look at the depth and the severity of this problem, the health care problem, and doubt whether Congress and this place has the ability to rise to the challenge.

We're here to say that it absolutely does. We are here to say that this is a unique moment in time, coming fresh off of an election with a mandate on health care, with a House full of Members who want reform, with a Senate full of Members who want reform, and with an administration that has made it one of their priorities that we can do it now.

Now, we may all have, as we will probably discuss over the course of the next hour, varying ideas on how we get there. And in the end for every single one of us when we go to press that green or red button on a comprehensive health care reform bill, there is going to be an element of a leap of faith. We are all going to have to cast aside the perfect for the benefit of the good. But it is time that we stopped arguing over the perfect system and started making some real improvements, big improvements, comprehensive, transformational improvements. I think that's where we will get to this year.

And I'm glad to have some of my colleagues on the floor of the House to talk about this tonight, in particular the doctor of the House, Representative STEVE KAGEN.

Mr. KAGEN. Thank you, Congressman MURPHY. It's good to be with you again on the House floor where we can begin to discuss with the American people about progress we can make together. And only by working together are we going to bring about the changes that we need.

Now, we did come here in 2006, November. We came for orientation. And we came with a message, and the message was about positive change. Now, I will just give you the good news. Just in case people haven't heard it across the country, there has been a change in Washington. We now have a President who can actually think things all the way through, someone who's really on our side for the changes that we need. And what have we done so far?

Well, for the Meronek family that I have the honor of representing, this is a photo of Wendy and her 3-month-old child. And they didn't have access to a doctor at the doctor's office. She had access at the emergency room because she didn't have any health care at all. She was qualified for SCHIP but it wasn't fully funded. We passed SCHIP in our first term here in the 110th Congress. We passed it and the President signed it. And the very first thing that the President did for this country this year was to pass legislation that guaranteed that children who are most in need have access to the doctor in the doctor's office. It reduces taxes, reduces our costs, increases the health for our children, and prevents problems from getting worse. It's good for people's health and it's good for our budget. So we began to take that positive change by helping children.

We also passed a bill that may not seem to be too related to health care, Lilly Ledbetter. This was a bill that guaranteed equal pay for women.

Now, of all of you here in the gallery, a few of you that might be here tonight, raise your hand if you're against equal pay for women. Raise your hand if you're against providing health care to children who are most in need at the doctor's office.

□ 1945

I don't think we see a hand going up. Women and children first, that is what this 111th Congress has done with the help of President Obama and his leadership.

I have here a few postcards I have received from my constituents in northeast Wisconsin that pretty well tell it like it is.

David and Dianne from Appleton: "We have health insurance, but cannot afford to use it." Now, that is a problem, when you have health insurance coverage and the only thing it guarantees is that the insurance company is going to take the money, then you have to fight like heck to get the money back. They have high deductibles and can't afford to use the insurance they have.

From Luxembourg, Wisconsin, Jim says, "My wife and I have preexisting conditions with our health. Right now, we pay \$3,000 a year after 80 percent is already paid."

"Preexisting conditions." It is time that we applied our constitutional rights that prevent us from suffering from discrimination by the health care industry. No discrimination. No citizen, no legal resident in this country anywhere should be discriminated against because of the color of their skin, and likewise they should not suffer from discrimination because of the chemistry of their skin. No discrimination based on the content of their heart. Well, what about the content of the arteries of their heart? We need to pass legislation that guarantees that no one will suffer from discrimination due to preexisting conditions.

Here is a card from Albert from Crivitz, Wisconsin, who writes, "Without a job that pays a fair wage, I won't have money to pay for health care, for gas, for a war, for Social Security or anything else."

It is really tough to separate health care from our economy and our economic recession from the loss of the 6 million jobs during the last 12 months. We have to put this thing all together. One thing directly affects the other.

Here is Kathleen from DePere, Wisconsin: "It is time for all Americans to have the same health care benefits as their representatives in Washington."

Well, that is not a bad start. I think people in our districts understand the situation just as well as we do here in Congress, and we are working very hard to bring about the changes that we need.

I yield to my colleague from Florida, RON KLEIN.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Thank you, Dr. KAGEN. Certainly it is an honor and privilege to be here and to talk about

this issue in the House of Representatives, because I know people at home are trying to figure out what it is that they can do, what ideas that they have, what ideas doctors have, hospitals have, caregivers have, to try to fix the system that in the long term is not sustainable.

It is not sustainable through Medicare and Medicaid based on the costs. It is not sustainable if you are a private-sector business and you are providing health care to your employees. You obviously want to do whatever you can to keep them healthy. You spend a lot of time training them, and we want them to come to work every day and be healthy and not have to end up in the hospital where they don't have coverage and obviously all the problems that go along with that.

So we have some serious issues out there, and I think this is one of those moments in time in America where we have to come together. This is not a Democrat, Republican or Independent issue. This is an American issue. This is something where we have to sort of in a nonpartisan way figure out what is working in the system and preserve that, and what is not working in the system and fix that.

There are lots of issues we know that are not working, and I will just give one perfect example, which I know when I am speaking on the floor of the House this evening a lot of people will be able to share and empathize with this scenario I am going to give you.

We have a very close friend. We have known them for many, many years. Their daughter has cystic fibrosis, and it could be any number of diseases that any of our families unfortunately have with their children.

This gentleman owned a business, a family business, for decades, a long, long time, and the business, based on what is going on right now over the last number of months, had to close. Well, fortunately, for all the years that he has been raising his family, they have had a good health insurance plan that the business paid for. Obviously, it was something that gave them peace of mind, knowing that when their daughter needed hospitalization or therapy or treatments, she could get it.

Well, when your business goes out, there is no COBRA, and a lot of people are not aware of that, because there is no underlying policy. The reality is for him to find an insurance policy, a health insurance policy right now that will take care of his daughter with her preexisting condition, that is what it is known as, it is almost impossible to get that coverage, and, if you can get it, it costs a fortune and usually has all sorts of exclusions and limitations.

The same example for women who have had breast cancer. Literally millions of women that have had breast cancer, generally speaking after they have had breast cancer, they are going to have a difficult time getting coverage. And guess who needs it the most? Someone who has cancer. God

forbid, if it ever comes back, you want to know if you need surgery or an oncologist or a second opinion or to have whatever, a lumpectomy or whatever it may be, that you will have the hospitalization and care.

Unfortunately, this is a big gap. And "gap" is really not giving it the right feeling, because "gap" is just a word. But this is a crisis. This is a crisis for families who can't afford or can't get that kind of health insurance. And there is no reason.

There is a very simple answer, obviously. What is insurance? Insurance is supposed to spread the risk. When you have a large pool, when a large corporation has 10,000, 20,000, 100,000 employees, they buy a policy and it spreads the risk. And, God forbid, if one of their employees has a serious illness or car accident, that is covered in the big pool by all the rest of the employees. That is how insurance is supposed to work, whether it is homeowner's insurance or any kind of insurance you buy. Health insurance is the same.

The tragedy, of course, is that over time we have allowed a system to develop where there are large gaps in our delivery of health care. We have to fix it. It is the right thing to do.

I will turn it back to the gentleman from Connecticut who is running this discussion tonight and thank him for allowing me to participate.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you very much, Mr. KLEIN. I am glad you are here with us tonight.

I want to turn over the podium to Representative OLVER from Massachusetts. One of the statistics that stands out, and I know Mr. OLVER is going to talk a little bit about the amount of money we are spending on health care, in 1970 about 7 percent of our gross domestic product was devoted to health care. Since 1970, in 30 to 40 short years we have jumped up to almost 17 percent of our gross domestic product is spent on health care. That number is going to very quickly hit 20, and could get up all the way up to 30 in a very short time if we don't do something about it.

It is always going to be a necessary component of spending, but that kind of growth is just unsustainable as an economy, something that the Appropriations Committee, of which Mr. OLVER is a senior member, will be no doubt grappling with, and I yield to him.

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut and my friends from Florida and Wisconsin for being here tonight to help to enlighten people about what has become a very, very critical issue for America.

The only agreement that I can see about the debate that we are beginning to have on reform of the health care system is that virtually every American family, all across the board, knows that health insurance is too expensive. For the 50 million or so Americans who don't have any health insur-

ance, it is obviously too expensive or they otherwise would already have it. For the next 50 million who have too little insurance or are underinsured, as it is called, they know it is too expensive when their insurance company refuses to pay for coverage that they thought they had or the insurance company makes a claim that there was a previous condition involved and that may have been why they are now are claiming that they shouldn't pay the money. Or there are a certain number of people who have lost jobs in this economy and thereby have lost their coverage for health insurance, and for them, obviously, the whole situation has gotten out of hand.

Yes, our American health insurance is too expensive. Let me use this first chart and show you what the situation is here.

This is a chart which shows the health care cost as a percentage of gross domestic product in the G-7 countries. The G-7 countries are America and the next six largest economies in the world, except for China. These data, it indicates that the Japanese data are for the year 2005, whereas the other data are for the year 2008.

You can see on the chart that the percentage of health care cost as a percent of their domestic product ranges from 8.2 to 11.1 percent in the other six next largest economies in this world, and here we are up over 15. And, by the way, these data, if you look at 09, fiscal 09, you would probably find that that number 15.3 percent is probably up to 16 percent or a little higher because of the problems with the economy. Health care continues to go up, and people are struggling for that reason.

So we have by far the highest. We are 40 percent roughly higher than the next-highest one of the largest economies, which is the industrial economies with which we compete all the time. And the average of the other six members, our partners in the G-7, their average number is only two-thirds. We are more than 50 percent higher than the average of those other six countries.

So, yes, American health insurance is too expensive, and this huge gap between our health care costs, the burden that that puts on our industries, between that burden in this country versus the others of our major competitors, hurts American businesses and costs us jobs.

You only need to look at the auto industry, where our old icons of Chrysler and General Motors now are struggling, and in large measure because the cost of their health care in this country is so much greater than it is for other countries producing automobiles.

Well, that might be okay, or it might be acceptable, that kind of a cost difference, if we got the best health care. Everyone watching has probably heard a politician tell them that we have the best health care in the world.

Well, we do have the most expensive health care in the world. That chart

very clearly illustrates that we do have the most expensive health care in the world. But I would like to examine that question of whether we have the best health care a little bit more deeply with this chart, which shows what the life expectancy is among the very same heavily industrialized countries, which are our major partners in industry and in commerce and trade around the world. Again, I leave out China, but I am using the G-7 countries. All seven of them are listed there.

What you see on this chart is that life expectancy in the United States is less than each and every one of the other members of the G-7 group, each of the other six partner members in the G-7 largest economies in the world. And if I average the life expectancies in those other six countries, it is 3 years longer than American citizens live. Now, that does not suggest that we have the very best health care in the world or the very best health care that we could have.

Then on this last chart let me just illustrate one more measure of what our health care quality is, and this measure is one that directly affects a huge number of families at the very beginning of life. This is the question of infant mortality in the G-7 countries, where you see the listed number of deaths for children under the age of one. So it is deaths among new infants lower be than the age of one.

Going from Japan, you see 2.7 per 1,000 births, on to 5.5 for Italy per 1,000 births, and the U.S., the highest number of infant deaths that are occurring before the age of 1 year. Again, if you average the six, you find that the infant mortality in the United States is more than 50 percent higher than the average of these six other nations.

So, I think one has to ask the question, after going through all of that, and I have to look and see where the question is on my papers, one has to ask the question, is the assertion that the U.S. has the best health care in the world, basically is it true, is it not true, is it simply a lie?

□ 2000

We ought really to think very carefully while we're doing the reform of our health care system, as we're going to do later this year. We ought to think very carefully about figures like this and a whole bunch of other measures. I could go through a series of other measures that show similar kinds of data, and show that we are not doing as well as we ought to be doing as the richest country in the world. There are reasons for that. We'll have other times to perhaps explore some of those other reasons.

But I'm very pleased that the gentlemen, my friends from Connecticut and Florida and Wisconsin, are taking this up tonight, and that I have been able to bring some little bit of thought to how this is going forward in America. Thank you.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman. And those charts

really are instructive to let us know what we're getting for the money that we're spending. I don't think it's the worst thing that we spend a little bit more money on health care in this country than the rest of the world. You know, we have relative affluence here. We have a citizenry that very rightly has high expectations, and so I don't necessarily think anybody has a problem that we spend a little bit more on health care. But two questions are raised. One, how much more money should we be spending than other countries; and what are we getting for that money because, listen, Americans, certainly in my district at least, are value shoppers and they're willing to spend money if they're going to get value for it. And the problem is not enough Americans understand that they're not getting what they should be from those health care dollars.

Mr. KAGEN. Would the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Of course.

Mr. KAGEN. Let's not let the facts get in the way of a good argument or a good conversation, but the fact is that 72 million Americans are having great difficulty paying their medical bills as of November of last year. About 47 to 50 million Americans have no health care coverage at all. But let's not let the facts get in the way.

And I certainly appreciate Chairman OLVER reassuring the people in Japan, if they're looking in tonight, or this morning, for them, you know, they've got it pretty good in terms of health care coverage. And our friends in Europe understand that, you know, they don't have to worry about getting sick.

My way of thinking is, as a physician, if you're sick, you should have the reassurance that when you're sick, you're going to have the coverage that means you're going to be in your house, not the poorhouse. If you're a citizen, you should be in the risk pool. It should be just that simple. If you're a citizen, you ought to be in. And if it's in your body, it ought to be covered. We have to find a way to make certain that that works out.

And before I turn and yield to somebody else here in this discussion, not everyone agrees with all these ideas. That's why we have a debate. Here's a person from De Pere, Wisconsin who says, "I do not want the government involved in health care. The government mismanages money and thinks funds are endless." So you see, we have to reassure our citizens, not just in De Pere, but that good government can make a positive difference in your life.

Medicare was a tremendous program when it was first initiated; 16-1 was the ratio of people working versus retired. Now it's down to about 4-1, so there are some things we have to talk about.

Is Medicare sustainable in its current model? It's a great challenge. And can we somehow tease apart and differentiate our economic recession from our ability to pay for our health care costs? I don't think so.

People in my district are telling me, KAGEN, health care costs are just impossible. Small businesses, what are their greater components of their overhead? Energy and health care. And that doesn't matter if you're on Main Street, on Wall Street, or if you're a family farmer in northeast Wisconsin. So we have to attack the greatest cause of bankruptcy today in the country, which is the high cost of medical care.

I am confident that we're going to be able to work out some details to guarantee that if you're a citizen, you're in; that there will be no discrimination due to preexisting conditions; that the price for health care services, for hospital services, for your pills and prescription drugs will not be whatever they can get. It won't be whatever they can get. It'll be whatever they openly disclose, and give every citizen that same discount.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield for a point before Mr. KLEIN jumps in?

You know, that constituent of yours is multiplied, you know, by hundreds in all of our districts. I mean, people throughout this country have a fear of government-run medicine, in part because they hear about anecdotes from some of the countries that Chairman OLVER and others talked about in terms of the wait times. And, again, I think there are moments when facts are really necessary. Study after study shows that if you really do an empirical, data-based survey, wait times are, frankly, worse off in the United States than in many, if not most of those other countries.

And with respect to the one country that does tend to have wait times greater than the United States, Canada, most of those, in fact, all of those, are really for nonessential procedures. And I think it's worthwhile to then sort of mirror back to the United States.

In Canada, one of the things that comes up all the time is that if you want a hip replacement surgery you've got to wait about 6 or 8 weeks. And that's true. And that's a long time to wait, and too long. In the United States, you've got to wait about 2 weeks to get that surgery. But you know who pays for that surgery in the United States? Medicare. The government. So our government-run health care system does a pretty good job at eliminating wait times.

And for those of us who believe that ultimately you're going to have to have some increased footprint of a government-sponsored health care option for individuals and businesses, I think we can find solace in the fact that, although Medicare may not be perfect, it actually does pretty well with regard to at least that one indicator, wait times, compared to some of our other neighboring countries.

Mr. KLEIN.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I thank the gentleman. And just to add to that, I

know when I got elected in 1992 to the Florida Legislature, I had a group of people in south Florida that said single payer, that's the way to go. These are mostly senior citizens who thought that was just the best opportunity. Most of the doctors I was talking to who I knew in the community at that time were totally against that.

Well, what's happened now is many of my doctors in our community, who do just wonderful service, are now the ones saying Medicare seems to pay quicker, more efficiently than a lot of the managed care organizations. And I'm not picking on managed care as a whole. There are some that are good and some that are more difficult to deal with.

But I think the point of this all is that Medicare has generally worked fairly well. I think most seniors are pretty satisfied with a lot of things. It's not perfect, but I think that we understand that.

But if we think about, you know, what is it that, again, recognizing the different pieces here. We have a lot of people that retire to Florida, where I live, pre-Medicare; 55, 58, 59 years old. Maybe they're in business or work for some government up in the northern part of the country or from some other part of the country, and all of a sudden they don't have health care that transfers to Florida, and they can't buy health care because of a preexisting condition or any number of other things.

So what some of them have said is, why aren't we allowed to buy into Medicare on our dime? No government subsidy, just allow us to pay whatever the premium would be. And that's a very interesting idea. I think, again, just trying to think outside of the box, and there's not one silver bullet that's going to solve all these things. There may be some ideas for us to consider.

And another idea is, a lot of small businesses, we know that we like the idea of small businesses pooling their 12 employees here and 16 employees there, and 5 employees here, and 80 there to get to the larger critical mass so they can spread the risk again. Better price, better service, spreading the risk.

Why not allow those small businesses to buy into our State health care system or the Federal, you know, the employees for the Federal Government, again, on their dime. But we already know, we did some pricing on this, and the cost is far below what the private insurance companies would charge them.

So, you know, there are a lot of ideas out here. And I think what we really need to be doing right now is asking Americans, and all of us, as Democrats and Republicans in our Chamber here, ask Americans, what do you think is the right thing?

There's only so much pie to go around. We know we're spending, as Mr. OLVER recommended through his charts, more than any other country in

the industrial world, at least of the G-7. The money's there. Where's it going? And how can we make sure that that doctor/patient relationship that Dr. Kagen has with his patients and I have with my doctor and many other people have with their doctor really is one that is nurtured and supported. We know we get better quality medicine when my doctor is the same doctor over many years, as opposed to I get a new managed care list and now I have to choose a new doctor and all the kinds of things that really make for less good quality care medicine.

So again, I think this is opportunity for us to have the discussion, bring a lot of ideas forward, think outside the box a little bit and come up with some answers.

Mr. KAGEN. Well, Mr. KLEIN, I appreciate what it's like to be in Florida. I had a small medical practice there studying the fire ant allergy for a couple of years. I wanted to come up with a vaccine that would prevent people from having allergic reactions to those venomous creatures. We could talk an hour about the fire ants.

But on that hot subject, wouldn't it be nice if Medicare actually covered the overhead expense, or if Medicaid covered the overhead expense? You see, there's a subject called cost shifting. One of the reasons that the prices are so high is that everybody else is paying for the unpaid for health care that occurs not just in the emergency room but in doctors' offices and hospitals all across the country. And that takes place when Medicare does not cover the overhead of essential medical services.

And I guess it wouldn't shock too many people to understand that we don't have the data yet that actually determines and allows us to know here in Congress what the overhead expense is within a metropolitan statistical area. You know, I don't want to have to pay in Green Bay or Appleton, Wisconsin what they're paying for medical procedures in Florida or in New York City or in Los Angeles or other large metropolitan areas, certainly not Washington, D.C., where my first hamburger, fry and a Coke was \$22.50.

So the cost for health care has to be brought down, I think, in large part by creating a real vibrant, open and transparent medical marketplace. And, you know, I can go on my communication device—I'm not going to mention the brand. I don't want to promote a given product. I can go on the Web, the Internet, and search for the price of a car, the price of a book. How about the price of my prescription drugs that I might need, and map it out within the area in which I live?

I want the pharmacies to openly disclose the price and give every citizen the same lowest price that they accept as full payment for that product. I think it's time that the hospitals showed us their prices and then charged everybody the same. Wouldn't that be wonderful?

Mr. OLVER. It really would. I must say, it's daunting to be taking part in

a discussion with an M.D. who has been through this so intimately and has so many examples that he can put forward. We have two or three other medical doctors here in the Congress, and I'm glad we're not having this discussion among just them and me because I would feel completely out of place.

But I did want to comment to something that my friend from Connecticut had said after I finished my chart talk essentially, and that was, yeah, we should be willing to accept a higher cost in this country. True. I said that it would be perfectly acceptable if we were getting outcomes that correspond to the cost that is going in.

We do have a very productive workforce, and the total value of our economy is so high that I think you would find, per person, per member of the workforce, that the value of our economy, the gross product per member is substantially greater than most, if not all of these. I don't have the data on that, but I think I have seen them. And so you would expect that you should be able to spend more in real dollars than others and still maybe not be hurting the economy. But when it gets so out of range, then you really have to look at what are the outcomes.

One other outcome that I would just like to mention, because I used first the life expectancy of our people at large, from the time that they are born until they join their Maker, and then the infant mortality, but then look at the other question, the question of maternal mortality, which very closely mirrors the data on infant mortality, though that goes from the birth until 1 year of age, whereas maternal mortality would refer only to women who die in childbirth. And there, again, our value is, in this country, with supposedly the best health care in the country in the world, our number, again, is about twice, almost twice as high as it is in the other major industrial partners of ours in this whole world economic system. So that's just one more—I did not bring that chart along, but that's just one more of those measures of the many kinds of measures that you could look at.

Mr. KAGEN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. KAGEN. Some years ago I sponsored for citizenship a Ph.D. in my research laboratory. And when I was about to enter the political discussion in 2005, I asked my Ph.D., Dr. Muthiah, how did he look at our American health care system, because he grew up in Sri Lanka and then graduated from Southern India, Madras, and how did he look at the American system? And he said, well, Boss, American health care is upside down because if you go to the hospital and you have insurance, you get a discount.

□ 2015

If you have no insurance at all, you get the big bill.

So, you see, what we have to do is prevent the cost shifting, and by preventing cost shifting we can bring prices down. I think when we finally come to have an agreement that we should have a Federal standard. I mean, we have Federal standards in the United States for everything, making cars, we have OSHA, we have the environmental standards. We have standards for making clothing.

But we don't have a standard basic insurance policy that guarantees that if you get sick you are going to be in your house, not the poor house. We don't have a basic insurance policy that all the insurance companies, if they are going to be in business, should be offered an opportunity to sell, to compete within the marketplace.

I will give you, just an example, and I am not too good with examples. A few years ago I wanted to buy a Chevrolet Impala. At the time it was the highest percent American made car. I went out shopping for the Impala. I had five dealers with the same car. Now, they competed for me.

I didn't get it for free. I got a skinny deal. The dealer made money, the manufacturer made money, and there was an economy, a real marketplace, a competitive and transparent marketplace. What consumers want in health care is transparency. They want an opportunity to be able to afford the medications that they need so that they don't have to skip a meal or skip a pill, or as you referred to some minutes ago, cutting your medication in half.

There are a number of stories I could tell you that would make you cry. There is Jenny, who has two young children who came to see me. They were asthmatic. I made a wonderful diagnosis, I wrote the prescriptions for her and her children. I said come back in a month, they will be back in school, they will be fine.

And she came back a month later, and I examined the children, and they were not fine. They were still wheezing. Being right to the point, I came down pretty hard on her. I said, you know, the funny thing about these medications, they only work if you put them in the kids' mouths. And she lifted up her sack, which contained her own personal property and also some diapers, unzipped it, held out the prescription. It was the same ones I had written.

And she said, Dr. KAGEN, I took these prescriptions to the pharmacy, and I could see the medications behind the counter, but I couldn't afford to put them in my kids' mouths. Now, what are you going to do to help me? I said, well, that's it, I'm going to have to go to Congress because I can't go to the State House to fix this.

This is really a national crisis, one that can't be solved State by State. We can't have these incubators of democracy, as it has been referred to. We can't have one-State solutions like Massachusetts or another State, or Oregon. We need to find a national solu-

tion wherein there is going to be a real transparent medical marketplace to allow a drug company to produce a great medication, to openly disclose that price. And if it's \$1 in Mexico City, hey, thanks. If it's \$1 in New York City, Chicago, L.A., and everywhere else in between, we need to allow them to compete in an open, transparent medical marketplace.

But, first, we here in this Congress have to make a commitment, to make sure we get it right, to think it all the way through, and above all else let's find out what the real overhead cost is, because if Medicare doesn't cover the overhead costs for something, it's going to cause cost shifting or that service or product is just going to disappear.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. The stories are heart-breaking and, unfortunately, the longer you serve in this place or any other level of government, the more that you hear.

It gets back to that statistic that I started with, which is that some people have an impression that maybe folks that don't have insurance, people that don't have access to health care, well, it's their fault. You know, they are living off the dole, they are freeloaders, free riders. It's not true.

Study after study shows you that 80 percent, or somewhere in that neighborhood, of individuals who don't have insurance are part of a family in which somebody or both parents are working full time. They just happen to work for an employer that doesn't offer insurance or that their insurance is kind of 50 percent insurance. It gets you part of the way there, but not very far. These are the folks that we are really talking about.

And I think that in this moment of great economic crisis—a poll came out the other day that showed that 70 percent of Americans are fearful in the next few months that either they or their spouses will lose their jobs, that more people today are conscious of the fact that they are just one paycheck away from losing all their health care benefits. And should they get sick, as they have watched their parents or their relatives or their coworkers do, that their life could be over as they know it.

As Representative KAGEN said, the number one cause of bankruptcy in this Nation is medical bills, individuals who have had an illness, a cancer, an injury, that they could not have foreseen or prevented. And it has fundamentally changed their lives. They have lost their house, their car and their livelihood.

That's who we are really talking about here. Mr. KAGEN is right. Representative KAGEN said you can't do this one State at a time.

I am wholly supportive of States like Massachusetts. My home State of Connecticut is endeavoring to try to produce a system of universal coverage today. I am very supportive of their efforts to do so. But their efforts should

highlight the fact that ultimately this has to be a national solution. Why? Because the only way you ultimately get costs down is to use the leverage of the Federal Government, ultimately, to bring those costs to a reasonable level.

Now, we certainly do have to put the money into the Medicaid and the Medicare system to make sure that we aren't shifting money off to the private sector. But, so many of us are supportive, as Mr. KLEIN mentioned, of opening up the Medicare system or opening up the Federal employees' health system to more Americans because we see that as a way to try to use the purchasing power of the Federal Government to get costs down.

A poll that I referenced about Americans' support for a major health care reform bill also shows that 77 percent of Americans favor allowing the government to offer a plan that would give them an option to join a publicly sponsored program or to keep their private health care insurance. And, in fact, it pretty much cuts across all parties. We said at the outset this has nothing to do with Republicans and Democrats. Whether or not you have insurance has absolutely nothing to do with the party that you registered with or where you sit on the spectrum of our American belief system. This is a non-ideological, nonpartisan problem.

And so although the numbers vary a little bit, the support for a publicly sponsored option for individuals and businesses to buy into, one that would be one of the best and I think most cost competitive options in the marketplace, show that greater than 80 percent of Democrats favor it, greater than 50 percent of Republicans favor it or just under 50 percent of Republicans favor it. But amongst Republicans, 33 percent say they don't have any opinion, so you almost have a 2 to 1 support versus opposed ratio. So you have folks of all parties and all persuasions supporting major reform.

Just one more point before I turn it back over to you, Mr. KAGEN, is your notion of having a level playing field and having transparency is so important, because there are a lot of people in this Chamber that support a single payer Medicare-for-all system, you know, go to a European style system of health care. But this is the United States of America. We have unique needs. We are not Canada, we are not England, we are not France or Germany.

We are going to create our own universal health care system here, informed by the unique needs and desires and expectations of our citizens. And I think most of us agree that that's going to maintain, maybe in not as great a percentage of our system as it is today, but it is going to maintain our private health care insurance system.

And the way to get to a system that is fairer and more equal is to allow for that health care insurance exchange, allow for a marketplace where, as you

said, everyone can go and compare prices, can know when they are buying that product that they aren't going to be ruled out just because they have a preexisting condition, an issue that there is no greater leader in the Congress on than Mr. KAGEN, know that if they work for a business that they are not going to cause that business to not be able to provide health care insurance simply because they are the one employee of six that has higher health care costs than everyone else, that we are going to have equal coverage, a fairness in benefit levels and a transparency in price that will give, I think, a level of surety to people as they buy that insurance product that they are going to be covered and that they are going to get the best deal.

Right now if you are an American health care consumer, you don't know either. You don't know whether you bought the cheapest product, because there is no one place to go. There is no one aisle in the supermarket where you go and compare prices. You also don't know whether you are going to keep that insurance.

Because even if you got in as the bell rung, there is a thing that happens now called post-claims underwriting where even after you get sick, a lot of insurance companies will try to kick you off your health care, claiming that you should have known that you were going to get sick when you signed up in the first place. So I am very excited about this idea of the health care insurance exchange and glad, Mr. KAGEN, that you have been leading on it.

Mr. KAGEN. The consumers of America need to be able to compare apples to apples. And really the only way to get that done is to come up with at least a basic Federal standard, an insurance policy, one that will cover the basics and keep you in your house if you get sick, one that every insurance company has to offer to every willing purchaser, every citizen and legal resident within a metropolitan area where we can create the largest risk pool possible to leverage down prices for everyone.

Here I have someone in rural America. This is really a telling story. She is from Waupaca, Wisconsin, and, quote, "no health insurance for 4 years, one son in the Army on active duty, my son shipping out. He is guarding our home, but we are not taking care of our families here at home. We are taking care of people overseas.

"We know numerous people over 50 who have lost their jobs so companies can cut health care and payroll costs and then can't find any other work and no longer have health insurance."

Now this is being multiplied all across the country as this recession rolls across not just the United States but across other nations as well. We have to establish a basic insurance policy so we can begin to have an open and transparent and very competitive marketplace for insurance process.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Let's think about that soldier that comes

back from serving his country overseas and goes and gets a job that pays a decent wage but works for a struggling company that just can't afford to continue to employ people and give them health care benefits.

And so he, returning from serving his country abroad, putting his life on the line, comes back and gets a decent, hardworking, fair-paying job and has no health care benefits. And then he looks to this House. He looks to the people that he sent to Congress who sit here in this nice air-conditioned Chamber with pretty decent health care.

And he wonders to himself, I fought for this country, I came back and got a job, did everything that I was supposed to. And the people that I sent to Washington, D.C. get a pretty good health care plan, and what am I left with.

I think that whatever we do, whatever Federal regulatory scheme that we come up with for health care insurance, it should at least guarantee that everybody out there gets to have health care like we do. That if you are going to elect men and women to go to Congress who are going to enjoy the benefits of the Federal employee health care plan, that every American out there should have access to that, certainly those that come back from duty overseas and are playing by all the rules we ask them to when they return.

Mr. KAGEN. Well, be careful there, because you may just get what you want. There is nothing to say really that the health care that you have is the best available.

I will bet you don't understand completely what you have got for insurance, because it's so hard to read and interpret that policy. We have got an idea here that's kind of a good idea, but like many things here in Congress, if it makes sense, it just may not happen.

So what we really have to do is just clear away all the clutter and ask some very basic questions: Do you want to have an opportunity to go to the pharmacy and pay the lowest price available for that prescription? I think you do.

Is there any reason why someone should be discriminated against? Now, let's say there is five of us standing in line to get the prescription, 30 pills of drug X at a pharmacy.

Why should we pay five different prices? Why shouldn't they just put the sign up on the wall and say here is what it is. Put it on the Internet, here is what it is. And let's get some competitive forces to leverage down these prices.

When insurance companies have to compete in an open marketplace, we are going to leverage down that price, my best guess is about 22 percent before they really begin to compete for the customer, just like the auto dealers competed for my precious dollars for that Chevrolet Impala. So I look forward to a competitive marketplace.

As you know, I chose not to select health insurance when I got here. It

was offered to me, and I was quite surprised. They said, "Well, Congressman, before you leave to go back to Wisconsin, would you like to hear about the benefits?"

And I said, "Lady, are you kidding me? What are you talking about?" And she showed me a list of health care benefits, of cafeteria plans I could choose from. I had to go catch a plane.

I said, "Well, okay. What did you take?"

"Oh, I took the Cadillac plan," she said, "\$250 deductible. They have got to take you because you are a government employee."

I said, "Well, I'll tell you what. As soon as you can make that same offer to everybody else that I have the honor of representing, I will be happy to make my choice."

□ 2030

I agree with you that we have to have choices, but they've got to be openly disclosed, and we need to get a basic insurance policy that really says, if you're a citizen, you're in.

Now, one of the things that I am really pleased about with this President is that President Barack Obama gets it. He doesn't just get it in his mind. He gets it in his heart. He actually feels what we feel and what my patients feel, and he has taken the single, most essential element in health care as his number 1 element, and that is no discrimination due to preexisting conditions. When we frame health care around our civil rights, we're not saying you have a constitutional right to this or that service. We're saying that you shall not suffer from discrimination, like we passed last year, based on your genetic potential. You will not suffer from discrimination at the pharmacy because you have less money in your pocket than somebody who is getting a discount and not you.

You mentioned our veterans who served not for themselves but for their country. Isn't it appropriate that when a veteran comes home that his wife and his family get the same discount on that medication that they might need? What about their neighbors? What about their whole community? What about their entire country? Isn't it appropriate, if the pharmaceutical company is making a profit at the VA price, that we all benefit from his service or her service at that leveraged down discounted price? We have to begin to use the leverage of the marketplace.

I'll finish up with my comments by saying that we have witnessed in the last year the collapse of the housing bubble. That repercussion, that ripple effect in the economy, has just taken down many millions of jobs. It has taken away businesses left and right, and it continues to do so.

I believe we're also looking at another bubble, and that bubble is in the price of health care. It's simply out of reach for ordinary families, averaging \$1,200 to \$1,400 a month for insurance

premiums, and it guarantees only one thing: that, every month, the insurance company is going to take your money and that you'll have to fight like hell to get it back. Having insurance today doesn't guarantee that you're going to get the services that you need. That's how Chairman OLVER was able to show us all the data.

We are spending a lot of money for health care. We are not getting the value. So I think it's time to begin to ask the question if we shouldn't begin to change the process of how we're going to reward the delivery of health care, to change the process and reward value, not just per head or per prescription. We have to begin to reward value and prevention. Look, you are exactly what you eat.

As my father says, "Steve, boy, pollution begins at your lips. If you don't put it in, it won't stay on you."

"Well, okay. I'm doing my best to lose weight, Dad," but the reality is we can do this by working together.

It will take Democrats, Republicans, Libertarians, and Independents. The American people don't want any more argument about this. They want us to come up with a solution that works for their budgets, that works in their homes and that works within a framework that guarantees that, if you're a citizen, you're in. If it's in your body, it should be covered.

I am more confident tonight than ever before that, this year, we're going to achieve that goal of guaranteeing access to affordable health care for everyone who is legally here.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you, Mr. KAGEN.

We have sort of run the gamut this evening of the problems that underlie the existing system—the lack of transparency in insurance markets, the discriminatory practices of insurance companies, the lack of cohesion in prices when you walk into a pharmacy or into a hospital, the amount of money that it puts on top of businesses that are already struggling to compete in this world.

When you talk about health care, it may be the most complex topic that we ever talk about here. It seems insurmountable sometimes. It seems like there's too much to try to take on at one moment, but there are simple solutions here, as you said: Pay for performance instead of pay for volume. Pay for prevention rather than crisis care. Give people options that they can see and understand.

I think that there are some solutions here that can cross party lines, as you said, Mr. KAGEN. I think that we can achieve a real victory in health care for America, in health care for America this year, this session, that guarantees that for citizens of the most affluent and the most powerful country in the world. Just because you can't afford to see a doctor doesn't mean you're not going to get sick. I hope we get the chance to do this more often and to bring our colleagues to the realization that the time for reform is now.

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

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT OF 2009

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I very much appreciate the honor of addressing you here tonight on the floor of the House of Representatives.

There is an issue that comes to mind for me immediately. It is the reason that I have asked for some time tonight here in this Special Order in this hour of privilege that we have. It is a disturbing factor that I have experienced, along with a number of others, through a markup in the Judiciary Committee last week, and that is this dramatic departure from the rule of law, the dramatic departure from the Constitution, the dramatic departure from the understanding that criminal law in America would be focused on overt acts, not on the thoughts that we might divine would be within the heads of the perpetrators.

I'm speaking specifically, Mr. Speaker, about the hate crimes legislation that has been pushed through the Judiciary Committee and that will arrive here on the floor of the House of Representatives tomorrow.

By the rule, the rules process that has taken place, there were a whole series of amendments that were offered in the Judiciary Committee. Those who watched the committee will know that the Judiciary Committee in the United States House of Representatives is the most polarized committee on the Hill. It's the committee that goes out and recruits, I'll say, the most hardcore, left-wing people in this Congress to advocate for the most hardcore, left-wing—and I'll say—sometimes unconstitutional, often illogical proposals that might come before this Congress to be rammed through the Judiciary Committee but not without a legitimate markup. I will concede that point to the chairman, Mr. CONYERS.

Many of us offered amendments, but there was a determination to vote down, to shoot down and to defeat every constructive amendment that was offered before the Judiciary Committee on this so-called "hate crimes legislation," Mr. Speaker.

On Thursday, after a full day Wednesday and a most-of-the-day Thursday markup and after that legislation on the so-called "hate crimes" passed the House Judiciary Committee, it went to the Rules Committee, which met today, Mr. Speaker. The Rules Committee's job is to also enhance something that is the responsibility of every chairman on this Hill, that is the responsibility of you, Mr. Speaker, and that is the responsibility of all of those who have gavels in their hands. I've

spent some time with a gavel in my hand, Mr. Speaker. The job of the chairman is to bring out the will of the group. It's not to impose the Chair's will on the group. To bring out the will of the group is the constitutional act of justice that should come from the hand that holds the gavel.

What happened instead—and perhaps, just perhaps, the hate crimes legislation flowed out of the Judiciary Committee reflecting the will of the Judiciary Committee, but when it is filtered through the Rules Committee—the Rules Committee that sits in judgment upon whether there will be amendments that are allowed to be offered here on the floor of the House of Representatives or whether there will not and which of those amendments might be offered—the Rules Committee has a profound responsibility to weigh the proposals and to make a determination that this House can work in an expeditious fashion but can still reflect the will of the United States House of Representatives.

That will has been frustrated, Mr. Speaker, because the Rules Committee, I'm told, has ruled there will be no amendments on this hate crimes legislation, that it will come to the floor under a closed rule with no amendments allowed, only the amendments that were offered in the Judiciary Committee and by no other Member of Congress. All of those who do not sit on the Judiciary Committee will have an opportunity to try to perfect this legislation that they call the hate crimes legislation but that I call, Mr. Speaker, the thought crimes legislation.

That's at the core of our discussion here this evening, and I'll submit that the will of this group, that the will of the United States House of Representatives, is directly frustrated by the actions that, I believe, are directed from the Speaker's office, by the actions of the Chair of the Rules Committee and by the actions of the majority members on the Rules Committee who have decided to shut down the amendments process and ram through a piece of legislation tomorrow with only 30 minutes allowed for all of the Members of the United States House of Representatives to voice their objections here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

There will be no amendments allowed, just a voice where there will be more than 30 people lined up who will have less than a minute to add their words to this, and where there will be no chance to sway the opinion of this body, the opinion of this body that is locked in on an idea that we're going to have hate crimes legislation in America that punishes the thoughts of people who may or may not be perpetrating crimes against folks because of their particular, special protected status that would be created under this hate crimes legislation.

I, Mr. Speaker, oppose, and I defy the logic of the people who would advocate for such legislation and the very idea that we could divine what goes on in

the heads of people when they commit crimes.

I will argue that the history of criminal law in Western civilization has always been about the overt act, not about the covert act; about the overt act, not about the thought, not about what goes on in the head of the perpetrator and certainly not what goes on in the head of the victim. We recognize and have for millennia that the value of the victim is intrinsic in that each human life has a unique value, a unique value that is priceless and sacred. Whether it's a baby who was just conceived a moment ago or whether it's someone in the last days or hours of his life, we all measure that life equally.

In fact, former Governor of Pennsylvania Robert Casey said human life cannot be measured. It is the measure, itself, against which all other things are weighed.

Yet this hate crimes legislation would weigh it differently. It would weigh the life or the health or the physical well-being of an individual who fit within this special protected status—the status that might be wrapped up in their sexual orientation, their gender identity or their gender, itself—of having a special status if it happens to fit the list of proclivities that they believe should be protected status.

Now, when you start valuing one person's well-being, one person's life differently than that of another, we have deviated dramatically from the essence of criminal law and have started ourselves down a path by which we're evaluating not as the proponents of the bill—and I will say there is the gentleness from Madison, Wisconsin, whom I specifically asked:

Is this a crime committed, and is it evaluated by what's in the head of the perpetrator or by what's in the head of the victim? I think I might have misunderstood her, but they corrected me clearly, and they said: Well, it's what's in the head of the perpetrator.

All right. So, if we're going to presume that a crime could be committed and if we're going to enhance the penalty, maybe, 10 years or maybe as much as life in prison for kidnapping, for example, because we're going to judge what goes on in the mind of the perpetrator at the time he committed the crime and what provided him the incentive for committing that crime, then we're evaluating here by law what goes on in the head of the perpetrator.

But, Mr. Speaker, there's another component of this. This is what goes on in the head of the victim as well, because the special protected status rests upon not physical characteristics, not immutable characteristics—those characteristics that can be independently verified and that cannot be willfully changed. No, Mr. Speaker. These characteristics are those mutable characteristics, those that reflect not just the physicality of the victim but the attitude and what goes on in the head of the victim.

So, for the first time, if this legislation should become law, the Federal Government will be punishing and will be acting upon legislation that presumes to be able to know what's in the mind of the perpetrator and what's in the mind of the victim. It will match those two things together and will determine if a crime were committed and, if so, how to enhance the penalty. This is a bizarre thing, Mr. Speaker.

This takes me back to the book "1984" by George Orwell, written in 1949, where George Orwell wrote—and I will summarize this because I don't exactly have the quote in front of me:

We don't care about the overt act. We don't care about any overt act. What we care about is the thought, because, if you can control the thought, you can control the overt act.

So why would we care about the act, itself, when we could control the thought? By the way, we're not going to be satisfied if you just simply agree with us. You must do so willingly. We must bring your mind around to the point where you're eager to agree with us. When that point comes, there will be no more overt acts that we disagree with, and therefore, we will have controlled the mind, and by controlling the mind, we've controlled the actions, themselves.

□ 2045

This is a bald-faced effort to enforce public affirmation for behaviors that have been considered to be historically aberrant behaviors by the American Psychological Association, Mr. Speaker. There is a long list of them. The list that I have is 547 of them long. As near as I can determine, they're all specially protected activities or thought processes that are protected under this hate crimes legislation, Mr. Speaker.

We tried mightily to amend the bill and to try to bring some sense to this idea that whatever the proclivity, it was going to be protected by a Federal hate crimes law. We can't cross that line, Mr. Speaker. We've got to maintain criminal penalties for the overt act, not for the thought, because we can't know what goes on in the mind of the perpetrator, and we can't know what goes on in the mind of the victim.

Mr. Speaker, that opens this subject matter up, and I recognize that there are some very effective Members of the House of Representatives that would like to address this subject matter. And no matter how focused they may be on preparing themselves, I would be so happy to recognize the gentleman from Texas who is my good friend, Mr. GOHMERT, for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Iowa. You have pointed out some real problems and real issues with this hate crimes bill.

We are constantly being told there is an epidemic of hate crimes in America. You look at the statistics, and there are actually fewer crimes now attributed to any type of bias and prejudice

than there were 10 years ago. Another problem is the States, every one, have laws to deal with crimes against a person. That is a State obligation, and every State has their own. And it's governed by the State law. And most States have a hate crime law.

This is the Federal Government, the Big Brother that Orwell talked about, coming into the thoughts of every individual.

Now we've been told that this bill will protect constitutional speech. It will protect religious speech. But that breaks down when they have to admit that, well, of course, if it's religious or constitutionally protected speech that is relevant to the underlying offense, then, of course, it is not protected.

Well, you can't take this new law in a vacuum because 18 U.S.C. 2(a) still exists, and it will exist if this becomes law. Some people who are not lawyers talk about it referring to accessories, but it is not. In legal circles, it's called the law of principals. And under Federal law, 18 U.S.C. 2(a), if you aid or encourage, counsel—and here's a big verb—or induce someone to commit a crime, then it is as if you are the one who committed a crime. It's called the law of principals. You induce someone else to commit a crime, you might as well have pulled the trigger or done it yourself.

So with that law existing and not going away when we pass the hate crimes bill, if heaven forbid it gets passed, then how do you go about inducing someone to commit a hate crime? Well, you'd probably have to tell them that an activity is wrong.

There are preachers, rabbis, imams across this United States of America all this week who will be telling people that there are certain types of sexual immorality that the Bible, the Tenach, the Koran, say are wrong. Well, if you're telling people that an activity is wrong and it hurts the moral fabric of the country and it undermines our moral authority in this Nation—and perhaps you even quote from the Bible or the Torah or the Koran where it talks about Sodom being destroyed because of the activity of those, that it got so bad that the people residing there even wanted to have sexual relations with two male angels that were sent, well, that, in both the Bible and the Torah, Tenach—where this is discussed—in the Koran, the same story is discussed in the Koran, you explain to people that God got so upset about this he destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah. Even today, you cannot find remnants of Sodom and Gomorrah. And you tell people that God feels so strongly about this that he's destroyed a city and you can't even find any remnants of the people or the cities.

And someone goes out—even though you have never encouraged violence—commits a violent act and says, Well, my preacher, my rabbi, my imam told me that this was wrong and it caused the destruction of a city and that reality is what induced me to do this, you

don't think the preacher, the rabbi or the imam would be arrested for inducing that crime? Of course.

You can go even further. I can hear a prosecutor with a bent towards this kind of hate crime stuff going forward and saying, You know, we heard this preacher talking about homosexuality being wrong. That preacher should know that there are crimes of violence being carried out against homosexuals around the country that have gone on—even though they are lower in number than they were 10 years ago—they should know that and therefore since they are saying it's wrong, that stirs up all kinds of hard feelings. He should know he's inducing people to create crimes of violence. Therefore, we've got to stop him. He's attempting to induce a Federal hate crime.

This is serious stuff, because that's where you go. And the prosecutor could then say, "Look. Yes, we arrested the preacher; yes, we booked him into jail, and yes, it is a question of intent. Did he intend to induce the crime? Well, I am going to leave that question for a jury to decide." You can hear that said by many prosecutors around the country on other issues: "Look, I am not God. We will allow a jury to decide this question of fact on whether or not he intended to induce the crime."

So getting back to basics, though, there is no epidemic. And as my friend from Iowa knows, in discussion, in debate in the committee and outside the committee, we've said, "Now, what are the cases that justify the Federal intervention into this State law area?"

We're told what about James Byrd, that horrible case down in Jasper where this poor African American was drug to death by white guys, three of them. Two were most culpable. That justifies a Federal hate crime? No, it doesn't. Those two guys that were most culpable got the death penalty. This bill doesn't even offer the death penalty as a penalty. This bill wouldn't affect that case. The other guy got life in prison. This bill wouldn't affect that case at all.

Some have mentioned the terrible case regarding Nicholas West. From accounts, he was a sweet young man. He was picked as a victim because he was homosexual. Brutalized, kidnapped, killed. That was in my home county. The perpetrators have already been sentenced to death and the death sentence has been carried out. This case would not be affected.

Now, everyone in America deserves protection of the law. We get in trouble when we begin to carve out little special groups here and there that deserve more protection than someone else. You think a pregnant mother does not deserve the protection of a homosexual? You think a military member doesn't deserve the protection of a transvestite? You think that a particular child wouldn't deserve the protection of a transvestite, a transgender person? Why are we carving this out? They are protected under the law.

You know, there are those of us who believe the biblical teaching about homosexuality being inappropriate, but I've sentenced people for harming a homosexual because they deserve to be protected under the law. It doesn't matter who you are, it doesn't matter who you sleep with, you deserve to be protected, and we do our country a great injustice when we begin to say these deserve more protection than these over here.

But when we discuss sexual orientation—we brought that up in committee, and we were told, Well, it doesn't need a definition. For one thing, it's defined in another law in the Hate Crimes Statistical Act. Well, it was defined in that law as only including heterosexuality and homosexuality. We said, All right. If you think it's confined to that, why don't you put that definition in here?

"No, we don't need to do that." Well, you do.

I have been an appellate judge. You want to review what a definition of any word or phrase means in a bill? First, you look to see if it's defined, and if it's not defined, is there any direction to other laws within that bill that tells you, for the purpose of this law, what the definition is. They didn't want to do that. They didn't want to refer to the Hate Crime Statistical Act.

And yet here on page two of the bill, we've got other definitions. Crime of violence has the meaning given that term in section 16, title 18, U.S. Code. Hate crime has the meaning given such term in 28003(a) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act. Over here—I believe it's page 12—it talks about another definition of explosive or incendiary device has the meaning given such term in section 232 of this title. Firearm has the meaning given such term in 921(a) of this title.

Why wouldn't you define sexual orientation? You should. Because the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual IV tells us the names of different conditions. It talks about all the types of sexual orientation people have. There are all kinds of sexual orientations. Some are weird. Some are sick. Some will get you put in prison. But if you don't define it, they're included.

My friend from Iowa here, Mr. Speaker, made an amendment trying to exclude pedophiles from the protection of sexual orientation here because these people are oriented sexually towards children. That was voted down. Voted down. You know, you want to give pedophiles the protection, this extra protection you're not willing to give a pregnant woman or a child or a mother or military? This is incredible. But that's what they did.

It creates the scenario, too, of other types of sexual orientation. Some are oriented toward exhibitionism. Some are oriented sexually toward voyeurism. This bill sets up the incredible scenario where a woman could see a man flash her and she is astounded, hits him with her purse, and takes off

running. Under that scenario, if this became law, the flasher committed a misdemeanor and the woman that hit him with a purse—because he's oriented sexually towards exhibitionism—is now a Federal felon looking at 10 years in prison. That is insane. This makes no sense.

□ 2100

One other thing, though, as a judge dealing with different types of defendants, hearing all kinds of psychiatric testimony, psychological testimony, and just dealing with different defendants on thousands of cases, what struck me in what I heard was that people that are the hardest to rehabilitate are those who are antisocial personalities under the DSM-IV. They are harder to rehabilitate than people who act out of a bias or prejudice. And yet this bill says we are going after the people who are probably the most easy to rehabilitate and make them suffer more, if that's possible—you can't make anybody suffer more than the death penalty—but we are going to make them suffer more than someone who commits a crime out of bias or prejudice. It makes no sense.

Antisocial personalities, they know the difference between right and wrong, they could control their conduct, but they choose to do wrong. Many antisocial personalities like to hurt people. This bill, the way it is drafted and the way we are going to vote on it tomorrow—because we were not allowed one single amendment to come to the floor—creates the scenario where someone could be arrested for a hate crime in this bill, brought to Federal court, have a jury selected, put in the box, the trial go forward, and the defendant convince the jury that he committed the act of violence causing bodily injury to the defendant randomly—he didn't care who he hurt, he was gonna hurt somebody. And if he is successful in raising a reasonable doubt that he committed the crime randomly and he had no bias or prejudice, he just wanted to hurt somebody, under this bill that we vote on tomorrow, he is acquitted. That is insane. That is insane.

We are going to let the random, senseless killer, abuser, brutalizer go free under this bill? We need to pass laws that make sense. We need to pass laws that say every life in America is important. But this doesn't do that.

What saddens me greatly is that the bottom line of this hate crimes bill is—this is the message that goes out from this hate crimes bill we will vote on tomorrow—if you are going to hurt me, shoot me, brutalize me, please don't hate me; make it a random senseless act of violence. That is what this says. And that is why this should not become law.

I thank my friend from Iowa and yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and I very much thank the gentleman from east Texas for his clarity with his understanding of this legislation.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I have sat with our committee staff, sat with my own staff. I have gone through this language. I have looked for a way that there is a consistent index between the definition that is in this legislation and understanding what it does. It doesn't exist. It is ambiguous. It is ambiguous, and it runs, actually, in contradiction to the existing statute that it references that the gentleman from Texas spoke to; one of them is a crime of violence definition, and the other one is a hate crime definition.

But also, the definition that is in the bill for gender identity, when I asked the question what is gender identity, and the answer that I received back in committee from the gentlelady from Madison, Wisconsin, was "it is defined in the bill." Don't you know? Well, it is defined in the bill. Gender identity means "actual or perceived gender-related characteristics."

I am this Midwestern guy. We have a number of different kinds of fence posts; some of them are hedge posts, some are cedar posts, some are pine, creosote, pressure-treated. Some are steel, T-posts, round posts. You name them, we've got them. We've got electric fence posts as well. We have a whole different bunch of varieties.

Now, if I would define a fence post as "actual or perceived characteristics of a fence post," you get the idea what the definition of gender identity is when it is the actual or perceived gender-related characteristics. It is no definition at all. And this definition will be defined by lawyers and judges, some activists, some that want to adhere to the law. None, if this legislation is passed, would be able to go back and track the definitions in this legislation and determine the intent of Congress, except to offer ambiguities that can be used at any extent.

And what a couple of the other ambiguities are; crime of violence means the threatened use of physical force against the person or property of another. But the bill doesn't say property, it says the person. But the definition in the bill says person or property.

A hate crime means a crime in which the defendant intentionally selects a victim, or in the case of a property crime, the property is the object of the crime, but the bill doesn't say property, it says a person that possesses these special protected characteristics—which makes them sacred cows in this society. And, Mr. Speaker, I, perhaps, will expand that thought of sacred cows, but I am much more interested in hearing from the gentlelady from Minnesota, who has arrived on the floor tonight to fill us in on her view of the hate crimes legislation.

I would be so happy to yield as much time as may be consumed by the gentlelady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. I want to thank so much my colleague, STEVE KING from Iowa—the "stunning" STEVE KING of

Iowa, as he is known in the mainstream media, so grateful for your advocacy, and also for that of Judge GOHMERT. And Judge GOHMERT, I trust that you're a hanging judge down in the State of Texas.

I just wanted to have a chance to speak just for a few moments on this hate crimes legislation. It truly is momentous, this rule that we will take up tomorrow.

First of all, I just want to say, from my perspective, this appears to me easily to fit the definition of an unjust law. Why do I say that? Because this will bring to Americans more loss of freedom, more loss of rights than we have seen leave in this first 100 days here in Congress because it goes to the very heart of the Bill of Rights. When the Founders passed the Constitution, they would only pass it on one condition, and that is that the Bill of Rights would be passed next.

This is the very first amendment—what many consider the most important amendment—our First Amendment right. And contained in that First Amendment right is the freedom of speech and expression of religious affiliation. And this goes to the heart of taking away American's right to speech and expression and sincerely held religious beliefs.

I feel that this hate crimes legislation in some ways could be considered the very definition of tyranny because it gives government literally the key over deciding what the thoughts of Americans should be. And it says that Americans could only hold certain opinions and not others, and they can only express certain opinions and not others. Otherwise, it would be seen as a criminal act.

And I think back over this last century of world history, and I think of nations where they called certain expressions of speech not only hateful, but criminal. And that is what this bill does, it regulates speech. Government regulates speech. And it just seems that it is one more chink resulting in the loss of American freedom.

This bill, if it passes tomorrow, will have to be considered then a part of President Obama's 100-day legacy. And on his watch, if he chooses to sign this bill—and from all indications it appears he will—this will lay the foundation to further deny Americans First Amendment rights.

I think it also, we could say, denies equal protection under the law. If you have an individual going through a crosswalk and a person is in their car and they hit that person in the crosswalk, it is up to the person who is hit to file the charge if it was a hate crime or not. So if the person is gay, and that is the status that is being protected, and the person driving the car is straight, would it be a hate crime if the person driving the car who is straight hit the person who is gay in the crosswalk? So does it say, then, that that life that was hit in the crosswalk is more valuable because it was a gay life

versus if the person who was in the car, who is gay, who hits the person in the crosswalk, who is straight, does that mean that the straight person in the crosswalk doesn't have a cause of action against the person who is gay who is driving that car? It raises the question of whose life is valuable and whose isn't. That is the question that Mr. GOHMERT raised earlier.

Who will the government prefer? And who decides who gets protected? Are we protecting people on the basis of their behavioral actions; if they choose to have certain actions that are sexual in a certain manner, they get protected when others don't? Who decides who gets to be the good guy in this situation? Who gets to decide who is the bad guy in this situation?

And I would ask this question, is it a moving target? If we give government this level of authority, then easily we can see that down the road government could amend this hate crimes law to say that now a new behavior will be protected.

One thing that was mentioned by Mr. GOHMERT earlier, that was brought up by Mr. KING, that apparently people who are practicing pedophiles would be considered protected under this legislation, but not, I understand, veterans, not, I understand, pregnant women, not, I understand, 85-year-old grandmothers would be protected under this law. But who would be protected? A pedophile, someone who considers themselves gay, someone who considers themselves transgender, someone who considers themselves a cross-dresser? That is who is protected.

And yet, think of the impossibility that we are tasking government with. We are asking government to peer into the mind of the individual who perpetrated the crime. Government somehow is so wise, so all knowing that now government can peer into the mind of the individual and can somehow discern if the individual in fact hated the person based upon, potentially, what their sexuality is versus the sexuality of the person who the crime was being perpetrated against. Won't that be a moving target? Depending on what the new behavior of the day—the behavior du jour, so to speak—that government approves or won't approve?

Again, I think this is the very definition of tyranny because government's arbitrary decision will mean that more Americans will lose their First Amendment freedom of speech and expression. And this is something, again, that Mr. GOHMERT had alluded to earlier. And that is when we can look, when this hate crime legislation has been put into place across the world, whether it is in Sweden, whether it is in Canada, whether it is in other nations, we can see what other nations have done with this type of legislation and what it has led to, the loss of freedom for individuals, citizens within those countries, and the citizens whose speech were protected.

Then I look at the specter of our own Supreme Court. One of our Justices,

Ruth Bader Ginsburg, said, again, we need to have more Supreme Court Justices in our country look at international laws and the laws of other countries when we define our own. Well, our judges could look at Sweden, they could look at Spain, they could look at Canada. And they could see that pastors and priests who spoke out and who just gave sermons behind their pulpit that promoted what the Bible says about sexuality—and homosexuality in particular—that was construed as a hate crime in Sweden, construed as a hate crime in Canada, in Britain, in Spain. And if that is the case, we will not allow pastors to even have freedom of speech and expression.

As a matter of fact, we saw in Britain where there was a collision course in the EU Constitution between freedom of speech and expression and between exercising religious rights. When that clashed and came into contact with the hate crimes portion of the law internationally, which provision prevailed? They were both contained in the Constitution, hate crimes and religious liberties, hate crimes versus freedom of speech and expression. On every occasion, the law that prevailed was the hate crimes provision. In every case, the provision that lost was the provision that so-called protected a person's right of religious belief and expression. Do we think we will fair any differently here in the United States? I don't think so.

I think the collision course that we are on this evening, Mr. Speaker, is one that probably should frighten Americans almost more than any other. And I say it because there is probably nothing more sacred in our Constitution than that very First Amendment that protects my conscience. And even if my beliefs or your beliefs or the beliefs of people that are listening to us have this debate this evening are antithetical to what all of us believe here this evening—someone might hold some very hateful beliefs, but we are America, shouldn't they be allowed to hold those beliefs? Shouldn't they be allowed to believe, in this country, things that are contrary to what government believes? But that is not going to be allowed anymore. And people's sincerely held religious beliefs can now be considered contrary to public policy. And we can see for the first time in our Nation that people would be disallowed from having their sincerely held religious beliefs.

I think we are seeing a little bit of death today in this Chamber. We are seeing what our Founders bled and died for go away a little bit more in this Chamber tonight. We can hear Patrick Henry. We can hear echos of Jefferson, echos of Madison this evening in this Chamber. What would Daniel Webster say?

□ 2115

And as much as they would rail against people assaulting other people on the basis of what they believed, cer-

tainly they would not elevate to a certain level an extra measure of protection for expression of that speech.

I thank the gentleman, I thank Mr. GOHMERT, and I thank the colleagues who are coming behind me because there is something that we should be fighting for. It's fighting for the idea that we are a Nation that is founded under God and that we have our rights emanating from a God who gave us unalienable rights, and we are losing that right tomorrow on this floor if this comes through.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota very much for coming here to the floor and, Mr. Speaker, for inspiring the families across America to understand what's going on here in the United States Congress.

This is a powerful thing that is happening, and it undermines the principles of law that have held together for thousands of years in this modern era of special protected status for people based upon their self-alleged behavior and what goes on in their minds. This is a breathtaking thing that may take place here tomorrow, and I clearly oppose it, Mr. Speaker.

But in the interest of time, I'd be very happy to yield to the favorite daughter of Oklahoma, the gentlewoman (Ms. FALLIN).

Ms. FALLIN. Thank you to the gentleman from Iowa. I appreciate your hosting this hour tonight for us to discuss a very important issue to our Nation and a very important issue to this Congress and this body. And I appreciate the words that have been spoken so eloquently by my colleagues here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address a couple of things in this piece of legislation that should give us pause as we look at the intent of this legislation, this bill.

First of all, it would federalize a number of crimes that have traditionally been left to the States. Assault is a local crime. So is homicide. But under this bill, the Department of Justice would be allowed and encouraged to jump into these cases when they met certain criteria as a hate crime. The Federal Government does not have unlimited resources or even manpower; so do we really want the prosecutors, who should be dealing with things like terrorists or mobsters, dealing with and debating what a street corner thug may or may not have said or may or may not have thought when it comes to a mugging? Local law enforcement and local prosecutors, local courts do an outstanding job of handling such cases, and Congress should let them do their jobs.

But, second, this bill is also a clear violation of the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. It creates a special class of victims. It says one victim is more important than another victim, and in doing so, it relegates every other victim to a position of second class. Assault is assault, murder is murder, and they are all hate crimes,

in my opinion. But this bill elevates some victims and downgrades others. And this is every bit as unconstitutional as even a poll tax might be for this Nation.

And, third, this bill opens the door to the regulation of speech. And this really bothers me. One of our very basic foundations of our Nation, one of our very basic ideals of our Nation that we hold so dear is the freedom of speech, liberty and justice for all. I have to say I do find hate speech very abhorrent. It is childish. It is hurtful. It is wrong. But yet this piece of legislation, when you make hate speech a special precursor to a criminal act, you're only one step away from making speech itself an offense. And then who decides what comment will qualify for the hate speech?

When you look at some other countries like Canada and Great Britain who started out with hate crime laws like this and then they added hate speech as a separate offense and then what we find in those countries is now that Columnists in those countries must avoid certain subjects. Columnists must worry whether a caricature may become a crime.

And even more troubling is perhaps the way this legislation like this also threatens religion and freedom of religion. Should a Christian minister or a rabbi or an imam have to worry about what their message is maybe if it deals with something like sexuality and that might be considered to be hate speech? If so, that would be an unprecedented violation of the first amendment rights and a direct blow to the religious liberty in this country.

This legislation may be well intentioned, but it also puts this country on a very dangerous path. And more importantly, the Constitution, as well as a sense of very basic fairness, prohibits the elevation of one class of citizens above another.

All victims deserve justice. All victims deserve equal justice, and it should be equally rendered. But this bill is the wrong answer, and I want to urge my colleagues to reject this legislation.

To the gentleman of Iowa, I appreciate you, once again, for allowing us the time to discuss a very important issue with our Nation and to express our opinions.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I so much thank the gentlewoman from Oklahoma for coming to the floor to raise the issue that is so important as this House prepares tomorrow to attempt to cross this great divide. This great divide from punishing the acts of a crime, the overt acts of a crime, to divining what was in the mind of the perpetrator and using a definition of what's in the mind presumably of the alleged victim in order to come to some conclusion as to how much prison time a person deserves for an overt act that can be defined but not the thoughts, Mr. Speaker.

At this point I'd be very happy to yield to the gentleman from South

Carolina. Since we had a favorite daughter from Oklahoma, I would like to introduce a favorite son of South Carolina. The wonderful hospitality of South Carolina which I have experienced in every trip I have made down there, the Representative of which is Mr. GRESHAM BARRETT.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Not only is the gentleman from Iowa a stalwart when it comes to the conservative cause in this House, he is a classmate of mine and a dear friend. So I certainly thank him for all the fights he has been in in the past and will continue to be in in the future.

H.R. 1913, the Hate Crimes bill, this legislation is wrong and I oppose it because it creates a special class of victim, suppresses religious freedom, and criminalizes thought.

I ask you tonight why does Lady Liberty wear a blindfold? Isn't it because our Constitution demands equal, not special, but equal protection under the law?

Under this bill, justice will no longer be equal. It will depend on a victim's race, gender, or sexual orientation. This legislation would allow for different penalties to be imposed for the exact same crime.

While I'm not a constitutional scholar probably like my friend from Iowa, it's abundantly clear to me that this bill would violate the 14th amendment by creating a special class of victims who deserve some type of special protection under the law. More importantly, I fear this legislation would unwind a key thread to our judicial system by placing higher value on one life or lifestyle over another.

In addition to creating a special class of victims, this legislation could allow for criminal prosecution of religious leaders or members of religious groups who express their beliefs of their respective faiths. Pastors, imams, rabbis, people from across the country would now be forced to question the legality of the words that they preach. Consequently, this bill would inhibit religious freedom in our society. A scary thought.

Unfortunately, constitutionally protected speech is not the only freedom jeopardized by the Hate Crimes bill. This legislation would go so far as to guess what? Criminalize thought. No matter how fervently we disagree with what someone thinks, we cannot punish them for thinking it. It is the criminal action that merits swift justice. The action, not the thought or the motivation.

I fear that H.R. 1913 is a step in the wrong direction. When I think about justice, I think about justice for all no matter who you are in the United States of America. And I would urge all my colleagues tomorrow to vote "no" on H.R. 1913 because I certainly will be.

I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding. I thank him for weighing in on this fight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for com-

ing to the floor tonight and for addressing this subject matter.

Mr. Speaker, this so-called Hate Crimes legislation that proposes to understand and punish what's in the minds of people who may be committing crimes against victims or property, victims or property, Mr. Speaker. I don't know how somebody hates somebody else's property enough that if they would paint some graffiti on their garage door that what goes on in the mind of the person that has committed this act of vandalism can be punished with 10 years in the penitentiary but the act itself might be, well, let's say, a minimal fine for a misdemeanor of vandalism.

Mr. Speaker, I will lay out some scenarios here so that you and everyone else that is listening in can understand, I think, more clearly what's ahead of us. I have asked that we put together some definitions and these definitions that aren't in the bill, the definition that I described a little bit earlier of gender identity, when I asked the authors of the bill what is gender identity, they tell me, well, it's defined in the bill, don't you know. Defined in the bill, don't you know. And it's on page 14, line 24 and 25. Gender identity is the "actual or perceived gender-related characteristics." And I described it, Mr. Speaker, as describing that, well, what is the definition of a fence post? Well, that's an item that has the characteristics of a fence post. What's the definition of gender identity? Well, that's "actual or perceived gender-related characteristics."

This is a lawyer's dream. This is a judge's dream. This is a full-blown open license to do whatever one will when you get into a criminal court of law and argue whatever one will. This is almost intentional ambiguity written into legislation, legislation that we tried mightily to refine and perfect with definitions and clarity in the Judiciary Committee. Each effort was rebutted without a logical, and I repeat that, Mr. Speaker, without a logical rebuttal. Just simply: This is our bill, it's going to come out of committee the way it came in because we have determined that's what it's going to be. And we have exposed so many vulnerabilities, so many weaknesses, so many built-in biases, so many unjust scenarios in the debate in the committee that lasted 2 days that the Speaker of the House and the Chair of the Judiciary Committee and whoever else who has something to say about this decided we dare not allow one single amendment on the floor of the House of Representatives because if we do, it will expose these ambiguities, it will expose the bias, it will expose the departure from the hundreds of years old tradition and knowledge of what law is.

Natural rights that come from God, Mr. Speaker. They are reflected also in English common law, and they flow through our Declaration, and they show up in our Constitution. And they are billed here in this Congress for

more than 200 years. And we've punished always the overt act, not the thought, Mr. Speaker. And this is thought crimes; it's not hate crimes. We can't know if someone hates. Someone could commit a crime and not know what someone else's gender identity is, for example.

I will ask again how does one know? Could I go on the streets of Madison, Wisconsin, and go identify someone that fits this category of sexual orientation and discriminate against them? How do I know, Mr. Speaker?

And here are some of the protected qualifications that exist within the language of this bill. Never mind the verbal response was, well, no, sexual orientation only includes heterosexuality or homosexuality. Nothing else? No, nothing else. The expert from Madison, Wisconsin, where they should have some experts, I would think. Heterosexuality or homosexuality. It doesn't include bisexuality.

□ 2130

So anybody on the continuum between extreme heterosexuality and extreme homosexuality, anybody that might fit exactly in the middle or anyone in the continuum, they would not be part of this definition of "sexual orientation" that is one of the subjects and one of the special protected classes of this bill.

So I look around, and we come up with some definitions for sexual orientation. Here is one. This is from the Merriam-Webster Dictionary, and it is sexual orientation. "One's attraction to and preference in sexual partners."

That is mental. It is up here. You can't know that. You can't see that. You can't tell that. It can't be independently verified. It is not an immutable characteristic. It may or may not be willfully changed by the person that has a particular sexual orientation, Mr. Speaker. That is a mental definition.

Here is the other physical definition of sexual orientation, and this is from the American Heritage Stedman's Medical—medical—Dictionary. It says this: "Sexual activity with people of the opposite sex, the same sex or both." That is sexual orientation. So it might be the thought, it might be the act. It is not a physical characteristic. But gender may be a physical characteristic.

Now, I could go through this and confuse everyone more, and in the short period of time I have I will say this: We don't agree on what sexual orientation is, whether we are going to be defining it from the Merriam-Webster Dictionary or from the American Heritage Stedman's Medical Dictionary. They are two different things.

But if you look at the paraphilias that are produced by the American Psychology Association, here is what they have. And "paraphilia" is a powerful and persistent sexual interest other than typical sexual behavior. They have 547 specific sexual orientation proclivities, all of which are specially protected in this legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Here is another definition for sexual orientation. "Refers to feelings and self-concept, not behavior." But it might be behavior, because we know that the American Heritage Stedman's Medical Dictionary says it is a behavior.

But here is a list of the particular paraphilias, you might call them proclivities, you might call them some other things, that are specially protected in this bill under the broad definition of sexual orientation. Some of these I just simply can't say here on this floor.

Asphyxophilia. That would be a fixation with, a proclivity for strangulation, starvation for oxygen.

Autogynophilia. That is someone who sees themselves as someone of the opposite sex, a man seeing himself as a woman or vice versa.

Bisexuality, which was defined in the committee as not part of it, is part of sexual orientation.

It goes on. I have a more concise list over here, Mr. Speaker, and that goes down the line of exhibitionism; incest; partialism, which is an obsession with a specific body part; masochism; sadism; scatalogia, that is obscene phone calls; toucherism, which is, you can imagine, someone who gropes; voyeurism; bestiality. The list of these things go on and on and on.

I offered the amendment, Mr. Speaker, that would have at least eliminated and given us a start, eliminated pedophilia. But pedophiles are specifically protected under this hate crimes legislation. Everything you can imagine is under there, every proclivity, every paraphilia is specially protected under this hate crimes legislation.

It makes a Federal crime out of something that has been a local crime, and they reach across the lines of logic in an unconstitutional fashion to define acts against these proclivities as Federal crimes.

So imagine this. Let's just say you were in Chicago, the President's hometown, and there are folks all in there at a sports bar watching a White Sox game versus the Cubs, or an inter-league game perhaps, Mr. Speaker. And let's just understand that there is some friction involved between White Sox fans and Cubs fans, and they start to hurl some expletives and start to call each other some names and start to make some presumptions about the other side, the other fans, about what their particular proclivities might be. And someone throws a beer or an ash-tray and pretty soon they get in a fight, and you have got 15 people on one side that are Cubs fans, 15 people on the other side who are White Sox fans, all of whom have been called some kind of name about their particular paraphilias or proclivities, and we have now a Federal hate crimes brawl on our hands that can enhance the penalties beyond that imagined by the aldermen of Chicago, the local jurisdiction that might be there.

It brings the Feds in to deal with this, to sort this all out, because we

are going to imagine what is in the minds of these people that are Cubs fans and White Sox fans, and I for one can't imagine what would be in the mind of a White Sox fan.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. STARK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TONKO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HENSARLING) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, May 5.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, May 5.

Mr. McHENRY, for 5 minutes, April 30, May 4 and 5.

Mr. CONAWAY, for 5 minutes, today and April 29.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, April 29.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today and April 29.

Mr. CARTER, for 5 minutes, April 29.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 29, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1422. A letter from the Director, Policy Issues Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Requirements for the Disposition of Cattle that Become Non-Ambulatory Disabled Following Ante-Mortem Inspection — received March 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1423. A letter from the Management Analyst, Rural Development, RUS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — General Policies, Types

of Loans, Loan Requirements-Telecommunications (RIN: 0572-AC13) received March 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1424. A letter from the Acting Administrator Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Cabbage Crop Insurance Provisions (RIN: 0563-AB99) received March 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1425. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Modification of Pesticide Tolerance Revocation for Diazinon [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-1170; FRL-8410-1] received April 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1426. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cyhalofop-butyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0361; FRL-8406-8] received April 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1427. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Spiromesifen; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0272; FRL-8406-6] received April 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1428. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Thiamethoxam; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0167; FRL-8407-8] received April 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1429. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Captan, 2,4-D, Dodine, DCPA, Endothall, Fomesafen, Propyzamide, Ethofumesate, Permethrin, Dimethipin, and Fenarimol; Technical Amendment [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0097; FRL-8407-2] received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1430. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oil Pollution Prevention; Non-Transportation Related Onshore Facilities; Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Rule — Final Amendments [EPA-HQ-OPA-2007-0584; FRL-8788-5] (RIN: 2050-AG16) received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1431. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Prothioconazole; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0327; FRL-8403-9] received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1432. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Quinoxifen; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0362; FRL-8405-2] received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1433. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Castor Oil, Ehtoxylated, Oleate; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0666; FRL-8399-8] received March 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1434. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dinotefuran; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0845; FRL-8401-5] received March 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1435. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fenpropathrin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0875; FRL-8400-8] received March 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1436. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Propiconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-1202; FRL-8403-7] received March 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1437. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Thymol; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0081; FRL-8404-4] received March 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1438. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Triethanolamine; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0346; FRL-8404-1] received March 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1439. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tristyrylphenol Ethoxylates (CAS Reg. No. 70559-25-0) and (CAS Reg. No. 99734-09-5); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0095; FRL-8404-7] received March 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1440. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting the Council's Annual Report for 2008, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 3305, section 1006(f); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1441. A letter from the Designated Federal Official, Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, transmitting the Council's report entitled, "Report of Activities and Recommendations to Congress 2001-2008; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1442. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — *Bacillus subtilis* MBI 600; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0762; FRL-8408-7] received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1443. A letter from the Attorney, Office of Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Standards for Certain Consumer Products and Commercial and Industrial Equipment (RIN: 1904-AB74) received March 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1444. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on Public Readiness and Emergency Prepared-

ness (PREP) Act declarations for Botulinum toxin, Smallpox, Acute Radiation Syndrome and Pandemic Influenza, pursuant to Section 319F-3 of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1445. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Standards of Performance for Stationary Combustion Turbines [EPA-HQ-OAR-2004-0490; FRL-8784-4] (RIN: 2060-AO23) received March 17, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1446. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Lead; Fees for Accreditation of Training Programs and Certification of Lead-based Paint Activities and Renovation Contractors [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2008-0382; FRL-8404-2] (RIN: 2070-AJ40) received March 17, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1447. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [DE103-1101; FRL-8789-7] received April 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1448. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia; Enhanced Inspection and Maintenance Plan [EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0181; FRL-8892-8] received April 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1449. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Diesel Idling Rule Revisions [Docket No.: EPA-R02-OAR-2008-0659, FRL-8757-6] received April 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1450. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Wisconsin: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R05-RCRA-2008-0712; FRL-8789-6] received April 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1451. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Operating Permits Program; State of Missouri [EPA-R07-OAR-2008-0793; FRL-8791-6] received April 13, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1452. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ocean Dumping; Designation of Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site offshore of the Rogue River, Oregon [EPA-R10-OW-2008-0745; FRL-8791-2] received April 13, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1453. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Wisconsin: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R05-RCRA-2008-0711; FRL-8788-9] received April 13, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1454. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act) Supplemental Funding for Brownfields Revolving Loan Fund (RLF) Grantees [FRL-8791-3] received April 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1455. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment of the One-Hour Ozone Standard for the Southern New Jersey Portion of the Philadelphia Metropolitan Nonattainment Area [EPA-R02-OAR-2008-0479; FRL-8775-5] received April 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1456. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Kansas; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [FRL-8760-9] received April 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1457. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Priorities List, Final Rule No. 46 [EPA-HQ-SFUND-2008-0575, EPA-HQ-SFUND-2008-0576, EPA-HQ-SFUND-2008-0577, EPA-HQ-SFUND-2008-0585, EPA-HQ-SFUND-2008-0580, EPA-HQ-SFUND-2008-0581, EPA-HQ-SFUND-2008-0582, EPA-HQ-SFUND-2008-0583, EPA-HQ-SFUND-2008-0083; FRL-8790-1] (RIN: 2050-AD75) received April 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1458. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Albuquerque/Bernalillo County [EPA-R06-OAR-2008-0509; FRL-8788-8] received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1459. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Revisions to the Nevada State Implementation Plan; Updated Statutory and Regulatory Provisions; Rescissions [EPA-R09-OAR-2007-1155; FRL-8767-5] received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1460. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Variance Determination for Particulate Matter from a Specific Source in the State of New Jersey; [Docket No.: EPA-R02-OAR-2008-0020; FRL-8775-6] received March 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1461. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Hazardous Chemical Reporting; Tier II Inventory Information. [EPA-HQ-SFUND-0002; FRL-8785-3] (RIN: 2020-AE17) received March 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1462. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Performance Specification 16 for Predictive Emissions Monitoring Systems and Amendments to Testing and Monitoring Provisions [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0074;

FRL-8785-4] (RIN: 2060-AG21) received March 23, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1463. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Evert and Ludington, Michigan) [MB Docket No.: 08-26 RM-11418] received April 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1464. A letter from the Vice Admiral, USN Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting certification of a proposed lease of defense articles to the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. 02-09), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 39, 62(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1465. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Australia for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 09-17), pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1466. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Mexico for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 09-13), pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1467. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to the United Arab Emirates (Transmittal No. DDTC 009-09), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 39, 36(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1468. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed export of defense articles and services to Spain (Transmittal No. DDTC 135-08), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 39, 36(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1469. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of defense articles to Turkey (Transmittal No. DDTC 014-09), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 39, 36(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1470. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles to Japan (Transmittal No. DDTC 017-09), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 39, 36(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1471. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of technical data, defense services, and defense articles to Italy and the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DDTC 016-09), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 39, 36(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1472. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement to include the export of technical data, defense services, and defense articles to Mexico (Transmittal No. DDTC 006-09), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 39, 36(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1473. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of

State, transmitting the Department's report covering current military, diplomatic, political, and economic measures that are being or have been undertaken to complete the mission in Iraq successfully, pursuant to Public Law 109-163, as amended by Public Law 110-181, section 1223 and Pub. L. 110-47, section 1213(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1474. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on U.S. support for Taiwan's participation as an observer at the 62nd World Health Assembly and in the work of the World Health Organization, as mandated in the Participation of the 2004 Taiwan in the World Health Organization Act, Pub. L. 108-235, Sec. 1(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1475. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's Annual Report on Security-Related Assistance Provided by the United States to the Countries of Central Asia for fiscal year 2008, pursuant to Public Law 110-161, section 698(C); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1476. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's annual report for 2007 on United States Participation in the United Nations, pursuant to Public Law 79-264, section 4(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1477. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report for 2009 entitled, "Celebrating Life", pursuant to Public Law 108-25; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1478. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification for Fiscal Year 2009 that no United Nations organization or United Nations affiliated agency grants any official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization which promotes and condones or seeks the legalization of pedophilia, or which includes as a subsidiary or member any such organization, pursuant to Public Law 103-236, section 102(g); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1479. A letter from the Chairman, House Democracy Assistance Commission, transmitting the Commission's 2007 annual report, prepared in accordance with section 3(c) of House Resolution 24; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1480. A letter from the Associate Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's 2008 annual report on certain activities pertaining to the Freedom of Information Act, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1481. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's report for fiscal year 2008 on articles, materials, or supplies purchased outside of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1482. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a designation of additional members of the Special-Exposure Cohort from Tyson Valley Farm near Eureka, Missouri, pursuant to 42 C.F.R. pt. 83; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1483. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference on the United States, transmitting a draft bill to create Article III judgeships and address needs regarding existing temporary judgeships in the U.S. courts of appeals and district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1484. A letter from the Staff Director, United States Commission on Civil Rights,

transmitting notification of the establishment of the Illinois State Advisory Committee, pursuant to 41 CFR 102-3.70; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1485. A letter from the Staff Director, United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification of the establishment of the North Carolina State Advisory Committee, pursuant to 41 CFR 102-3.70; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1486. A letter from the Staff Director, United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification of the establishment of the Minnesota State Advisory Committee, pursuant to 41 CFR 102-3.70; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1487. A letter from the Register of Copyrights, United States Copyright Office, transmitting a schedule of proposed new copyright fees and the accompanying analysis, pursuant to Public Law 105-80 (111 Stat. 1529); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1488. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Withdrawal of NPDES Voluntary Permit Fee Incentive for Clean Water Act Section 106 Grants; Allotment Formula [EPA-HQ-OW-2006-0765; FRL-8792-3] (RIN: 2040-AE99) received April 13, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. Supplemental report on H.R. 1913. A bill to provide Federal assistance to States, local jurisdictions, and Indian tribes to prosecute hate crimes, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-86 Pt. 2).

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 371. Resolution providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2010, revising the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2011 through 2014 (Rept. 111-90). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 372. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1913) to provide Federal assistance to States, local jurisdictions, and Indian tribes to prosecute hate crimes, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-91). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FARR, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. NADLER of New York):

H.R. 2132. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to permit leave to care for a same-sex spouse, domestic partner, parent-in-law, adult child, sibling, or grandparent who has a serious health condition; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Oversight and Government

Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. MASSA, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 2133. A bill to amend the Act of August 21, 1957, to allocate funds from certain electric power sales from the Niagara Power Project in New York to capital needs of Western New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. MACK, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 2134. A bill to establish the Western Hemisphere Drug Policy Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REHBERG (for himself and Ms. MARKEY of Colorado):

H.R. 2135. A bill to amend section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that funds received as universal service contributions and the universal service support programs established pursuant to that section are not subject to certain provisions of title 31, United States Code, commonly known as the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 2136. A bill to establish the Honorable Stephanie Tubbs Jones Fire Suppression Demonstration Incentive Program within the Department of Education to promote installation of fire sprinkler systems, or other fire suppression or prevention technologies, in qualified student housing and dormitories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. STARK, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2137. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and title 5, United States Code, to require individual and group health insurance coverage and group health plans and Federal employees health benefit plans to provide coverage for routine HIV screening; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Ways and Means, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. BOREN):

H.R. 2138. A bill to provide grants to establish veteran's treatment courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

H.R. 2139. A bill to direct the President to develop and implement a comprehensive national strategy to further the United States foreign policy objective of promoting global development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 2140. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the withholding requirement with respect to proceeds from

certain pari-mutuel wagers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HARE, Mr. SIREN, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. CLARKE, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 2141. A bill to reform the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CUELLAR (for himself and Mr. MOORE of Kansas):

H.R. 2142. A bill to require the review of Government programs at least once every 5 years for purposes of assessing their performance and improving their operations, and to establish the Performance Improvement Council; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 2143. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the Secretary of the Treasury to not impose a penalty for failure to disclose reportable transactions when there is reasonable cause for such failure, to modify such penalty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, and Ms. FALLIN):

H.R. 2144. A bill to permit a State to elect to receive the State's contributions to the Highway Trust Fund in lieu of its Federal-aid Highway program apportionment for the next fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2145. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restrict the application of the windfall elimination provision to individuals whose combined monthly income from benefits under such title and other monthly periodic payments exceeds a minimum COLA-adjusted amount of \$2,500 and to provide for a graduated implementation of such provision on amounts above such minimum amount; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HALVORSON:

H.R. 2146. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the additional standard deduction for State and local real property taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HODES (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 2147. A bill to establish the Global Warming Economic Oversight Commission to study and report on the use by the Federal Government of funds from any auction or sale of greenhouse gas emissions allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 2148. A bill to promote the development and use of marine renewable energy technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. CANTOR):

H.R. 2149. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct ac-

tivities to rapidly advance treatments for spinal muscular atrophy, neuromuscular disease, and other pediatric diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HILL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BACA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. CAMP, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. KILROY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 2150. A bill to increase the amount of direct loans that may be provided by the Secretary of Energy to improve facilities for advanced technology vehicles manufacturing; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2151. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit discrimination in the payment of wages on account of sex, race, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 2152. A bill to authorize certain private rights of action under the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 for violations by foreign concerns that damage domestic businesses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. STUPAK:

H.R. 2153. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to increase the extent to which State law is used in determining whether a criminal conviction under State law is sufficient to deny a person the right to ship, transport, possess, or receive a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 2154. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for an additional, limited exception to the provision prohibiting a State or local officer or employee from being a candidate for elective office; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa):

H.R. 2155. A bill to provide for the limitation on entry of steel, drywall, and cement products that fail to meet industry standards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. PERRIELLO, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mr. NADLER of New York):

H.R. 2156. A bill to implement a pilot program to establish truck parking facilities; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 2157. A bill to provide increased funding for and improvement of the Debbie Smith DNA backlog grant program, to provide for DNA technology enhancement grants, to reauthorize certain DNA-related grant programs under the Justice For All Act of 2004, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2158. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a Federal income tax credit for the purchase of certain

nonroad equipment with alternative power sources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 61st anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself and Mr. MCHENRY):

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of a "National Lao-Hmong Recognition Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. BOCCIERI):

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the murder of United States Air Force Reserve Major Karl D. Hoerig and the need for prompt justice in State of Ohio v. Claudia C. Hoerig; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BACHMANN:

H. Res. 373. A resolution expressing support for designation of the month of September as "National Hydrocephalus Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GRAVES (for himself and Mr. GUTHRIE):

H. Res. 374. A resolution recognizing the roles and contributions of America's teachers to building and enhancing our Nation's civic, cultural, and economic well-being; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HARE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H. Res. 375. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Workers' Memorial Day in order to honor and remember the workers who have been killed or injured in the workplace; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H. Res. 376. A resolution expressing support for designation of the calendar year 2009 as "The Year of the Safe Child" to raise awareness and encourage the prevention of unintentional injuries among the Nation's children; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 17: Mr. MARCHANT.
- H.R. 21: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 22: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. HEINRICH.
- H.R. 52: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. MANZULLO.
- H.R. 179: Mr. LATOURETTE.
- H.R. 197: Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. COLE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CHILDERS, and Mr. MARCHANT.
- H.R. 203: Mr. BURGESS.
- H.R. 233: Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 262: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
- H.R. 270: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

- H.R. 333: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
- H.R. 362: Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 387: Mr. GALLEGLEY.
- H.R. 403: Mr. FILNER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. SERRANO.
- H.R. 442: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
- H.R. 484: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 556: Mr. MCNERNEY.
- H.R. 558: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.
- H.R. 600: Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 621: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GALLEGLEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. PLATTS.
- H.R. 669: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
- H.R. 702: Mr. KILDEE.
- H.R. 874: Mr. KILDEE.
- H.R. 877: Mr. GOODLATTE.
- H.R. 904: Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 952: Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, and Mr. MICHAUD.
- H.R. 997: Mr. ROONEY.
- H.R. 1018: Mr. FARR.
- H.R. 1020: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. TIERNEY.
- H.R. 1027: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
- H.R. 1053: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
- H.R. 1067: Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 1074: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. COLE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MACK, and Mr. MARCHANT.
- H.R. 1086: Mr. STEARNS.
- H.R. 1087: Mr. GOODLATTE.
- H.R. 1136: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 1179: Mr. WITTMAN.
- H.R. 1188: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARNEY, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
- H.R. 1189: Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 1190: Mr. BRIGHT.
- H.R. 1204: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. MURTHA.
- H.R. 1207: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. TIAHRT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
- H.R. 1209: Mr. KISSELL.
- H.R. 1210: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
- H.R. 1211: Mr. TONKO and Mr. NADLER of New York.
- H.R. 1213: Mr. INSLER.
- H.R. 1231: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
- H.R. 1318: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
- H.R. 1326: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
- H.R. 1327: Mr. BACA, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. GIFFORDS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. LANCE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. DENT.
- H.R. 1336: Mr. MICHAUD.
- H.R. 1362: Mr. BOYD.
- H.R. 1410: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
- H.R. 1415: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. HILL.
- H.R. 1430: Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 1449: Mr. LATTA.
- H.R. 1452: Mr. GOODLATTE.
- H.R. 1454: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FALEOMAVEGA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr.

- POSEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
- H.R. 1470: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. AKIN.
- H.R. 1474: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. HOLT.
- H.R. 1475: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 1479: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
- H.R. 1499: Mr. WITTMAN.
- H.R. 1511: Mr. WOLF, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. CARNAHAN.
- H.R. 1545: Mr. PAUL.
- H.R. 1549: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 1558: Mr. POLIS of Colorado and Mr. BOOZMAN.
- H.R. 1589: Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BERMAN, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
- H.R. 1600: Mr. DOYLE.
- H.R. 1605: Mr. CARNAHAN.
- H.R. 1621: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. POE of Texas.
- H.R. 1625: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BONNER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
- H.R. 1646: Ms. TITUS.
- H.R. 1670: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 1676: Mr. ISSA.
- H.R. 1684: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 1692: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. SOUDER.
- H.R. 1693: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. SESTAK.
- H.R. 1708: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. RAHALL.
- H.R. 1709: Mr. HONDA and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 1710: Mr. PRICE of Georgia and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 1723: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 1724: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
- H.R. 1739: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 1740: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.
- H.R. 1742: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
- H.R. 1744: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
- H.R. 1802: Mr. PITTS.
- H.R. 1827: Mr. GONZALEZ.
- H.R. 1835: Mr. COLE and Mr. THORNBERRY.
- H.R. 1842: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
- H.R. 1849: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
- H.R. 1877: Mr. COURTNEY.
- H.R. 1884: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MCHUGH, and Ms. KAPTUR.
- H.R. 1925: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. SABLAN.
- H.R. 1941: Mr. HOLDEN.
- H.R. 1944: Mr. CANTOR and Mrs. BACHMANN.
- H.R. 1948: Mr. MCHUGH.
- H.R. 1956: Ms. HIRONO.
- H.R. 1960: Mr. HENSARLING.
- H.R. 1966: Mr. SPACE, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
- H.R. 1977: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. NYE.
- H.R. 1985: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
- H.R. 1993: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
- H.R. 1998: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. FLEMING.
- H.R. 2014: Mr. GALLEGLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. KENNEDY.
- H.R. 2020: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

- H.R. 2034: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 2038: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 2047: Mr. MCHUGH.
 H.R. 2060: Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 2067: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. CLARKE.
 H.R. 2070: Ms. HARMAN.
 H.R. 2077: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 2081: Mrs. MALONEY.
 H.R. 2103: Mr. TERRY and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H.R. 2110: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 2116: Mr. BOREN.
 H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. SULLIVAN.
 H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Ms. WATSON, Mr. HARE, and Mr. SERRANO.
 H. Con. Res. 108: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. HALL of New York.
 H. Res. 57: Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. WEINER.
 H. Res. 90: Ms. BORDALLO.
 H. Res. 156: Mrs. MYRICK.
 H. Res. 166: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H. Res. 175: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H. Res. 185: Mr. MARSHALL and Mrs. MYRICK.
 H. Res. 191: Mr. FORBES, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. TONKO.
 H. Res. 192: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. HOLT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LANCE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KIND, Mr. WU, Mr. HARE, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RUSH, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H. Res. 204: Mr. UPTON, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H. Res. 209: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H. Res. 259: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. DINGELL.
 H. Res. 260: Ms. WATSON and Ms. WATERS.
 H. Res. 266: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. MARSHALL.
 H. Res. 267: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland.
 H. Res. 270: Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H. Res. 272: Mr. HENSARLING.
 H. Res. 291: Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H. Res. 299: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. COSTA.
 H. Res. 314: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H. Res. 331: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. KLEIN of Florida.
 H. Res. 338: Mr. MASSA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H. Res. 345: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PERRIELLO, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Res. 347: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. FORBES.
 H. Res. 349: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WU, Mr. CAO, Mr. WALZ, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. FORBES.
 H. Res. 350: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. ALTMIRE.
 H. Res. 357: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Ms. CLARKE.
 H. Res. 360: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mrs. MYRICK.
 H. Res. 363: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H. Res. 367: Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. SIREN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. GERLACH.