United States
*of* America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

*Vol. 156* WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2010 *No. 6*

# *House of Representatives*

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

## DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
*January 20, 2010.*

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN T. SALAZAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

## PRAYER

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

Lord God, Creator of heaven and Earth, Eternal Shepherd of the living and the dead, as a Nation we unite with other nations of the world and pray for our suffering brothers and sisters in the poverty-stricken and Earth-shaken nation of Haiti. Have mercy on us all.

We beg You to help all the people of Haiti in all their needs. Come to the aid of the afflicted. Take pity on the helpless and the most vulnerable. Raise up the fallen as well as the ruins where human life and human remains may be still hidden. Restrain the wayward and sustain the brokenhearted. Bring compassion to those who mourn and eternal life to those who are buried in anonymity.

For, with the people of Haiti, we call upon You, Lord, as the everlasting Redeemer and Resurrection, both now and forever.

Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

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

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. POE of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

## WALL STREET REFORM

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Wall Street Bonus Tax Act. The legislation introduced by Congressman PETER WELCH would right a terrible wrong.

Right now, dozens of the financial institutions responsible for the economic meltdown are reverting right back to their old bad habits. They are getting ready to clap themselves on the back for the great job they think they've been doing by giving themselves billions of dollars in bonuses. But the thanks and the bonuses should go not to the bankers at Goldman Sachs and Citigroup and the others; it should go back to the American people.

It was the American people who stepped in and saved the banks from themselves. It was the American people who pumped billions of taxpayer dollars into Wall Street to keep it from melting down and taking the rest of the economy with it. And it should be the American people who reap the benefits of that action, not Wall Street banks.

Congress should pass the Wall Street Bonus Tax Act and give the American people their money back.

## SECOND SHOT HEARD AROUND THE WORLD

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on April 19, 1775, 235 years ago, shots rang out in Massachusetts that forever changed the history of the world. British redcoats were ordered to seize the weapons of the American militia, even though it's never a good idea to try to disarm the American people.

The famous midnight ride of Paul Revere warned the Minutemen that the invincible British were coming. And as the sun rose over the town of Lexington, Massachusetts, the first shots rang out against the British tyranny, shots heard around the world.

At the north bridge of Concord, patriots fought the British Army. The mighty British were defeated and turned back towards Boston. These were the first battles of the American Revolution to throw off the yoke of tyranny for a new idea of freedom.

The people of Massachusetts have fired a second shot heard around the world. Yesterday, they fired back against big, intrusive government, not with bullets, but with ballots. The Senate election was a statement for freedom over oppression. Our government, like the British, would do well never to underestimate the American people.

And that's just the way it is.



Printed on recycled paper.

## HONORING STAFF SERGEANT DANIEL MERRIWEATHER

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a Memphis, Shelby County citizen who gave his life in service to our country in Afghanistan, Staff Sergeant Daniel Merriweather. He was the second soldier from Shelby County to die in Afghanistan since the beginning of Operation Enduring Freedom and our 12th in the Middle East since 2002. Staff Sergeant Merriweather, who was with the 118th Military Police Company, died when his convoy ran over an improvised explosive device.

He graduated from Overton High School in Memphis, Tennessee. He studied broadcast journalism, played football, loved sports, cowboy hats, boots, and country music. And you can see from his picture and from the reflections of his friends how much he loved life and how popular he was.

He wanted to serve his country, and he did so. He did two tours of duty, one in Afghanistan and one in Iraq. At 25 years of age, he is survived by his wife, Rachelle; his two children, 3-year-old Kale and Daniel Merriweather, Jr., just 3 months old; his parents, Pamela and Darryl Finnie; his sister, Adrienne; and his brother, Darryl Finnie, Jr.

These are the 12 soldiers who died from Shelby County, and unfortunately Staff Sergeant Merriweather joins that company.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a moment to honor the service and memory of Staff Sergeant Merriweather.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you, Sergeant Merriweather.

## PRESIDENT'S INAUGURATION ONE YEAR AGO

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today, the President was sworn into office, giving Democrats full control of Congress and the White House. After promising the American people a misnamed stimulus plan to keep unemployment under 8 percent, we see 10 percent unemployment continuing to cripple families.

Three hundred and sixty-five days later, the American people still haven't seen this Congress focus on job creation policies to promote small businesses. Instead, the American people have been saddled with more borrowing, more taxes, more spending, and increased deficits. As shown in Massachusetts, the American people support limited government, not failed big government.

Seven million Americans have lost jobs since Democrats took Congress, and now Americans want real change. It's time the Democrats get this message and get their priorities straight: Drop this backroom government health care takeover and take up job creation policies.

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

## MAIN STREET NEEDS HELP

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

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, last fall, at the end of the last administration, we all know that America's largest financial institutions and companies were on the brink of collapse, and the Federal Government, and more importantly, the American taxpayers came to their rescue. But let's be clear: We did not do that because we were fans of their behavior. We did not appreciate even then the excessive greed that was driving Wall Street without any sense of responsibility. We helped them because ordinary citizens were being crushed, and we hoped to get the credit flowing.

So what has happened? Wall Street has experienced recovery, but Main Street still needs help. Wall Street needs to help pay for the revitalization of Main Street, and that is why I support the Wall Street Bonus Tax, which is going to levy a tax on those excessive bonuses that the Wall Street banks have the audacity to continue to give out even as the plight of our middle class is suffering.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do everything we can to stand up for the American taxpayers and the people who live in our communities.

## LESSONS TO BE LEARNED FROM SPECIAL ELECTION IN MASSACHUSETTS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the United States Senate special election in Massachusetts offers many lessons for both Democrats and Republicans. Surely among them are these:

All true reform starts with the voice of the people.

Moderation beats extremism.

Common sense triumphs partisanship.

Voters can exercise real independence.

One-party control leads to arrogance.

There are few guaranteed election results.

Listen to the people, don't defy them.

Of course some will say there are no lessons to be learned or that the result of this special election should be ignored or can be explained away. But those who don't listen to the people, Democrats or Republicans, will pay a steep political price.

## AMERICANS WANT REAL CHANGE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. It's clear from the results last evening that the voters are angry. They haven't seen the change in direction that they thought they voted for 1 year ago in November.

Now, some Republicans will see it as an endorsement to turn back to the failed policies of the Bush years that put us in this mess. That wasn't the message. But the message is they want real change. They want the reform of Wall Street. They're tired of business as usual where the fat cats make out and the taxpayers get the bill. They want to see real reform in health care, take on the insurance industry, take on the pharmaceutical industry.

The Obama administration kicked off health care reform with a deal with the pharmaceutical industry. Now, that is not the kind of reform the American people want to see.

We need to step back and put forward a package of real reform. Take away the antitrust exemption of the health insurance industry; lower the cost of health care for all Americans; make the policies better; take on the pharmaceutical industry; allow people to reimport drugs from Canada that are exactly the same as the drugs sold here at a fraction of the cost. Those are the kinds of concrete steps people want to see.

## HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION CONTAINS A MARRIAGE PENALTY

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, while there is controversy about the pending health care legislation, one point where there should be bipartisan agreement is that the Federal Government should not penalize people simply for being married.

After review, it appears that both the House and the Senate bills contain significant marriage penalties. In the House bill, an unmarried couple with an income of $25,000 each would have their combined premiums capped at $3,076 per year. If the couple gets married, their annual premium cap drops to $5,160 for the same insurance. In short, there is a $2,084 penalty for simply being married.

While under the Senate bill it would be less, the marriage penalty would still exceed $1,500 a year. Simply put, a marriage penalty on the middle class is just one more reason to dump this government takeover of our health care system.

□ 1015

## A NEW ECONOMIC VISION

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, we know that job creation is Congress's job one, and we passed some time ago a great job creation engine for a clean energy economy in the United States. We passed that months ago in the U.S. House, and we know we have a tremendous opportunity for job creation. Building electric cars: I drove a Ford Focus all-electric car a couple of months ago. Building solar thermal plants: We now have contracts developing out in the Southwest. Building new energy-efficient windows: We heard from an entrepreneur the other day about the tremendous advances in energy efficiency.

Yet, to realize this economic vision, the U.S. Senate needs to get off the dime and pass a clean energy bill, and those who think that we should do nothing because Copenhagen didn't reach an agreement, I'll tell you what: the Chinese are not waiting. They're building solar plants. They're building electrical lithium-ion batteries. They're building new energy-efficient windows.

The U.S. Senate needs to join us and create a job-creating engine with clean energy and pass the energy bill.

## ''NO'' TO THE PELOSI TAKEOVER OF HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues in the House are ignoring the American people. Our constituents are holding rallies, posting blogs, talking with their neighbors, writing to their Congressmen, and are doing everything in their power to get them to listen.

The American people are telling us loud and clear: they don't want a government takeover of health care.

Listen to them. Massachusetts did. Americans want, need, and deserve better than a budget-busting, trillion-dollar health care bill when 10 percent of Americans are still unemployed. They are tired of sweetheart deals, secret meetings and dirty politics. There is still time to do what's right, to do what the people are asking us to do. Vote against the Pelosi takeover of health care.

## A SOBERING PICTURE

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a map from a new report by the Government Accountability Office that I requested in my role as Chair of the Joint Economic Committee. The report provides a detailed understanding of the state of the housing market at the end of June 2009, and it provides a sobering picture of the housing crisis this administration, President Obama, inherited.

By the end of last June, 1.7 million of the nonprime mortgages that originated from 2000–2007 had completed the foreclosure process. This map shows the estimated percentage of seriously delinquent nonprime loans by congressional district. It also serves as a map of the economic damage and social pain caused by lending practices of the past decade that were unsound by any measure.

Last year, this House passed financial regulatory reform to protect both consumers and our economy from the damaging effects of predatory lending. This sobering map is a reminder of why this legislation needs to pass into law.

## A BACKROOM DEAL TO INCREASE THE NATION'S DEBT LIMIT

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I saw the article in this month's Washington Post about the Obama administration's cutting a backroom deal with the Democrat leadership to create, by Executive order, a commission to deal with our Nation's excessive spending.

I am opposed to creating this panel by Executive order, and the American people will be opposed. Congress should be voting to create this commission, and it should be requiring that it act on the panel's recommendations.

What the President and the Democrat leadership have agreed to, which has only now come around to addressing the issue because they need political cover to increase the debt limit, is a fig leaf. This is the same group that has pushed our deficit to record levels and that has continued to write check after check from an account which already has a negative balance.

The American people will be cut out of the process. It is a backroom deal; and under this deal, the recommendations will be voted on by a lame-duck Congress, filled with retiring and defeated Members. This is wrong. Any action should be taken by a newly elected Congress, not one on the way out the door. Creating this commission by Executive order is the wrong way to go. We have to get this right. Too much is at stake.

## JOB CREATION

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

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, during the Bush administration, the unemployment rate nearly doubled. We hemorrhaged millions of jobs, including 743,000 jobs that we lost in January 2009 when President Obama was sworn in. They made the mess, but we have to fix it.

Thankfully, this President and the Democrats in Congress have put measures in place to stabilize our economy and to begin to create jobs for the more than 15.3 million people who are unemployed. To those who are actively seeking a job but who can't find one, the economy has begun to move again.

We have extended unemployment. We have extended COBRA benefits for those who are unemployed to help them make ends meet, but that's not enough. We have to continue that until we stabilize the economy significantly and until unemployment falls. During this Congress, we've really helped our job creators: small businesses. We have to do more for them to make sure we steer equity and investment to start-ups in high-growth fields like clean energy and information technology, and we have to strengthen microlending from the Small Business Administration.

Look, we are not finished until millions of Americans who want to go to work go back to work. Our job isn't done until Americans achieve the American Dream.

## HONORING IRA LEESFIELD

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Miami attorney Ira Leesfield on receiving the 2010 American Jewish Committee's Judge Learned Hand Award for Preferred Excellence.

The American Jewish Committee must have had Ira in mind when this prestigious award was created to honor the memory of Judge Learned Hand and the principles that he so well represented: individual rights and the importance of democratic values in an orderly society.

With his very strong professional background, outgoing personality and true compassion for our community, Ira Leesfield has been a strong voice for civil rights in south Florida for many years, and I am honored to count him as a friend.

As the senior and managing partner of Leesfield & Partners, P.A., Ira has received many other honors, including the Anti-Defamation League's Jurisprudence Award, and he was the first Florida recipient of the American ORT Jurisprudence Award.

I am pleased to join the American Jewish Committee, his family, friends, and neighbors in their celebration of Ira's countless contributions to our community and, indeed, to our Nation.

## THE STATE OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, how soon we forget.

It's instructive to recall where we were 9 years ago. We had created 23

million new jobs; we were at peace throughout the world. In fact, we had a projected surplus of $5.6 trillion. By this time, we would have paid off our debt. Instead, after 8 years of Republican control of all three branches of government, 8 years later, we had $12 trillion of debt; we were engaged in two wars; health care costs were strangling our families and businesses. In fact, we were losing 700,000 jobs a month.

One year later, that job loss has been cut by 90 percent. We have a health care reform bill that will enable all American families to have affordable health care at less cost. The process of governance is difficult. To just say ''no'' is irresponsible.

## GETTING THE AMERICAN ECONOMY BACK ON TRACK

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Massachusetts, Virginia, New Jersey—they have all spoken, and I think they speak for the American people.

They want us to try to work out these problems that they're facing together and not keep pointing fingers. It's time for us to get down to the job of creating jobs. They don't want this health care bill. It's pretty darn clear. That was the major issue in Massachusetts. So we need to get together and solve the problems of health care without ramming something down the people's throats from behind closed doors. It's extremely important.

They don't want higher taxes; they want lower taxes. They don't want more government interference in their lives; they want less. So what we ought to do is address the problems that are really important right now. The first thing is creating jobs and getting this economy back on track and not to try to ram a health care bill down the American people's throats that they really, really don't want.

## SAVING AMERICA FROM AN ECONOMIC ABYSS

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, there is always a great deal of danger in spontaneous reactions to elections. One of the things that I thought about last night when I watched SCOTT BROWN accept his victory in Massachusetts was that he didn't talk about returning to the agenda of 2000–2008. He didn't talk about returning to Bush economics or the Republican agenda. As a matter of fact, he never mentioned the word ''Republican.''

What he did talk about, and he talked about it extremely well, was about the need for us to listen to the people, that the job wasn't his job or a Kennedy job. This was the people's job. It's a lesson for all of us to learn.

The true political victory will be won by the party and the individuals who demonstrate responsiveness to the needs of their communities and of their citizens. We have been doing that now for a year. I think we can make a strong case on the Democratic side that we have saved this country from an economic abyss. We will continue to do that while we continue to listen to the people we work for.

## TOP 10 LIST OF HEALTH REFORM BENEFITS WASHINGTON REPUBLICANS THREATEN TO STRIP AWAY

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, we need to get our courage up and continue to reform health care. There are tremendous benefits that will be lost if we don't clearly draw the path to health care reform.

What we are doing is providing protections against insurance companies' discrimination and against losing coverage when you get sick. Insurance security, if you lose your job, will be guaranteed. There will be relief for small businesses and employers. There will be jobs for Americans in the health care industry, no lifetime limits on coverage, and there will be free preventative care.

That is what we want to do for the American people. We must go out and clearly explain the benefits, each and every one of us, to the American people.

## 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.

## PRIVATE FIRST CLASS GARFIELD M. LANGHORN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3250) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1210 West Main Street in Riverhead, New York, as the ''Private First Class Garfield M. Langhorn Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3250

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

**SECTION 1. PRIVATE FIRST CLASS GARFIELD M. LANGHORN POST OFFICE BUILDING.**

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1210 West Main Street in Riverhead, New York, shall be known and designated as the ''Private First Class Garfield M. Langhorn 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 ''Private First Class Garfield M. Langhorn Post Office Building''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

□ 1030

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. 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 proud to present H.R. 3250 for consideration. This legislation will designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1210 West Main Street in Riverhead, New York, as the ''Private First Class Garfield M. Langhorn Post Office Building.''

H.R. 3250 was introduced by my colleague and friend Representative TIM BISHOP of New York, on July 17, 2009, and was favorably reported out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee by unanimous consent on October 29, 2009. In addition, the legislation enjoys the support of the entire New York House delegation.

Born on September 10, 1948, in Cumberland, Virginia, Private First Class Garfield Langhorn distinguished himself through his brave, dedicated, and selfless military service during the Vietnam War as a member of the United States Army's Troop C, 7th Squadron, 17th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Aviation Brigade.

In recognition of his heroic actions during the Vietnam War, Private First Class Langhorn posthumously received the Medal of Honor, the highest military decoration awarded by the United States Government, as well as the Purple Heart. Private First Class Langhorn was one of 20 African American soldiers to receive the Medal of Honor for their service during the Vietnam War.

As noted by the citation accompanying his Medal of Honor, Private First Class Langhorn demonstrated ''conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life and beyond the call of duty'' while serving as a radio operator in Troop C in Vietnam's Pleiku province on January 15, 1969.

Specifically, the citation recounts that Private First Class Langhorn's

platoon had been inserted into a landing zone in order to rescue two pilots of a downed Cobra helicopter. While members of his platoon, who had found the two pilots dead, attempted to take the men's bodies to a nearby pickup location, Private First Class Langhorn provided radio coordination and covering fire as the platoon came under intense fire from enemy forces.

As darkness fell, an enemy hand grenade landed directly in front of Private First Class Langhorn and only a few feet from several wounded members of his platoon. In response, and without hesitation, Private First Class Langhorn threw himself on the grenade and absorbed the ensuing blast, thereby saving the lives of his comrades by sacrificing his own.

Accordingly, the Medal of Honor citation further notes that, ''Private First Class Langhorn's extraordinary heroism, at the cost of his own life, was in keeping with the highest traditions of the military, and reflects great credit on himself, his unit, and the United States Army.''

Mr. Speaker, in continued tribute to Private First Class Langhorn's bravery and self-sacrifice, the members of the United States Army's 7th Squadron, 17th Cavalry, past and present, have committed themselves to ensuring that his legacy and his memory lives on.

As noted by retired Sergeant Major Tony Morton, president of the 7th Squadron 17th Air Cavalry Association, all cavalry troopers assigned to the squadron must ''earn their spurs'' through the completion of a grueling 3-day series of tests and tasks known as the ''spur ride.'' It is notable that completion of one of the stations requires soldiers to possess a detailed knowledge regarding the service and sacrifice of Private First Class Langhorn, a requirement that, according to Sergeant Major Morton, serves to ensure that Private First Class Langhorn ''will go on in this squadron as long as this squadron is flying the colors.''

In addition, in 2008, the squadron cut the ribbon on a conference center named after Private First Class Langhorn and the unit's other Medal of Honor recipient from Vietnam, Sergeant Ray McKibben. Moreover, the squadron also rededicated a memorial to the two soldiers that has been relocated from Fort Knox, Kentucky, to the unit's new headquarters at nearby Fort Campbell on the Kentucky-Tennessee border.

Mr. Speaker, the life of Private First Class Garfield M. Langhorn stands as a testament to the lives of all those brave men and women who have served in the United States military and offered our Nation the ultimate sacrifice. Let us further honor the courageous soldiers through the passage of H.R. 3250, which designates the Riverhead, New York, Postal Service building in Private First Class Langhorn's name.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3250.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3250, designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1210 West Main Street in Riverhead, New York, as the ''Private First Class Garfield M. Langhorn Post Office Building.''

Garfield M. Langhorn's selfless and heroic actions, for which he received the Congressional Medal of Honor, serve as an inspiration to all Americans.

On January 15, 1969, U.S. Army Private First Class Garfield M. Langhorn of New York was serving as a radio operator in the Pleiku province of North Vietnam. His platoon's assignment was to rescue two helicopter pilots who had been shot down and were behind enemy lines. Langhorn coordinated with aircraft that were providing cover to his platoon during the rescue mission. While soldiers in the platoon were bringing the bodies of two helicopter pilots they were rescuing to an extraction site, well disguised North Vietnamese soldiers suddenly surrounded the platoon. Langhorn radioed the support aircraft for assistance and helped provide cover for the other soldiers in the platoon.

As night came, the fighting continued, but the air support could no longer accurately pinpoint the soldiers on the ground. The enemy soldiers continued to close in. An enemy soldier threw a hand grenade near Langhorn and wounded several of his colleagues and men. According to his Congressional Medal of Honor citation, ''choosing to protect these wounded, he unhesitatingly threw himself on the grenade, scooped it beneath his body and absorbed the blast. By sacrificing himself, he saved the lives of his comrades.''

Mr. Speaker, Garfield Langhorn was a true American hero. In his last dying words, he is reported to have said, ''You have to care.'' Private First Class Langhorn did care deeply about his fellow soldiers and he cared about his country. His story is an inspiration to all Americans.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 3250 to honor Private First Class Langhorn's sacrifice for years to come.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's kind words.

I yield 3 minutes to the chief sponsor of this bill, Mr. BISHOP of New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, let me start by thanking my friend Mr. LYNCH for his remarks with respect to this legislation. Let me also thank the gentleman from Illinois for his remarks and his support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as the proud sponsor of H.R. 3250, and I thank the leadership for calling up this bill to name the United States Post Office located at 1210 West Main Street in Riverhead, New York, in my district on Eastern Long Island, as the ''Private First Class Garfield M. Langhorn Post Office Building''.

It was a journey of a hardworking American family, looking for an opportunity and a better way of life, that brought the family of Private First Class Garfield Langhorn of the United States Army from Cumberland, Virginia, to Riverhead, New York, in the early 1950s.

Private First Class Langhorn's mother still lives in this close-knit community—her name is Mary—where she raised her son who proudly answered the call of his country during the Vietnam War. He distinguished himself as a radio operator and as a good soldier. I am proud to represent Mrs. Langhorn, and I commend her for the grace and the dignity with which she carries her loss.

On a hillside in Pleiku province, Private First Class Langhorn heard an even higher call than service and duty. His ultimate sacrifice saved the lives of several of his fellow soldiers by selflessly absorbing the explosion of an enemy grenade within his own body. It was an act of valor and heroism for which the Medal of Honor was created, and for which it is solemnly reserved.

Today, the Medal of Honor retains pride of place on Mary Langhorn's wall as a tangible symbol of the respect and honor her son earned from the American people. Passing H.R. 3250 today affirms the pride of Riverhead by memorializing one of its most distinguished citizens.

As they conduct their business each day, the people of Riverhead who visit the post office will be reminded of PFC Langhorn's extraordinary service and sacrifice and can reflect on the true value of freedom. They will know that PFC Garfield M. Langhorn is a national hero, and the values for which he gave his life, honor, loyalty, and family will again forever be memorialized.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to all of my colleagues in the New York delegation for cosponsoring this legislation, and I again thank Chairman TOWNS, Mr. LYNCH, and the gentleman from Illinois for their support.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 3250.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I again, in closing, urge my colleagues to join the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) in honoring Private First Class Garfield Langhorn through the passage of H.R. 3250.

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 pass the bill, H.R. 3250.

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.

## CONGRATULATING NANCY GOODMAN BRINKER

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 708) congratulating Nancy Goodman Brinker for receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 708

Whereas Ambassador Brinker is the founder of the Susan G. Komen for the Cure, the world's leading breast cancer grass roots organization, and Ambassador Brinker established the organization in memory of her sister, who passed away from cancer in 1980;

Whereas through innovative events like Race for the Cure, the organization has given and invested nearly 1.5 billion for research, health services and education services since its founding in 1982;

Whereas the Susan G. Komen for the Cure has developed a worldwide grassroots network of breast cancer survivors and activists who are working together to save lives, empower people, ensure quality care for all and energize science to find cures;

Whereas Ambassador Brinker has served as Chair of the President's Cancer Panel (1990);

Whereas Ambassador Brinker has served as United States Ambassador to Hungary (2001–2003);

Whereas Ambassador Brinker has served as Chief of Protocol of the United States (2007–2009);

Whereas, in May of this year, Ambassador Brinker was named the first-ever World Health Organization's Goodwill Ambassador for Cancer Control;

Whereas, on July 30, 2009, President Obama named Peoria native Ambassador Nancy Goodman Brinker as a recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom;

Whereas the Presidential Medal of Freedom is America's highest civilian honor that is awarded to individuals who make an especially meritorious contribution to the security or national interests of the United States, world peace, cultural or other significant public or private endeavors;

Whereas Ambassador Brinker's public service has impacted millions of lives and her work, from promoting cancer research to promoting freedom around the world, and has been praised by members of both parties; and

Whereas President Obama will present Illinois native Ambassador Nancy Goodman Brinker with the Presidential Medal of Freedom on Wednesday, August 12, 2009: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives congratulates Nancy Goodman Brinker for receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK) 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 and add any extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am proud to present H. Res. 708 for consideration. This legislation expresses our congratulations to Ms. Nancy Goodman Brinker for receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

House Resolution 708 was introduced by my colleague and friend Representative AARON SCHOCK of Illinois on July 31, 2009, and was favorably reported out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee by voice vote on December 10, 2009. In addition, the legislation enjoys the support of nearly 60 Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, seeing that my colleague is the lead sponsor of this, I will reserve the balance of my time and allow the gentleman to offer this resolution.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my appreciation to my friend from Massachusetts. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we rise today to honor a great woman, a great leader, and, really, an icon in our country and around the world for what the power of one person, working with hundreds and thousands of others, but really one person's vision, tenacity, and hard work can mean for her fellow mankind on Earth.

We rise today to honor Nancy Goodman Brinker. She was born December 6, 1946, in Peoria, Illinois, and is most notably known for her work with the Susan G. Komen for the Cure Foundation, the world's leading breast cancer grassroots organization, which has impacted millions of lives.

This organization was established in memory of her sister, Susie Komen, who passed away from cancer in 1980. Ms. Brinker since then has also founded the Susan G. Komen for the Cure's signature program, the Race for the Cure, the largest series of 5–K run and fitness walks in the world.

Since its origin in 1983 in Dallas, Texas, the Race for the Cure series has grown from one local race with 800 participants to a national series of 112 races that yielded just over 1.5 million participants last year.

Ms. Brinker's contributions to society extend beyond her work with the Susan G. Komen centers. Ms. Brinker has served in the government as Chair of the President's Cancer Panel in the early 1990s. She then went as the U.S. Ambassador to Hungary from 2001 to 2003, and then as the Chief of Protocol for the United States from 2007 to 2009.

□ 1045

Time magazine in 2008 named her as one of the 100 most influential people in the entire world. In July, 2009, President Obama named Nancy Goodman Brinker as a recipient of the 2009 Presidential Medal of Freedom. The Presidential Medal of Freedom, of course, is America's highest civilian honor that is awarded to individuals who make an especially meritorious contribution to the security or national interest of the United States, world peace, cultural, or other significant public or private endeavors. She was presented the Presidential Medal of Freedom on Wednesday, August 12, 2009. The inscription on her Presidential Medal of Freedom says this: Drawing strength from tragedy, Nancy Goodman Brinker has transformed the Nation's approach to breast cancer.

When her sister was diagnosed in 1977, most breast cancer victims knew relatively little about the disease and suffered from popular stigmas. Nancy Brinker promised to challenge these norms. She founded Susan G. Komen for the Cure in honor of her sister. Today, the organization supports research and community awareness programs across the United States and around the world. Nancy Goodman Brinker's unique passion and determination have been a blessing to all those whose lives have been touched by breast cancer. In fact, it's these 1.5 million participants in the Race for the Cure and the thousands of people that this organization have touched that have led to the increased awareness of breast cancer. It's her work that has led to the infamous pastel pink being synonymous with breast cancer awareness and the work of the organization.

But let us be clear. The work has done much more then just create awareness about breast cancer research. Nancy Goodman Brinker's work has saved lives. In fact, the work of the Susan G. Komen Centers has generated over its 27 years $1.5 billion in cancer research. As a result, we have discovered the first breast cancer susceptibility gene. The research dollars have led to the first use of magnetic resonance imaging scanners, or MRIs. They discovered the pathways that some cancer cells take in the body, leading to treatments to potentially stop the spread of cancers to other organs. And as a result of this continuous work, mortality from breast cancer is down. In the last decade, deaths from breast cancer fell by over 20 percent, and more than 2.5 million people in the United States are breast cancer survivors, the largest group of cancer survivors in America.

Now, as we read through the life and the work of Nancy Goodman Brinker, one might think this sounds like an obituary. But, my friends, rest assured Nancy Goodman Brinker's contributions to society are far from over. While many might retire, given this long resume of accomplishments, she continues to take on the mantle and

fight. Since her retirement from public service in our government, she has returned back as the CEO of the Susan G. Komen Centers and also was recently named the first ever World Health Organization's Goodwill Ambassador for Cancer Control.

Finally, I'd like to read a quote by our President, Barack Obama, when he issued the Presidential Medal of Freedom to Ms. Brinker. He said, One of the last things Susie Komen did before she passed away was ask her sister Nancy to make her a promise. Nancy promised her she would prevent other families battling breast cancer from hurting the way theirs had. What began with $200 and a list of friends has become a global race for the cure, a campaign that has eased the pain and saved the lives of millions around the world. In the months after her sister's death, Nancy lay awake at night thinking about the promise she had made and wondering whether one person could really make a difference. Nancy's life is the answer.

Mr. Speaker, that is the reason we rise today to honor Nancy Goodman Brinker for what she has done, for what she continues to do, and for the inspiration that she is to all Americans of what one person can do for their country and for the world.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

As was noted, on August 12, 2009, President Obama awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom, which is our Nation's highest civilian honor, to Ambassador Nancy Goodman Brinker in recognition of her efforts to advance breast cancer awareness and research. As noted by the President during the 2009 Medal of Freedom ceremony, the life of Nancy Goodman Brinker serves truly to answer the question whether one person can truly make a difference.

It is correct, as the gentleman from Illinois has noted, that this began as a promise between sisters. As she was falling victim to breast cancer, Susan G. Komen asked her beloved sister, Nancy, to promise to do everything she could to ensure that other families battling breast cancer had the help they needed to fight the deadly disease. From that simple promise between sisters, and in the honor of her sister, Ambassador Brinker has devoted her life to advancing breast cancer awareness and research.

In 1982, 2 years following her sister's passing, Ambassador Brinker, a breast cancer survivor herself, established Susan G. Komen for the Cure, a global nonprofit organization dedicated to supporting breast cancer research, a program that has affected millions of families in America. Notably, Susan G. Komen for the Cure, which also serves as the world's largest grassroots network of breast cancer survivors and activists, has raised nearly $1.5 billion to support advancements in breast cancer research, education, and health services since its inception. From its advocacy at the local, State, and Federal levels in support of enhanced breast cancer screening and treatment programs to its coordination with local health groups around the world to assist women in nearly 200 countries in overcoming social, cultural, and economic barriers to breast health treatment, Susan G. Komen for the Cure stands as a testament to the bravery of Susan G. Komen, as well as the commitment and vision of Ambassador Brinker.

As noted by Ambassador Brinker, Susan G. Komen for the Cure faced an immediate uphill battle in its mission to promote breast cancer awareness and research. In 1982, the disease received scant media attention and the fight against breast cancer was hampered by scarce resources, an inadequate supply network, and limited treatment options. However, under the dedicated and creative leadership of Ambassador Brinker, the breast cancer movement has managed to break the silence surrounding the disease and secure major advances with respect to breast cancer research, funding, education, and treatment.

In 1982, Ambassador Brinker founded the Susan G. Komen Race for the Cure, which is big in my district and is presently the world's largest and most successful education and fundraising event for breast cancer. In addition, Ambassador Brinker has also pioneered the concept of cause-related marketing, through which her foundation has established a variety of strong and enduring partnerships with businesses that share her commitment to ending breast cancer. Annually, the foundation raises over $30 million through its marketing partnerships.

Moreover, Ambassador Brinker and her foundation have played an instrumental role in securing the passage of key legislation to promote public investment in breast health and breast cancer care. Most recently, the organization contributed to the passage of an amendment authored by Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI of Maryland to the Senate health care reform bill to ensure that breast cancer screening is available for women between the ages of 40 and 49. As noted by Ambassador Brinker, she will continue her efforts until the amendment becomes law.

In addition to her work on behalf of Susan G. Komen for the Cure, Ambassador Brinker's commitment to ending breast cancer can be witnessed through her service as Goodwill Ambassador For Cancer Control for the United Nation's World Health Organization. In this capacity, Ambassador Brinker has sought to raise breast cancer awareness and strengthen treatment programs in impoverished nations as well as advocate in support of stronger global action for cancer prevention in accordance with the global strategy for the prevention and control of noncommunicable diseases that was endorsed by the World Health Assembly in 2008.

Mr. Speaker, in light of Ambassador Brinker's tireless efforts on behalf of ending breast cancer and her distinguished public service, it is not surprising that she was named as one of our Nation's Presidential Medal of Freedom recipients for 2009. Let us congratulate Ambassador Brinker on her receipt of our Nation's highest civilian honor and commemorate her life's worth through the passage of H. Res. 708.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 708.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague and good friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, for his leadership on this crucial effort to eradicate breast cancer in our lifetime, and I rise in support of his resolution to congratulate Ambassador Nancy Goodman Brinker for receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Since her sister's death 30 years ago, Nancy has been devoted to finding a cure for breast cancer. As founder of the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation and the 5K Race for the Cure, Nancy has helped to raise almost a billion dollars for this noble effort. In my congressional district, the Miami-Fort Lauderdale Race for the Cure has raised more than $4.5 million. Our yearly local events reach hundreds of thousands of people as an educational outreach tool and as a grassroots movement builder. The research grants from Nancy's foundation have contributed to many of the new treatments that have truly saved lives. Through efforts like hers, we have made important strides in increasing breast cancer awareness throughout our Nation.

Today, the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation is recognized as the leader in the fight against breast cancer. In solidarity with the countless survivors, like my good friend and Florida colleague, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I thank Ambassador Brinker for all that she has done and certainly all that she will continue to do in this noble fight against breast cancer.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague and good friend, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I do thank the gentleman from Illinois.

It is such an honor for me today to rise in strong support of the resolution to congratulate Ambassador Nancy Brinker for receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom. Ambassador Brinker founded Susan G. Komen for the Cure in 1982, and has since built it into the world's leading breast cancer grassroots organization. The Susan G. Komen Foundation awarded $780,000 in research grants in 2008 in my home

State of Tennessee, and we are grateful for those grants.

Through her advocacy efforts, Ambassador Brinker is to be commended for saving countless lives as a trailblazer fighting for the health of women worldwide, empowering patients, and raising billions in funding for continued breast cancer research. She has worked tirelessly, building an impressive resume of accomplishments, most recently being named the first ever World Health Organization's Goodwill Ambassador for Cancer Control.

I commend Ambassador Brinker for standing with all women to raise awareness on the issue of mammography rationing in the health care reform bill and continuing to advocate for increased access to appropriate therapies and screenings for all Americans. Her contributions to society deserve much praise, and each points back to her original goal: to ease suffering and raise awareness to eradicate breast cancer for all, and to honor the memory of her sister. Today, we honor her.

□ 1100

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, with that, I urge all Members to support the passage of House Resolution 708, honoring one of the finest Americans, Nancy Goodman Brinker.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, in closing, again I urge my colleagues to join Mr. SCHOCK of Illinois in congratulating Ms. Nancy Goodman Brinker on receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom through the passage of H. Res. 708.

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. 708, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CONGRESSWOMAN JAN MEYERS POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4095) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9727 Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, as the ''Congresswoman Jan Meyers Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4095

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

**SECTION 1. CONGRESSWOMAN JAN MEYERS POST OFFICE BUILDING.**

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9727 Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, shall be known and designated as the ''Congresswoman Jan Meyers 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 ''Congresswoman Jan Meyers Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK) 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 and add any extraneous materials.

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 chairman of the House subcommittee with jurisdiction over the United States Postal Service, I am pleased to present H.R. 4095 for consideration. This legislation will designate the United States Postal Service facility located at 9727 Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, as the ''Congresswoman Jan Meyers Post Office Building.'' Introduced by my friend and colleague Representative DENNIS MOORE of Kansas on November 17, 2009, H.R. 4095 was reported out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee on December 10, 2009, by voice vote. Notably, H.R. 4095 has the support of the entire Kansas House delegation.

Since the lead sponsor, Mr. MOORE, is here, I would like to yield him such time as he may consume in bringing this resolution to the floor.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to rise in support of bipartisan legislation which I introduced with my colleagues in the Kansas congressional delegation, H.R. 4095, designating the post office located at 9727 Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, as the ''Congresswoman Jan Meyers Post Office Building.''

Jan Meyers was elected to represent the Third Congressional District of Kansas in 1984 and reelected in five subsequent elections. In 1995, she became the first Republican woman to chair a standing House committee, the Small Business Committee, in more than 40 years. That milestone capped Jan's long tenure as a public servant that began with 5 years of service on the Overland Park City Council and included 12 years in the State senate. As Congressional Quarterly described her, Jan was ''a mild mannered social moderate known for her willingness to compromise . . . Meyers' middle ground instincts make her a case swing vote.''

Janice Lenore Crilly, Jan, was born on July 20, 1928, in Lincoln, Nebraska, the daughter of Howard M. Crilly, a newspaper publisher, and Lenore N. Crilly. Jan and her brother Donn were raised in Superior, Nebraska. In 1948, she graduated with an associate fine arts degree from William Woods College in Fulton, Missouri, and with a B.A. in communications from the University of Nebraska in 1951. Following graduation, she worked in advertising and public relations.

Jan Crilly married Louis ''Dutch'' Meyers who eventually became a Kansas City television station executive, and they raised a daughter and son, Valerie and Philip. Jan's career in Kansas GOP politics began in 1966 when she served as Overland Park chairwoman for Larry Winn, Jr.'s campaign for the Third Congressional District U.S. House seat. Two years later, she was the district co-Chair for the first of Senator Robert Dole's string of five successful Senate races. In 1974, Jan chaired Republican BOB BENNETT's gubernatorial campaign in Johnson County.

From 1967 to 1972, she served as a member of the Overland Park City Council, presiding for 2 years. In 1972, Jan won election of the Kansas State Senate and served there for the next 12 years, rising to chair the Public Health and Welfare Committee as well as the Local Government Committee. When Representative Winn retired in 1984, Jan entered the GOP primary to succeed him. By that point, the district was a narrow north/south sliver, nestled in the northeast corner of Kansas across the river from the metropolis of Kansas City, Missouri. In a five-way race, she won the party nomination; and in the general election, she faced a formidable opponent in the Democratic candidate, Kansas City Mayor Jack Reardon.

Jan emphasized her long experience in State politics and campaigned around the district. When Congresswoman Meyers arrived in the House after winning that race, she was appointed to the Committee on Science and Technology, the Committee on Small Business, and the Select Committee on Aging. In the 100th Congress, she transferred from Science and Technology to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Jan was most active on the Small Business Committee where she introduced a number of legislative measures to protect small business interests and to ensure they had fair representation in government. She worked to bring permanent tax cuts for small business. When Republicans took control of the House in the 1994 elections, Jan Meyers was promoted to chair the Small Business Committee. It marked the first time that a Republican woman had chaired the House committee since Edith Nourse Rogers headed Veterans' Affairs in the 83rd Congress from 1953 to 1955.

''Leadership positions come as a result of seniority,'' Jan said. And later she said, ''I sincerely hope that women

continue to run and continue to get elected, and I think that will ultimately result in more women being elected to leadership positions.'' Jan declined to run for reelection in 1996, noting that she wanted to spend more time with her family. ''There are other things in life I want to do, and being a Member of Congress, if you take the job seriously, simply does not leave time,'' Jan told the press. She also said she believed that Members of Congress should serve no more than 10 to 14 years.

Jan returned to Overland Park, Kansas, where she joined foundation boards for a local library and a community college.

Mr. Speaker, Jan Meyers was a valued and important Member of Congress during her tenure in this body, and it is fitting that we vote today to name on her behalf a post office in the city she served as a commissioner. This is bipartisan. I ask for the support of my colleagues.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4095, which would designate the facility of the United States Postal Service, located at 9727 Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, as the Congresswoman Jan Meyers Post Office Building. Congresswoman Meyers dedicated her career to serving the people of Kansas.

After working on Larry Winn's successful campaign for a Kansas City-based House seat in 1966, Meyers began her own career in public service as a member of the Overland Park City Council from 1967 until 1972. In 1972, Meyers won a seat in the Kansas State Senate. She would serve in the State senate for 12 years, eventually becoming the Chair of the Public Health and Welfare Committee. In 1984, Congressman Larry Winn decided to retire. Meyers won the election for the district's open seat. She served her constituents for five terms, during which time she became the Chair of the Small Business Committee. She was the first woman in almost 20 years to chair a Permanent House committee.

Small businesses were very important to her throughout her career. She once commented, ''There may be more dramatic issues, but none that are more important . . . because the small business sector employs at least 50 percent, maybe a little more, of the individuals in this country. Virtually all of the entry-level employees are with small business.'' A quote that is relevant to today.

While some wanted to eliminate the Small Business Committee at the time, Congresswoman Meyers was committed to seeing the committee was active and served an important purpose. In 1995, Congresswoman Meyers decided that she would retire and not run for reelection in order to spend more time with her family. She considered bills that she introduced that lowered taxes and reduced regulation on small business owners as some of the greatest accomplishments in her career.

Throughout her five terms of service, Congresswoman Meyers believed that it was very important to ''listen to your conscience and your constituents, both. Most of the time, they'll agree.''

Mr. Speaker, to honor Congresswoman Meyers' career of service and the work that she did both for her constituents in Kansas and for small business owners throughout America, I encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time; however, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the great State of Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman from Illinois for recognizing me today.

I am here today to honor former Kansas Congresswoman Jan Meyers, a fiscal conservative and a true public servant. Jan served in the House of Representatives from 1985 to 1997, representing the communities around Kansas City. In 1995, she became the first woman chairman of a House committee since 1976.

Before her election to Congress, she served on the Overland Park City Council and as a senator in the Kansas State Legislature. While serving Kansans in the House of Representatives, Jan was a consistent advocate for fiscal responsibility, an example that many in Washington today could follow. Whether she was promoting legislation in the Small Business Committee to protect small business owners or offering conservative solutions during the debate over welfare reform, she always remembered that when Congress spent money, it was the taxpayers' money, not the government's.

She regularly voted to cut taxes so that Americans could keep more of what they earned and worked to reduce the budget deficit and eliminate wasteful government spending. Kansas son and American hero Bob Dole summed it up well when he said of Jan Meyers on the Senate floor that she ''never stopped fighting to reduce the regulatory and tax burdens on America's small businessmen and women.'' She was a true steward of the people's resources and worked hard on their behalf.

Yet it was her caring and attentive nature that Kansans really remember. Although a conservative Republican, Jan reached out to Kansans of every philosophy. She was sensitive to the needs of Kansans and always quick to respond to their problems. Jan never forgot who she worked for and always had time for the folks back home.

To me, Jan was more than an ideal public servant. She is also a friend. The manner in which she met difficult circumstances with a smile gave me comfort on several occasions, and I value her kindness and gentle spirit. While we recognize Jan today, it's also important to note the recent loss of Jan's husband of 56 years, Dutch. Together, Jan and Dutch made a good team and raised two wonderful children.

Our Nation needs more public servants like Jan Meyers, people that are good stewards of taxpayer money and put service above self. Designating a post office in her hometown of Overland Park in her name will remind Kansans of these characteristics and honor her legacy for years to come. I thank Jan Meyers for a job well done and for a life well lived.

I appreciate the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I urge support and passage of H.R. 4095, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today to rise in support of bipartisan legislation I introduced with my colleagues in the Kansas congressional delegation, H.R. 4095, designating the post office located at 9727 Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, as the ''Congresswoman Jan Meyers Post Office Building''.

Jan Meyers was elected to represent the Third Congressional District of Kansas in 1984, and re-elected in five subsequent elections. In 1995, she became the first Republican woman to chair a standing House committee, the Small Business Committee, in more than 40 years. That milestone capped Jan's long tenure as a public servant that began with 5 years of service on the Overland Park City Council and included twelve years in the state senate. As Congressional Quarterly described her, Jan was ''a mild mannered social moderate known for her willingness to compromise. . . . Meyers' middle ground instincts make her a key swing vote.''

Janice Lenore Crilly (Jan) was born on July 20, 1928, in Lincoln, Nebraska, the daughter of Howard M. Crilly, a newspaper publisher, and Lenore N. (Hazel) Crilly. Janice Crilly and her brother, Donn, were raised in Superior, Nebraska. In 1948, she graduated with an Associate Fine Arts degree from William Woods College in Fulton, Missouri, and with a B.A. in communications from the University of Nebraska in 1951. Following graduation, she worked in advertising and public relations. Jan Crilly married Louis ''Dutch'' Meyers, who eventually became a Kansas City television station executive, and they raised a daughter and son, Valerie and Philip.

Jan Meyers's career in Kansas GOP politics began in 1966, when she served as Overland Park chairwoman for Larry Winn, Jr.'s campaign for the Third District U.S. House seat. Two years later, she was district co-chair for the first of Senator Robert Dole's string of five successful Senate races. In 1974, Jan chaired Republican Bob Bennett's gubernatorial campaign in Johnson County. From 1967 to 1972, she served as a member of the Overland Park City Council, presiding for two years. In 1972, Meyers won election to the Kansas state senate and served there for the next 12 years, rising to chair the public health and welfare committee as well as the local government committee.

When Representative Winn retired in 1984, Jan entered the GOP primary to succeed him. By that point, the district was a narrow north-south sliver nestled in the northeast corner of Kansas across the river from the metropolis of Kansas City, Missouri. In a five-way race she won the party nomination. In the general election she faced a formidable opponent in the Democratic candidate, Kansas City Mayor Jack Reardon. Jan emphasized her long experience in state politics and plastered the district with ''Jan Can'' posters. Benefiting from being on a ticket that featured President Reagan and the popular Senator Nancy Kassebaum (who received more votes than Reagan in the November elections), Jan won.

When Congresswoman Meyers arrived in the House, she was appointed to the Committee on Science and Technology, the Committee on Small Business, and the Select Committee on Aging. In the 100th Congress (1987–1989), she transferred from Science and Technology to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Jan was most active on the Small Business Committee. She introduced a number of legislative measures to protect small business interests and to ensure that they had fair representation in government. She worked to bring permanent tax cuts for small businesses.

When Republicans took control of the House in the 1994 elections, Jan Meyers was promoted to chair of the Small Business Committee. It marked the first time that a Republican woman had chaired a House committee since Edith Nourse Rogers headed Veterans' Affairs in the 83rd Congress (1953–1955). ''Leadership positions come as a result of seniority,'' Jan said later. ''I sincerely hope that women continue to run and continue to get elected, and I think that will ultimately result in more women being elected to leadership positions.''

Jan declined to run for re-election in 1996, noting that she wanted to spend more time with her family. ''There are other things in life I want to do, and being a Member of Congress, if you take the job seriously, simply does not leave time,'' Jan told the press. She also said she believed that Members of Congress should serve no more than 10 to 14 years. Meyers returned to Overland Park, Kansas, where she joined foundation boards for a local library and a community college.

Mr. Speaker, Jan Meyers was a valued and important member of Congress during her tenure in this body and it is fitting that we vote today to name on her behalf a post office in the city she served as a commissioner.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to voice my support for H.R. 4095, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9727 Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, as the ''Congresswoman Jan Meyers Post Office Building''.

I would like to also congratulate my colleague and fellow Kansan, Mr. MOORE, the sponsor of this bill, for his service to our state. And thank Mr. MORAN and Mr. TIAHRT, the other members of the Kansas delegation who joined me as the original co-sponsors of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, We Kansans are proud of our pioneering spirit and Congresswoman Jan Meyers is a great example of that spirit. Born in Lincoln, Nebraska, Jan attended public schools in Superior, Nebraska before receiving a bachelor of arts from the University of Nebraska in 1951.

After moving to Kansas, Jan served on the City Council of Overland Park, from 1967 to 1972. She then served in the Kansas Senate from 1972 to 1984 and in 1984 she was elected to the House of Representatives where she served until January 3, 1997. During her time in this body, Jan chaired the Committee on Small Business in the 104th Congress, the first woman to serve in that capacity in more than 20 years.

Jan's commitment to fiscal responsibility made her a regular recipient of the Golden Bulldog Award from Watchdog of the Treasury for her work to eliminate wasteful in government spending she was regularly named Taxpayer Hero by the Citizens Against Government Waste.

Jan is also an advocate for children and was a leader for health care reform. A committed conservationist, Jan was essential in the creation of the Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve, 10,894 acres of protected Kansas tall grass prairie, which forms the only unit of the National Park System dedicated to the rich natural and cultural history of this cherished ecosystem that is in our state.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, Jan Meyers is a great Kansan who served our State and this Nation with distinction and I consider myself lucky to call her my friend.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, again I encourage my friends on both sides of the isle to join Mr. MOORE of Kansas in honoring the life and legacy of Congresswoman Jan Meyers through the passage of H.R. 4095, 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 pass the bill, H.R. 4095.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## EARLY DETECTION MONTH FOR BREAST CANCER

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 158) expressing support for the designation of an Early Detection Month for breast cancer and all forms of cancer, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 158

Whereas in 2009, 1,479,350 new cases of cancer will be diagnosed in the United States;

Whereas the most common types of cancer in the United States are nonmelanoma skin cancer, breast cancer in women, prostate cancer in men, lung cancer, and colorectal cancers;

Whereas one out of every eight women in the United States will develop breast cancer in her lifetime;

Whereas incidence of breast cancer in young women is much lower than in older women, and young women's breast cancers are generally more aggressive and result in lower survival rates;

Whereas breast cancer currently takes the life of one woman in the United States every 13 minutes;

Whereas in 2009, 192,370 women in the United States will be diagnosed with invasive breast cancer;

Whereas there is currently no known cure for metastatic breast cancer;

Whereas many oncologists and breast cancer researchers believe that a cure for breast cancer will not be discovered until well into the future, if such a cure is possible at all;

Whereas prostate cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death among men, with over 80 percent of all cases occurring in men over age 65;

Whereas African-American men are diagnosed with the disease at later stages and die of prostate cancer more often than do white men;

Whereas in 2009, 1,910 men in the United States will be diagnosed with invasive breast cancer;

Whereas if detected early enough, over three-quarters of those who develop cancer could be saved;

Whereas greater annual awareness of the critical necessity of the early detection of breast cancer and other cancers will not only save tens of thousands of lives but also greatly reduce the financial strain on government and private health care services by detecting cancer before it requires very expensive medical treatment and protocols;

Whereas there is a need for enhanced public awareness of cancer screening; and

Whereas the designation of an Early Detection Month will enhance public awareness of breast cancer and all other forms of cancer: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That the Congress supports the designation of an Early Detection Month to enhance public awareness of screening for breast cancer and all other forms of cancer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK) 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 and add any extraneous materials.

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.

On behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am proud to present House Concurrent Resolution 158 for consideration. This resolution expresses support for the designation of an Early Detection Month for breast cancer and all forms of cancer.

□ 1115

House Concurrent Resolution 158 was introduced by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), on June 25, 2009, and was favorably reported out of the House Oversight Committee by voice

vote on December 12, 2009. In addition, the legislation enjoys the support of more than 50 Members of Congress.

In recognition of Mr. ETHERIDGE's sponsorship, I would like to recognize him and yield him such time as he may consume.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise today in support of this resolution expressing the support for the designation of an Early Detection Month for cancer. I would also like to thank Chairman TOWNS for his work in bringing this bill to the floor.

Every year almost 2 million Americans are diagnosed with cancer. Tragically, more than one-quarter of those cases result in death. Early detection can help patients get early treatment. It can stop the spread of the disease before it becomes untreatable, or before it requires expensive medical treatments, and can be the difference between life and death. Early detection saves tens of thousands of lives annually, and also greatly reduces the financial strain on government and private health care services.

Several years ago, I was diagnosed with melanoma. My cancer was found early because I see my doctor regularly. Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, who joins me in sponsoring this resolution, found hers early because she was aware of how to test for the early signs of cancer. As cancer survivors ourselves, we want to enable all Americans to have the knowledge and access to care that can lead to early detection.

This resolution expresses support for an Early Detection Month beginning in May 2010. This concurrent resolution enhances public awareness of cancer screening and early detection so that any person who gets cancer can have a chance to survive.

Mr. Speaker, early detection is critical to help reduce the tragedy of cancer deaths in our country. I urge my colleagues to join me in fighting a disease that has claimed so many lives but, with support for early detection, can be beaten.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 158, which expresses support for the designation of an Early Detection Month for breast cancer and all forms of cancers. Each year in the United States, there are over 1.4 million new cases of cancer, and hundreds of thousands of Americans die from this dreaded disease. Most of us know a family member, a friend, or a colleague who has been diagnosed with cancer and who has died from a struggle with cancer. Inevitably, cancer will affect every one of us in some way.

While early detection of cancer does not make every case treatable, early detection can dramatically increase the chance of survival. The American Cancer Society reports that the rate of death from breast cancer has been declining since 1990 largely because of the increased rate of early detection.

The American Cancer Society has similar conclusions for the declining mortality rate among men diagnosed with prostate cancer. Early detection is essential to helping to treat cancer and save thousands of lives every year.

Unfortunately, despite the benefits of early detection, many Americans do not get the yearly examinations from their doctors that could detect various forms of cancers. The American Cancer Society reports that only 51 percent of all women 40 years and older had a mammogram in the last year. Less than half of all men age 50 and older were screened for prostate cancer in the last year. Nearly half of all Americans who are in the age groups most vulnerable for these types of cancers are not getting the early detection tests that could save their lives.

Mr. Speaker, we need to encourage more Americans to get early cancer detection tests such as mammograms and prostate screenings. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this resolution which will create an Early Detection Month and raise public awareness of early detection of cancer to encourage more Americans to get lifesaving, early detection tests.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak in support of this, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlemen from Illinois and North Carolina, and I want to drill down some of the numbers that have been offered by the American Cancer Society.

They report that in 2009, 1.5 million new cases of cancer were diagnosed in the United States alone. In addition, the American Cancer Society notes that roughly one out of every two American men and one out of every three American women will have some type of cancer at some point in their lifetime. They also report that the most common types of cancer in the United States are nonmelanoma skin cancer, breast cancer in women, and prostate cancer in men. One out of every eight women in the United States will develop breast cancer, and about one in six men will be diagnosed with prostate cancer.

Furthermore, the American Cancer Society estimates that in 2009, more than 560,000 Americans died of cancer. In other words, more than 1,500 people lost their lives to cancer every day last year. The American Cancer Society also notes that cancer accounts for nearly one out of every four deaths in the United States, which makes cancer the second most common cause of death in the United States, exceeded only by heart disease.

Now, despite these troubling statistics, with early detection and proper management, cancer can be highly treatable. As noted by the American Cancer Society, the 5-year relative survival rate for all cancers diagnosed between 1996 and 2004 is about 66 percent, up from 50 percent in 1975 to 1977. The 5-year relative survival for female breast cancer has improved from 63 percent in the early 1960s to 89 percent today. Additionally, over the past 25 years, the 5-year survival rate for prostate cancer has increased from 69 percent to almost 99 percent.

Now, cancer can strike any individual regardless of gender, race, or age; but still, it is important to note that the risk of being diagnosed with cancer increases with age. In fact, according to the American Cancer Society, 77 percent of all cancers are diagnosed in persons 55 years and older.

Mr. Speaker, greater awareness of the critical necessity of breast cancer, prostate cancer, and all other cancers will save tens of thousands of lives, and may also help decrease the financial strain on government and private health care services by detecting cancer before it requires costly medical treatment.

Accordingly, let us take this opportunity through passage of H. Con. Res. 158 to increase public awareness of breast cancer and all forms and types of cancer and encourage all Americans to work with their doctors in order to maximize the possibility of early detection.

I urge my colleagues to join Mr. ETHERIDGE in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 158.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for the time.

I rise in support of this resolution for the designation of an Early Detection Month for breast cancer. I do so in solidarity with and through the strength of thousands of breast cancer survivors.

Almost everyone in this country, unfortunately, knows someone who has suffered from breast cancer. Breast cancer is the second most common cancer among women, but it is becoming one of the most survivable cancers if the disease is detected early, which is the purpose of the bill before us.

We must remain vigilant in our efforts to educate and diagnose and treat. With these three pillars—education, diagnosis and treatment—we can and we will save lives. Let us make sure that we educate one another on the dangers of breast cancer and the need for early and routine checkups. Early detection makes the difference in surviving this terrible disease.

In memory of Congresswoman JoAnn Davis, who passed away at the age of 57 while serving last Congress after a 2-year battle with breast cancer, and for my baby granddaughter, Morgan Elizabeth, let us make sure that our efforts to defeat this terrible disease continue with the same strength, and even stronger, in our efforts at early detection for all individuals in our country and, indeed, the world.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I believe that probably everybody in the House and in the Senate has someone that they know or knew that had breast cancer or another form of cancer.

My first wife, Barbara, died about 8 years ago from cancer. I will never forget the day she felt a lump in her breast. She thought it was a fibrous tissue. She had them before, and she didn't want to go have herself tested. I said, I want you to go to the doctor and have him look at that. She did, and she called me a couple of days later when I was out here in Washington and she started crying and said, I've got breast cancer. Of course, I went back home and we went to the doctor and went through all of the things that you have to go through, including the chemotherapy. For any family that has gone through that, they know how very difficult it is. Had she had a mammogram earlier, she might not have had the breast cancer metastasize and go to other parts of her body. She ultimately passed way. It was a tragic thing to watch that.

That is why this bill, although it may sound like just a resolution, is very, very important. One of the things in the health care negotiations that has concerned me a great deal is that there was some talk about limiting mammograms to people 50 and above, and the people between 40 and 50 might not be included in getting mammograms and having coverage for that, either under the health plan or insurance plans.

I want to read you a letter from a young lady from my district in Noblesville, Indiana, Tonya Lewis. Here is what she says: ''I was diagnosed with triple negative breast cancer in May of 2008 at age 39. I found this lump myself. I had a baseline mammogram at age 35. It came back clear. I was advised not to have another mammogram until age 40. The radiologist that read my mammogram at age 39 advised me that if I would have had a mammogram at age 36, 37, or 38, most likely I would not have had to have a mastectomy and 14 lymph nodes removed. My cancer spread to my lungs and chest wall after doing chemo and radiation. After completing nine different types of chemo, as of November 24, 2009, I am finally cancer free. Please fight for us breast cancer survivors and the young women in the future. I believe mammograms should be available and paid for by insurance companies at any age.''

When we talk about limiting breast cancer screening to people 50 and above, I think we make a mistake because breast cancer does kill. One in every eight women is going to get breast cancer in their lifetime and it is going to affect families across this country. I think we ought to make sure that we don't start limiting mammograms to only people 50 and above. It has been 40 and above for some time. In this particular case it wouldn't have helped her because she was in her thirties when she developed breast cancer. It is a very, very serious thing, and unless somebody has lived with it, they don't understand how horrible it is to watch somebody pass away going through the travails of cancer.

So I want to congratulate my colleagues on sponsoring this bill, and I hope in the negotiations on the health care bill, regardless of how it comes out, we make sure that we take care of the women who are suffering from these things and catch it before it becomes terminal.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of House Concurrent Resolution 158, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 158, a resolution expressing support for the designation of an Early Detection Month for breast cancer and all forms of cancer.

Breast cancer in women is one of the most frequent forms of cancer recognized in the more than 2 million new cases of cancer diagnosed each year in the United States. In fact, every 13 minutes a woman dies from breast cancer, and in 2009 alone, 192,370 women were diagnosed with breast cancer in the U.S. This resolution recognizes the importance of early detection for breast cancer victims and is paramount due to the deadly nature of the disease.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Preventative Services Task Force recommendations—against routine mammography for women ages 40 to 49 and breast self-examinations—were shocking to say the least. As a practicing OB/GYN physician for nearly 30 years, I saw first hand the benefits that early detection of cancer in women can have on saving lives and improving quality of life. Therefore, it is imperative that this House duly recognizes the significance of self-examination and early detection of breast cancer.

The designation of Early Detection Month will enhance public awareness of the catastrophic and devastating effects of cancer. Hopefully, this resolution will shine further light on a disease that so commonly affects millions of Americans and in turn help to promote research and advanced medical procedures that will one day lead to a cure.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, again I encourage my friends on both sides of the aisle to join Mr. ETHERIDGE in supporting the designation of an Early Detection Month for breast cancer and all forms of cancers through the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 158.

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 concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 158, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the grounds 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.

□ 1130

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3254, TAOS PUEBLO INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT; FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3342, AAMODT LITIGATION SETTLEMENT ACT; AND FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1065, WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION ACT OF 2009

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1017 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1017

*Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3254) to approve the Taos Pueblo Indian Water Rights Settlement Agreement, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; (2) the further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative McClintock of California or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3342) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, to develop water infrastructure in the Rio Grande Basin, and to approve the settlement of the water rights claims of the Pueblos of Nambe, Pojoaque, San Ildefonso, and Tesuque. All points of order against consideration of the

bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; (2) the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative McClintock of California or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1065) to resolve water rights claims of the White Mountain Apache Tribe in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; (2) the further amendment printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative McClintock of California or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Diaz-Balart). All time yielded during consideration of this rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1017.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1017 is a single rule that provides for separate consideration of three measures dealing with water rights settlements. Each bill is to be considered under a structured amendment process.

The rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 3254, the Taos Pueblo Indian Water Rights Settlement Act; H.R. 3342, the Aamodt Litigation Settlement Act; and H.R. 1065, the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2009. Each bill has 1 hour of general debate, to be controlled by the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule for H.R. 1065 self-executes an amendment to ensure that the bill is PAYGO compliant. Each bill allows for the consideration of a separate amendment by Representative MCCLINTOCK, which is debatable for 10 minutes. The rule also allows a motion to recommit, with or without instructions, for each of the three bills.

H.R. 1065, the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2009; H.R. 3254, the Taos Pueblo Indian Water Rights Settlement Act; and H.R. 3342, the Aamodt Litigation Settlement Act are all bipartisanship pieces of legislation, and they are all sensible pieces of legislation. Each of these bills will approve, ratify, and confirm carefully negotiated settlement agreements between tribal representatives, non-Indian water users, and the United States Government.

These agreements will provide both the tribes involved and affected communities in Arizona and New Mexico proper access to clean water. These three bills will provide critical funding for the development of drinking water supplies for people who have been hauling their water for years in the back of their pickup trucks. We know how critical clean drinking water is for the human body's health and development. These bills will improve the health of young Native Americans by providing clean drinking water, and certainty to non-Indian people that the water will be available to them for development and use.

H.R. 1065 provides the required congressional approval for the agreement between the White Mountain Apache tribe and water users throughout Arizona. This legislation boasts the support of the entire bipartisanship Arizona delegation.

H.R. 3254 and H.R. 3342 each approve water settlement agreements in New Mexico considered critical to clean water access to the Taos Valley and Rio Grande watershed. Both of these bills were favorably reported by voice vote out of the Natural Resources Committee.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it has taken decades to work out these settlements. Congress has a responsibility to approve these settlements now and provide clean drinking water access for the affected tribes and the non-Indian people, and for their generations to come. I believe it is time for Congress to move on these bills, and I am pleased that Chairman RAHALL and the Natural Resources Committee has worked in a bipartisan way to move these bills through the process.

Now, there is some concern on the other side of the aisle that the Justice Department has not commented formally on any of these bills. Our colleague from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) believes the Department of Justice should formally respond to each of these bills before they take effect. The gentleman from California has legitimate concerns, and these concerns deserve to be considered on the floor today, and that is why we made this amendment in order on each of these bills.

This is a good rule. I urge my colleagues to support it today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Over the next 2 days, the House is set to consider three separate bills that would approve and ratify tribal claims to water rights made by the White Mountain Apache tribe in Arizona and the Pueblos of Pojoaque, San Ildefonso, Tesuque, and Taos in New Mexico. The bills would also restore and protect some environmentally sensitive land and watersheds, and require the maintenance of the water systems in question until they are conveyed to the respective tribes.

I support these bills when the McClintock amendments are included because I believe that the settlements will bring long-term certainty and stability to the respective tribes and water users in the affected areas.

Mr. Speaker, last night the majority in the Rules Committee decided to allow for consideration all three of the amendments submitted to the three bills we are set to consider this week. I wish to thank them for their uncharacteristic generosity in allowing minority amendments. These important amendments would prevent the bill from taking effect until the Attorney General assures Congress in writing that the settlements in these bills would represent a net benefit to the U.S. taxpayer based on the costs and risks of litigation and the odds the tribes would prevail in the litigation. I believe these amendments are important because they require the Attorney General to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of the settlements and make sure that they are fiscally responsible before the settlement funds can be paid.

Now, I assume that the other side of the aisle will highlight that this rule allows debate on all of the amendments which were submitted to the Rules Committee, but it restricts any and all possible further amendments from consideration. It is not an open rule. The majority campaigned on a promise to allow open and bipartisan debates in

Congress, yet this year they have yet to allow even one open rule. That is correct, not one open rule. And that, Mr. Speaker, includes even the traditionally open appropriations process.

They could have changed that glaring and unfortunate statistic by allowing an open rule on the underlying, uncontroversial bill, but the majority in the Rules Committee decided to continue to make this the most closed Congress in history.

Now, let's look at the possible reasons the majority on the Rules Committee decided to vote against an open rule for these bills. Could it be that there is not enough time on the House schedule this week? Well, the House, until last night, was scheduled to be in session until Friday. And this rule, as proposed, only allows for a total of 3½ hours of total debate time for all three bills and all three amendments.

Even though we are now scheduled to leave on Thursday, we still have more than enough time to complete the three bills with an open rule. I sincerely doubt that an open rule would garner more than a handful of amendments. It would allow the majority to say for the first time, and to prove, at least offer some evidence, that they are living up to their pledge to run an open Congress.

I believe the real reason is that the majority is afraid of an open debate even on uncontroversial bills, and so they restrict debate consistently. It has become their standard operating procedure to close debate in the House. It is unfortunate, but it is a fact.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate how well my colleague on the Rules Committee adheres to the Republican talking points, but I will again reiterate that all the amendments that were brought to the Rules Committee last night were made in order. And I think this is a good rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Well, it is not a question of talking points, it is a question of fact. We will move on.

I at this point yield, Mr. Speaker, 5 minutes, to my distinguished friend from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN).

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida. I appreciate the opportunity.

My simple resolution requires that all negotiations on the health care bill be conducted under the watchful eye of the American people. The American people are angry, and for good reason. Washington is not listening.

□ 1145

Last night I think is a perfect example: It's not about Democrat and Republican, it's about the American people wanting to have more input into the process.

Even worse, Washington is not even letting the American people into the room to discuss or hear the health care reform debate. Secret deals, backroom deals on the health care bill should not be tolerated. In the State of Florida, we have the toughest sunshine laws in the country. You can't have two city commissioners, two county commissioners, two State senators—no one can go in the back room together and cut a deal or a secret deal and then lay that on the American people. We want to bring that sunshine to Washington. I am pleased that we have over 165 Members that have joined me in this cause and cosponsored this bill, this resolution, Democrats and Republicans.

Also, I introduced, and we have 111 Members that have signed, a discharge petition to force a vote on the floor. We want to get a vote to the floor on this sunshine resolution, and we feel confident that we're going to be able to do that.

C–SPAN has offered to publicly broadcast the health care meetings, and congressional leaders should accept that opportunity. Even the President said during the campaign eight different times that he wants this to be the most open, transparent administration in history. He said eight different times he wanted C–SPAN in the room. C–SPAN has agreed to be in the room during these negotiations. I don't want to, as a Member of Congress, end up with a 3,000-page bill at the end of the day that nobody has had a chance to read and you've got a day or so to look at it.

I think there is a good reason why Speaker PELOSI doesn't want the negotiations in public, because basically it's a bad bill. In my area of Sarasota-Bradenton, Florida, we have the most seniors, almost 300,000 in our district, more than any other district in the country. They want to cut Medicare $500 billion. I've seen the cuts. They're very real. They want to raise taxes on small business.

I know the biggest issue we've got is the economy and jobs. Working families want to get back to work, but yet they want to charge 8 percent on payroll. I've been in business for 30 years; I'm not a career politician. I can tell you that will kill more jobs than anything. That's a fixed expense, 8 percent on payroll.

They want to charge another 5.4 percent tax on businesses. Most businesses have pass-through income, whether they're a Sub S or LLC or a partnership, or whatever kind of business. They want to raise the taxes from 34, let Bush's tax cut sunset, which will take it to 39, then another 5.4, which will take it 45 percent in Florida. In many States like California that have a State income tax, or Oregon or New York, of 10 or 15 percent, it could take it up as high as 60 percent. So these small businesses have a lot of pass-through income. They're not going to have the capital. They're going to be sending the money here. That's going to cut more jobs.

It's time to bring some sunshine to Washington that we've got in Florida.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, aside from the fact that the gentleman's comments have absolutely nothing to do with the bill that we're talking about here today, I find it ironic that any Member on the other side of the aisle would talk about jobs with a straight face given their record.

In the last 3 months of the Bush administration, the economy was losing, on average, 673,000 jobs per month. In the last 3 months of 2009, the average job loss was 69,000 per month, an improvement of nearly 90 percent. That is not acceptable, but we are trying to bring this economy in a different direction.

They drove this economy into a ditch; let's not forget that. Let's not forget the economy that President Obama inherited. Let's not forget the record job losses and the stock market crash and all the special deals on Wall Street.

I've heard enough from the other side about the issue of jobs. They nearly ruined this economy. They are responsible for the massive job losses that we see now that we're trying to fix. So enough about that.

I will go back to what we are talking about here today, and that is a rule to consider these important bills dealing with clean water for Native American tribes. I again would reiterate that this is a good rule, everything they wanted they got, and I hope it will pass unanimously.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Well, Mr. Speaker, we saw last night that the blame game no longer works. And if we want to look at the past, we will see that when we cut taxes, we made it a reality; the recession after 9/11 was the shortest recession in history.

Now, unfortunately, the policies that are being followed now are totally different. They're increasing debt massively. The deficit as a percentage of GDP after TARP—that I opposed, but it can be said that it was a bipartisan decision, TARP—after TARP, the deficit as a percentage of GDP was 4 percent. Today, 1 year after the Democrats took the Presidency and they had already taken the House and the Senate, the deficit as a percentage of GDP is almost 12 percent, Mr. Speaker.

We are running in a dangerous direction, heading toward a collision with a fiscal crisis of unprecedented proportion. But, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats just don't get it. They don't see it. The American people sent a message last night that they had better, but it still remains to be seen if they received the message.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to my distinguished friend from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

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

Mr. WOLF. I rise in opposition to the rule.

Today, the press is reporting that a backroom deal has been cut with Democratic leadership to create a deficit-cutting commission by Executive

order. There are also reports that instead of putting every spending program and tax policy on the table, discretionary spending controlled by the Democratic-controlled Appropriations Committee would be exempt.

I oppose creating this panel by Executive order, and the American people will oppose this sleight of hand also. Press reports suggest that the Democratic leadership intends to bring the commission's recommendation up for a vote in Congress, but a vote that is not mandated as it would be if Congress passed similar legislation statutorily. More important, the vote that could take place under the administration's plan would happen after the midterm elections and before the newly elected Congress begins. It would be basically a lame-duck Congress vote. Lawmakers who are retiring or get defeated could vote on a set of recommendations with regard to entitlement spending and tax policy but never be accountable to the American people. Is it right for an outgoing Member of Congress to consider proposals that could affect every single American, knowing that days or weeks later they will no longer answer to voters in the district they once represented?

Between the Democrats and the Republicans in both Chambers, over 30 Members have already announced that they are retiring or running for another office. It is not appropriate for outgoing lawmakers who may eventually lobby for a special interest that has a vested interest in the outcome of the vote on the commission to then vote on that recommendation. Any recommendation put forward should be considered by the newly elected Congress, who will have to publicly stand by their vote on the commission's recommendations, Members who have been elected and are accountable to the American people. A deficit commission established through Executive order amounts to nothing more than political cover.

This Congress has run up the country's credit card to a point of no return, and now the administration wants to be able to tout a bipartisan solution to spending that will conveniently help them survive the upcoming election cycle. All of a sudden, the Obama administration has found deficit-cutting religion. The same administration that pushed through a $787 billion economic stimulus promising that unemployment would be held under 8 percent now wants to get our Nation's financial house in order. The same administration that promised an open and transparent process on health care reform, which is now being negotiated behind closed doors and could cost taxpayers nearly $1 trillion, now wants credibility on spending issues.

The FY 2009 budget deficit registered at an unprecedented $1.4 trillion. I believe the American people understand the depth of our financial problems, recognize the spending gorge that Congress has embarked on, and won't be fooled by a fig leaf commission established by an Executive order.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the American people will be cut out of the process under this plan. The bipartisan commission process I've talked about, and many Members on both sides have talked about for 4 years, includes a legitimate public engagement mandating public town hall-style meetings throughout the country. Now there will be no input from the hardworking people in our neighborhoods and communities. That is not right, and everyone knows it.

If lawmakers were serious about the debt and the deficit issues that Americans are increasingly worried about, Congress would halt the budget gimmicks, the slick talking points, and muster the political will to have an honest conversation with the American people about where we are, where we're heading, and what changes need to be made to get back on track. But an open process that allows the American people to weigh in will never happen through a commission established by an Executive order all done here in Washington.

This morning, Congressman LAMAR SMITH, our colleague from Texas, in a 1-minute speech on the floor offered a series of lessons to be learned from yesterday's special Senate election in Massachusetts. He said, All true reform starts with the voice of the people. The people will not have a voice in a deficit commission established through an Executive order.

He also said that common sense triumphs partisanship. A commission through Executive order negotiated by one party is the height of partisanship. Republican leadership in the House and the Senate have not been involved in this effort.

He also said voters can exercise real independence. Where is the voice of the people in a process that will not go beyond the Beltway?

In closing, Mr. SMITH correctly, and I say correctly, noted that one-party control leads to arrogance. We are seeing today an arrogance of power by a party that forecloses the minority from a seat at the table. And to be fair, Republicans were just as arrogant at times. Hopefully we have learned a lesson and will never go back to those times.

Mr. SMITH concluded that we should be listening to the American people, not defying them. The people of Massachusetts spoke yesterday. We would be wise in this Congress to heed that lesson.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as we wait for the Republican leader, let me say that I have enjoyed this debate. These are noncontroversial bills that are being brought to the floor, and yet they're important. And, also, there are issues that have been brought out and that will be brought out now. I will oppose the previous question to bring out the issue that Mr. BUCHANAN talked about and bring it to a floor vote this morning.

Since the Democrats regained the majority in the House, I have heard a number of Members come down to the floor and quote Supreme Court Justice Brandeis that sunshine is said to be the best disinfectant. I think that quote is fitting. It's fitting today considering, as Mr. BUCHANAN pointed out, that as we speak, the majority is drafting, behind closed doors with no sunshine in sight, health care legislation that will affect every American.

So I think the question is begged, what is going on behind those closed doors? We don't know. We do not even know who is at the table. The American people deserve to know what is going on behind closed doors.

□ 1200

We need to bring sunlight, sunshine, into a process that is shrouded with secrecy. That is why I, along with a bipartisan group of 163 Members of this House, have cosponsored House Resolution 847, a resolution by my friend and colleague, Representative BUCHANAN, that expresses the sense of the House that any meetings held to determine the final contents of sweeping health care legislation be held in public view and not behind closed doors. Mr. BUCHANAN pointed out the fact that C–SPAN has offered, in fulfillment of a campaign promise by the President, to be present at the negotiations.

Now, in order to help bring in sunshine to a process that the majority continues to hide from public view, I will be asking for a ''no'' vote on the previous question so we can amend this rule and allow the House to continue the Buchanan transparency resolution. This vote will give Members of the majority a chance to live up to their promise, as the distinguished Speaker said, ''to lead the most honest, most open and most ethical Congress in history.''

Madam Speaker, I know that Members are concerned that this motion may jeopardize consideration of the water rights bills and of the settlement bills that are being brought to the floor today; but I wish to make clear that the motion I am making provides for the separate consideration of the Buchanan transparency resolution within 3 days so we can vote on the water rights bills and then, once we are done, so that we can consider the Buchanan transparency resolution, H. Res. 847.

I have been informed that the Republican leader will not be coming down to the floor at this time.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, in closing, let me say a couple of things.

One is that this is a good rule and it should be approved. Secondly, and I say this with respect to my friends on the other side of the aisle, when they talk about sunshine, it's laughable. When you compare the transparency and the openness of this Democratic Congress to the way this place was run when they were in charge, there is no comparison.

I remember one night, after a conference report was completed and when all of the signatures were on the conference report, when they snuck in a special provision to provide special immunity to drug companies. That's the kind of transparency and openness that existed when they were in control.

On the health care bills, they've been on the Web. The House bill has been on the Web, and the Senate bill has been on the Web. Even the Senate read it verbatim. So there has never been as much openness and transparency in any Congress as we've seen in this Congress.

When my friend from Florida talks about the deficit, boy, what a short memory. When Bill Clinton left office, he had eliminated the deficit, and we had started paying down the debt, and we left George Bush, Dick Cheney and my Republican friends with a surplus. Through their reckless policies—tax breaks for millionaires, special privileges for Wall Street and drug companies and all that they did—they racked up a record debt, and they did nothing about it. In fact, when they were in charge, they used to argue on the floor that somehow the deficit and the debt didn't matter anymore. They tried to say it wasn't a big deal.

So they left this President with a mess. I guess it's sometimes fun to make a mess, but it's not so fun and not so easy to clean up a mess. The Democrats in Congress and the President of the United States have to clean up the mess that they left. It's a little bit ironic that those who drove this economy into a ditch are complaining about the size of the tow truck.

The fact of the matter is we have to make some tough decisions. We have to create the conditions for jobs to grow. We have to invest in industries where there is a future, and we are trying to do that.

Again, in the last 3 months of the Bush administration, the economy was losing, on average, 673,000 jobs per month. In the last 3 months of 2009, the average job loss was 69,000 per month, which is an improvement of nearly 90 percent. We on the Democratic side have pledged to do everything we can to help create more jobs in this country and to focus on the issue of jobs, because that's where the concern amongst the American people really is.

In the stock market, stocks have seen significant gains since the beginning of March 2009, following the passage of the Recovery Act, which they all were opposed to. The Dow is up 58 percent. The S&P is up 64 percent. The Nasdaq is up 75 percent.

The GDP has grown. In the first quarter of 2009, the GDP was negative 6.4 percent. By the third quarter of 2009, the GDP was on the rise, increasing plus-2.2 percent, the best quarter for growth in 2 years. Forecasters predict steady GDP growth throughout 2010.

We see home sales are now rising. We see manufacturing beginning to rebound. U.S. manufacturing activity rose 55.9 from 53.6 in November, reaching the highest level since April of 2006. It is a positive indication of broader economic growth.

So it is difficult to sit here and to listen to lectures from Members on the other side of the aisle who created this mess, which is the worst economy since the Great Depression. That's what they gave to President Obama. We have to fix it, and we have pledged to do whatever is necessary to help put people back to work, to help people be able to stay in their homes, and to help nurture growth in future industries.

So, Madam Speaker, I appreciate the comments from my friends on the other side of the aisle. Given their abysmal record, it's hard to believe they come here with straight faces to talk about these things; but we're going to fix the mess that they made.

Again, I would urge my colleagues to support the rule, and I would urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1017 OFFERED BY MR. DIAZ-BALART

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. On the third legislative day after the adoption of this resolution, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV and without intervention of any point of order, the House shall proceed to the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 847) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that any conference committee or other meetings held to determine the content of national health care legislation be conducted in public under the watchful eye of the people of the United States. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 847.

---

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308–311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's ''American Congressional Dictionary'': ''If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.''

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. 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.

## ACCELERATION OF INCOME TAX BENEFITS FOR CHARITABLE CASH CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4462) to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the earthquake in Haiti, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4462

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

**SECTION 1. ACCELERATION OF INCOME TAX BENEFITS FOR CHARITABLE CASH CONTRIBUTIONS FOR RELIEF OF VICTIMS OF EARTHQUAKE IN HAITI.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, a taxpayer may treat any contribution described in subsection (b) made after January 11, 2010, and before March 1, 2010, as if such contribution was made on December 31, 2009, and not in 2010.

(b) CONTRIBUTION DESCRIBED.—A contribution is described in this subsection if such contribution is a cash contribution made for the relief of victims in areas affected by the earthquake in Haiti on January 12, 2010, for which a charitable contribution deduction is allowable under section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) RECORDKEEPING.—In the case of a contribution described in subsection (b), a telephone bill showing the name of the donee organization, the date of the contribution, and the amount of the contribution shall be treated as meeting the recordkeeping requirements of section 170(f)(17) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(d) PAYGO.—All applicable provisions in this section are designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Madam Speaker, all of us have witnessed this horrendous event that has taken place on our continent; and I know that, whether Republican or Democrat, we all want to be able to do whatever we can to ease the pain of these poor people. That's why I'm glad that Mr. HERGER is here representing the Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee, which did not hesitate to meet and decide on just what we could do as a committee to make it easier to encourage people to make contributions. I know all over the country that people are collecting clothes, food, and things of that nature; but the bottom line is that they need cash; they need checks. This is what we have decided to do.

So we have a nonpartisan bill here on this which deals with the technicality. It's available on the Web site of the Joint Committee, www.jct.gov, and it's listed under Document No. JCX–2–10.

This bill allows Americans and others to make generous cash contributions to the charities of their choice; and at the same time, it allows them not to have to wait until next year to be able to deduct these as charitable contributions. It accelerates the time that this can be done between now and March so that any contribution that is made can be deducted on the 2009 tax return, which is being prepared now for April 15.

In addition to that, there has been some question as to how you can document the actual payment if it were made on the cell phone or if it were made without actually having proof of a charitable deduction. The only proof that could be made would be by using the telephone bill, and there was a question as to whether or not that would be considered as sufficient evidence of making the contribution. This bill will, indeed, make it possible for text messages to be relied upon, text messages which are used on cell phones, when claiming these charitable contributions.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, we have all been moved by the reports and images of last week's horrendous earthquake in Haiti; and we were reminded just this morning of the dire situation that country is facing as reports have surfaced of a major aftershock.

Throughout our history, Americans have been eager to help others recover from the devastation of wars and natural disasters in faraway places. Once again, we have seen the compassion and generosity of the American people displayed front and center in the Haiti relief effort, including an outpouring of real-time donations through cell phones and the Internet. While many of our own U.S. citizens are struggling to find work and to make ends meet, it is only fitting that we should provide immediate tax relief for these charitable contributions.

This bill, which is sponsored by the bipartisan leadership of the Ways and Means Committee, as well as by the whips of both parties and by more than 150 Members from both sides of the aisle, would permit itemizers to treat Haiti-related charitable contributions made through the end of February as if they were made in 2009 rather than in 2010. This would allow itemizers the opportunity to claim the charitable deductions under 2009 returns, which most taxpayers are required to file by April 15 of this year, instead of waiting until they file their 2010 returns.

□ 1215

It would also permit taxpayers who use cell phone text messages to contribute to the relief effort to use their phone bill as a record of their donation. This is a commonsense bipartisan idea, and it deserves the support of every Member. I urge an ''aye'' vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK). He is a member of the Ways and Means Committee, but, more importantly, he has been so closely identified in the bringing back of Haiti before this tragedy. He has been there, and we admire and respect the contributions he is making to rebuild this great nation.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I want to thank all of the Members that are here and the bipartisan support that we have for this great piece of legislation to not only incentivize Americans who continue to do what they have already done, to be able to help the people of Haiti, to be able to take off their contribution or get the tax benefit for giving in their 2009 taxes. I think it is important that we have a strong vote on this piece of legislation.

The Haitian people—I was just there. I spent 2 days on the ground there. Humanitarian workers are working so hard, and the majority of these nongovernmental organizations that people can contribute to are doing the best work on the ground as it relates to the feeding and providing of comfort for the Haitians that are in desperate need of international support at this time. Madam Speaker, I would go even further to say hats off to our emergency response and urban rescue people that are really saving lives every day.

With the contributions that Americans give to organizations that are doing great work on the ground, coupled with the Congress and the House's action today of passing this legislation to allow some benefit to that individual for their contribution, will feed into a better response and a better recovery, not only for Haiti, but to also continue to fulfill our humanitarian commitment to the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere.

So I commend the chairman, the rest of the leadership that signed on to this bill, Republican Whip CANTOR, and a number of others that are on the Ways and Means Committee for this bipartisan effort. Thank you so very much.

I am pleased to be a co-sponsor on Chairman RANGEL, Majority Whip CLYBURN, Ranking Member CAMP, and Republican Whip CANTOR's bi-partisan bill that will provide an incentive for our citizens to contribute monetary donations to the relief efforts following the devastating January 12, 2010, earthquake in Haiti.

I filed an almost identical bill yesterday, H.R. 4467—with many co-sponsors.

Under this bill, if a citizen makes a cash contribution before March 1, 2010, they can take the charitable contribution deduction off of their 2009 income taxes, obviously decreasing their 2009 tax liability.

The American people have shown an outpouring of support for the Haitian people during their most vulnerable moment.

There have been countless donations from individual Americans offering whatever help they can.

Now is the time to give an added boost to the nation's charitable spirit by accelerating income tax benefits for Americans making donations.

I just returned from Haiti, witnessing first hand the horror and devastation of the earthquake.

I represent more Haitian Americans than any other Member of Congress, and my district includes Little Haiti in Miami.

With so many of my constituents in pain, I am happy to be a part of this effort to help the Haitian people and all victims of this disaster.

This bill will not only help increase contributions.

But as the bill only applies to cash contributions, the bill encourages the much needed cash to be donated.

Since the night of the earthquake, I have fielded regular calls from constituents who were stranded, and lost loved ones in Haiti.

Last Thursday night in Miami, I convened in four hours an emergency community wide meeting attended by 300 plus people to coordinate the rescue effort amongst first responders, relief experts, and the Haitian American community in Miami.

On Saturday I met with Vice President BIDEN in Miami in Little Haiti and then again at Homestead Reserve Base in Homestead Florida.

On Saturday night, I bought my own 1 way ticket from Miami to Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic on American Airlines.

I landed at 12:30 a.m. (Sunday morning), secured a drive from a Dominican local and together they drove through the night to the Dominican-Haiti border and then crossed into Haiti during sun up arriving at the airport at around 7a EST on Sunday.

Never have I seen such devastation.

I witnessed the rescue of a young 2 year old that has moved me emotionally like nothing before.

Also, let's not forget that Haiti has come to America's aid before.

As an ally Haiti has been instrumental in the forming of our union.

In the Revolutionary war, Haitians fought with Americans for our independence.

Even as recently as 2005, Haiti again came to the aid of ailing Americans as the country offered support in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina.

I am pleased to be a part of this legislation that will help boost our help to Haiti.

What the Chairman's bill (and your bill) does:

This bill will accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the earthquake in Haiti.

Under current law, a taxpayer is allowed to deduct charitable contributions in the taxable year the contribution is made.

The bill asks for an exception to this for cash contributions made to the Haitian relief efforts: A taxpayer who contributes a cash contribution in January or February, 2010, will be allowed to take the charitable contribution deduction in the 2009 taxable year instead of having to wait for the 2010 taxable year.

Mr. HERGER. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from California for the time.

I rise today as an original cosponsor of this bill.

As my colleagues have explained, this important measure would accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions to our relief efforts in Haiti. This means that those who are able to contribute now may receive the tax deduction for the 2009 filing period.

With over $40 million in private and corporate donations already made, this will be a great incentive for the American people to reach even deeper into our pockets and help our friends in Haiti. This, in turn, will augment U.S. Government efforts, demonstrating the clear benefits of public-private partnerships. And it is an important step at a time when we must do more with less in the face of rapidly rising deficits here at home.

There is no doubt that the United States, as a government and as a people, stand side by side with the people of Haiti during this most tragic time. Our assistance efforts so far are unparalleled, and last week, President Obama pledged $100 million in U.S. funding toward the relief efforts.

It is my hope that, after expeditious surveys of the damage, a significant portion of this funding will come from the $845 million in international disaster assistance that this Congress has already appropriated for fiscal year 2010. By pulling from these funds, we will be able to quickly address the humanitarian needs in Haiti right now.

In addition, I urge President Obama to immediately begin efforts to convene an international donors' conference to bring together other responsible nations and international organizations that can join the United States in committing efforts to help the Haitian people recover from this horrible disaster.

Keeping in mind the urgent nature of this much-needed assistance, it remains incumbent upon the U.S. to work to ensure that international donations are pooled and integrated, that pledges are tracked, and that transparency measures are put in place to help ensure that aid reaches those who need it.

Further, we should encourage joint ventures and public-private partnerships as we consider the many ways that we may help promote not only the immediate but also the long-term recovery of Haiti as well. The United States will do its share, but the rest of the world must do its best also. Other nations must not forget about Haiti, once the attention on the crisis has subsided, and leave the U.S., as has been often the case, to bear most of the responsibility for the recovery of Haiti.

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

Mr. HERGER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, we have all been deeply moved by the outpouring of support that we have seen from communities across the United States. Unsurprisingly, the Haitian American community has shown invaluable leadership in the aftermath of last week's tragic earthquake. Now more than ever, the U.S. must focus our efforts on engaging these communities to make sure that they are involved in the rebuilding of their native homeland.

The Haitian diaspora is a valuable resource that must be tapped to ensure that the stability, freedom, success, and prosperity that the Haitian people deserve finally come true.

I would like to thank Chairman RANGEL and Ranking Member CAMP for introducing this important measure. I strongly urge my colleagues to support its passage.

I thank the gentleman again for the time.

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the Chair of the Ways and Means Committee in permitting me to speak on this and the rapid action that the committee has taken.

As we are overcome with grief and sympathy for the Haitian tragedy, I am reminded of the devastation I saw in Indonesia in the aftermath of the 2004 tsunami, where over 160,000 people were killed. That disaster inspired cooperation that was truly incredible even in the troubled island of Aceh that had been torn by war for years. That rebuilding effort sparked a terrific renaissance there.

This must signal a new day for the troubled but promising country of Haiti. Obviously, our immediate priority must be saving lives with food, water, shelter, medical supplies. I am pleased that groups in my community, like the acclaimed Mercy Corps, and the Northwest Medical Team, have leaped into action with resources from the Pacific Northwest to make a difference under these dire circumstances.

But we must recognize that decades of crushing poverty in Haiti have left ordinary people far too vulnerable to disaster. We have an obligation as a country, as we work with comprehensive aid efforts in the months and years ahead after the cameras are gone, to help the Haitians rebuild that nation. You know, there are problems with the nation of Haiti. But the world has not always, indeed has seldom been a good neighbor to that troubled country.

I am pleased that this legislation will make it easier for Americans, who face tough times themselves, to help give gifts of life and hope to our neighbors in that devastated island. The bill allows those who have donated to Haiti a chance to claim the donation in the tax return that they are preparing this spring rather than waiting a full year to claim the deduction. It is a simple gesture, but it will encourage giving in this challenging economy and helping do what is right for Haiti.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to yield 2 minutes to the majority whip, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN). There is no question that he has provided the leadership on this issue and inspired the Ways and Means Committee and so many other Members in the Congress. Haiti has a true friend in the heart of JIM CLYBURN, our Democratic whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman RANGEL for yielding me this time.

I want to thank you and Mr. CAMP for bringing this legislation forward. I want to thank the minority whip, Mr. CANTOR, for joining with us in making this a truly bipartisan effort. I also want to thank the 162 cosponsors, original cosponsors, of this legislation.

I believe that all of us who are familiar with the various areas of our great country know that it all depends on where you live as to what kind of catastrophic event you can expect to visit your community. For many of us, it may be a dust storm; for others, like my area of the country, a hurricane; for others, it could very well be an earthquake.

All of us are but the sum total of our experiences, and I believe that it is this vast amount and broad level of experiences that the people of these United States of America are going to call upon in order to respond to the people of Haiti. And for us to offer all Americans the opportunity to deduct on their 2009 taxes any contribution they make to this effort by February 28 will go a long way toward incentivizing the kind of behavior that we think is very, very important.

I want to thank the sponsors of this legislation and thank all of those who will be voting for it today. It is one way that we can say to the people of this Nation that Americans not just sympathize with them but we empathize as well.

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to our whip, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise this afternoon in strong support of this important relief legislation for the people of Haiti.

On January 12, 2010, Haiti was shaken by an earthquake unparalleled in its history. As horrendous as they are, the pictures in our newspapers and on TV can only begin to tell the story of the suffering of the Haitian people. Just this morning, the people of that country had another scare, experiencing another shock with a magnitude of 6.1.

Madam Speaker, when crisis calls, American citizens are at their finest. The people of the U.S. have always been, and continue to be, a generous and giving people. And whether it is offering shelter to orphan children, making cash donations, or simply volunteering time, when tragedy strikes, the American people take action.

Charitable donations have already begun pouring into organizations assisting in the relief efforts. This legislation allows generous Americans who make a cash donation to the Haitian relief effort to treat those donations as if they were made in the tax year 2009.

□ 1230

Similar policy has been used in past tragedies, and studies show that it actually increases the total amount of charitable contributions.

I want to thank my colleague, Majority Whip CLYBURN, for his assistance in bringing this legislation to the floor. I would also like to thank the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Michigan and their leadership in bringing forward this important bill. While it is often the differences between the parties in Congress that makes the news, this legislation demonstrates that we can come together on commonsense proposals to ease the suffering of our fellow man. When our offices discussed last week how we could help encourage charitable donations for the relief effort, and in particular this proposal, it was clear that partisanship had been set aside. I think the American people and those in Haiti are all the better for it. I ask for support of this legislation.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to, first of all, commend Chairman RANGEL and Ranking Member CAMP for their quick action and leadership on this legislation.

I rise today in strong support of this bill to accelerate the income tax benefits for those who make cash contributions to people affected by the earthquake in Haiti. Americans are deeply saddened at the level of devastation caused by the earthquake that struck Haiti on January 12, resulting in tremendous damage and loss of life.

There are enormous needs in Haiti. It is important to have the Federal Government, our government, demonstrate leadership in providing relief. I also wish to acknowledge and recognize all of the organizations and groups, not-for-profits, churches. Over the weekend, I visited several churches, and I was tremendously impressed at the level of giving that people out of the goodness of their hearts were pouring out. And especially do I congratulate and commend Bishop Blake and the Church of God in Christ churches for the enormous contribution that they are making; the Baptist churches, Methodist churches. All churches. People are demonstrating what it means to give of themselves and to help others.

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4462. On January 12, Haiti was struck by a magnitude 7 earthquake, which devastated the country and people of Haiti. I have lived for approximately a dozen years in earthquake country, and I know how serious an earthquake of this magnitude is. I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to the families who have lost loved ones in this horrible tragedy. Even in the face of this disaster, the people of the world have united in response through prayer, monetary donations, and critical humanitarian aid. In fact, The Chronicle of Philanthropy reported yesterday that over $275 million has already been generously donated worldwide.

I am again humbled by the efforts of humanitarian aid groups based in west Michigan, which has a long history of charitable giving in times of need. The response to this natural disaster has proved no different. I'm grateful to my constituents for their compassion and generosity, which has existed for many years. Humanitarian aid groups in Grand Rapids that are contributing to the relief effort include Rays of Hope for Haiti, the Christian Reformed World Relief Committee, the Red Cross, and countless others. Even a global corporation located in my district is en route with several flights this week to Haiti, transporting medical supplies and a medical team. The extraordinary efforts by all of these groups are to be commended.

While our country and the world respond to emergency needs in Haiti, I have heard from many in my community who echo my fervent requests to provide additional assistance to the orphans in Haiti. I ask for your continued prayers for the children of Haiti who will soon be united with their adoptive families here in the United States, and especially for those who have been orphaned in the wake of last Tuesday's tragedy. I also urge the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of State to greatly speed up the adoption process and visa procedures for not only the orphans already in process but also for all the children who became orphans due to the death of their parents in the horrible earthquake.

I urge my constituents and all Americans to donate to a reputable charity organization for earthquake relief in Haiti. I am very pleased that former Presidents Bush and Clinton are leading efforts through the Clinton-Bush Haiti Fund. This bill, H.R. 4462, will allow taxpayers to deduct their donations from their 2009 taxes, and it is my hope that all people who are able will offer their support to the people of Haiti.

May God bless and comfort the people of Haiti.

Mr. HERGER. Madam Speaker, in closing, I'd simply say that this is a good bill. It reflects the generosity of the American people in responding to a horrific disaster, and I urge all Members to vote ''aye.''

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4462, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I close this on the high note that America has shown its greatest, especially in this Congress. I want to thank SCOTT MURPHY, a new Member, for insisting that we move forward on this. Of course, the Republicans, Mr. HERGER and Mr. CAMP, who joined together with Democrats to prove that when Americans want to do things, that party labels don't really mean that much. I do hope that the rest of the country would see what we have done and take advantage of this legislation in order to make certain that they have an accurate recording of the contributions that they make through the telephone as well as to take advantage of the expediting of deductions that are being recognized by the Internal Revenue Service.

I hope everyone would vote for this bill and let this be a symbol as to what this Congress can do. It's not just for Haiti, but for ourselves and the rest of the free world.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4462, To Accelerate the Income Tax Benefits for Charitable Cash Contributions for the Relief of Victims of the Earthquake in Haiti Act, authored by my friend and colleague from New York, Representative RANGEL, the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. This important legislation would permit people who make charitable contributions to the relief work in Haiti to take a tax deduction on their 2009 taxes instead of on their 2010 returns. This is an excellent idea which will hopefully spark additional giving to help the people of Haiti.

Tens if not hundreds of thousands of people have lost their lives in the Haitian tragedy and hundreds of thousands more are homeless. The American people have been deeply moved by this crisis and are showing their profound generosity through donations to organizations helping the Haitian people. In fact, as of yesterday, the American Red Cross had already raised $112 million for Haiti, $22 million of which came from text messages sent by the American people. The outpouring to Haiti from the great people of this nation and from around the world has been truly overwhelming. I am touched by how Americans from all walks of life have given their time, talents, and financial resources to help those whose lives depend upon such aid.

By permitting taxpayers to take a deduction on their 2009 taxes instead of their 2010 returns, H.R. 4462 will help those Americans who have already donated and encourage those who have not yet done so. In addition to thanking Chairman RANGEL for this legislation, I would also like to mention our colleague, Representative KENDRICK MEEK, who was developing similar legislation. He has been a leader on all aspects of U.S. policy toward Haiti and deserves to be recognized here in Congress.

Again, I strongly support H.R. 4462 to recognize the generosity of the American people in responding to the devastation in Haiti and to encourage future giving. This is a bill that inspires ''the better angels of our nature'' and helps the victims of this disaster, as well. It deserves our unanimous support.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of today's bill to accelerate the tax benefits for charitable contributions made in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake in Haiti. The people of Haiti have endured an unimaginable disaster, and our thoughts go out to the millions of families who have been affected by this tragedy.

In times such as these, we must unite in common purpose to help those in need. I am truly heartened by the outpouring of support from the American people, who have contributed hundreds of millions of dollars to disaster relief organizations over the last week despite the economic challenges they face here at home. As policy makers, we should do all we can to encourage this charitable spirit and assist Americans in giving whatever they can through immediate tax relief. The bill will allow people to claim cash contributions made to victims of the Haiti earthquake on their 2009 tax returns, rather than waiting until they file in 2010. It offers an immediate benefit for those who have already made a contribution and provides a little extra incentive for others who are considering a donation of their own.

It is crucial that we join together to support the ongoing rescue and recovery efforts. This bill is a small but necessary component of those efforts, and I remain ready to assist the international community as they bring additional aid and relief to Haiti.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4462 which would allow Americans to deduct the charitable contributions they make to the Haitian relief efforts in January and February of 2010 on their 2009 tax returns. I commend Chairman RANGEL for bringing this bill forward and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The toll of human suffering in Haiti is unimaginable, with up to an estimated 200,000 people who have lost their lives and nearly 3 million people affected by the earthquake. Haiti is the poorest, least developed country in the Western Hemisphere which, even before the quake, suffered from political instability, hurricanes, and food shortages. Even so, the loss of life and destruction from this disaster has left the country in a state of collapse not seen in Haiti in over two centuries.

The images of death and devastation coming from Haiti are driving Americans to donate their time, money, and supplies—it is truly America at its best. All donations, large and small, are helping to provide crucial necessities for this relief effort. Millions of dollars are pouring into non-profit organizations that are making sure that money and supplies go directly where they need to go, to the people of Haiti. The bill we pass today will help encourage even more donations.

We know that the effort to rebuild Haiti and care for those who have been injured will continue for some time to come. The people of Haiti need our help and I am pleased that we are doing all that we can to promote the generosity Americans have shown since the devastating earthquake shook Haiti last week.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4462.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I lend my full support for H.R. 4462, introduced by my colleague Chairman CHARLES RANGEL, which allows for the acceleration of tax benefits for charitable cash contributions to benefit the victims of the earthquake in the Republic of Haiti on January 12, 2010.

This tax benefit will allow persons who make cash donations to the relief efforts in Haiti from January 11, 2010 to March 1, 2010 the opportunity to claim those donations as charitable contributions on their 2009 Federal Income Tax Return.

The 7.0 earthquake that ravaged the Haitian capital of Port-au-Prince, the city of Jacmel and the city of Carrefour brought immediate devastation to the country, taking the lives of approximately 200,000 people and leaving tens of thousands missing. This event, which has left an estimated 1.5 million homeless, has completely destroyed most of the infrastructure in the capital, and was deemed the largest earthquake of this magnitude in over two centuries in the Republic of Haiti.

Providing a tax benefit on charitable contributions would offer an incentive for American citizens to give during an essential period for the relief effort in Haiti. Several charities saw a significant drop in contributions, which fund the entirety of their operations, due to the economic crisis. Non-profit organizations will need considerable resources to provide the long-term services for a population devastated by a natural disaster. This tax benefit will ensure those resources are funded by an outpouring of generosity from the American people.

In the face of this grave tragedy, the American people have given from their hearts, as well as their pockets, to assist the people of Haiti during this time of extreme hardship and turmoil. This philanthropy should not go unnoticed, especially as many people have chosen to donate at a time when their own financial well-being is uncertain.

I would like to thank Chairman RANGEL for introducing this piece of legislation, and the American people for their benevolence in this time of adversity for the Haitian people.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4462, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CELEBRATING 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF SONG TRIBUTE TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1010) celebrating the life and work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. during the 30th anniversary of the Stevie Wonder song tribute to Dr.

King, ''Happy Birthday,'' and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1010

Whereas the life and work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was properly captured in Dr. King's most famed speech, ''I Have A Dream'', on August 28, 1963, when he said, ''I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal' '';

Whereas beginning with the Montgomery Bus Boycott on December 1, 1955, Dr. King led protests, demonstrations, rallies, freedom rides, sit-ins, vigils, all in non-violent fashion, to combat hate, inequality, and racial injustice in the United States;

Whereas following the end of the Montgomery Bus Boycott in 1956, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and others, including Dr. Ralph Abernathy, formed the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) in 1957 to promote civil rights and to bring an absolute and nonviolent end to segregation;

Whereas the efforts of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and those that joined him in the civil rights movement resulted in the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Fair Housing Act of 1968;

Whereas several U.S. Supreme Court cases decided during the era of the civil rights movement, like Browder v. Gayle (352 U.S. 903 (1956)), Boynton v. Virginia (364 U.S. 454 (1960)), and Heart of Atlanta Motel Inc. v. United States (379 U.S. 241 (1964)) were consistent with the work of Dr. King and others to eradicate segregation and discrimination and deem such practices unconstitutional;

Whereas Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. received the Spingarn Medal in 1957 and the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964, distinctions that were given to him at the young ages of 28 and 35, respectively, for the selflessness and dedication he exhibited in advancing civil rights;

Whereas the life and work of Dr. King, to advance justice, equality, and peace for the entire human race, ended prematurely, when he was assassinated on April 4, 1968, in Memphis, Tennessee, while challenging the inequitable wages and treatment of Memphis sanitation workers;

Whereas Martin Luther King, Jr., was survived by Coretta Scott King, an activist in her own right, and 4 children, 2 sons and 2 daughters, who would also continue the fight for civil rights and equality;

Whereas 4 days after the assassination of Dr. King, on April 8, 1968, Representative John Conyers, Jr. introduced legislation to recognize Dr. King with a Federal holiday that coincided with the great civil rights leader's birthday, January 15, 1929;

Whereas the campaign to secure a Federal holiday in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. lasted 15 years, with the 1980 Stevie Wonder song tribute to Dr. King, ''Happy Birthday'', solidifying the campaign's success;

Whereas Stevie Wonder dedicated his album sleeve for ''Hotter Than July'', an album released on September 29, 1980, and upon which ''Happy Birthday'' is recorded, to Dr. King, with an inscription that read, ''[Martin Luther King, Jr.] showed us, nonviolently, a better way of life, a way of mutual respect, helping us to avoid much bitter confrontation and inevitable bloodshed'';

Whereas Mr. Wonder also wrote on his album sleeve for ''Hotter Than July'' the following, ''We still have a long road to travel until we reach the world that was [Dr. King's] dream. We in the United States must not forget either his supreme sacrifice or that dream'';

Whereas Stevie Wonder encouraged the establishment of a Federal holiday in recognition of Dr. King on his album sleeve for ''Hotter Than July'' by expressing that, ''I and a growing number of people believe that it is time for our country to adopt legislation that will make January 15, Martin Luther King's birthday, a national holiday, both in recognition of what he achieved and as a reminder of the distance which still has to be traveled'';

Whereas the song, ''Happy Birthday'', became a rallying cry, which led to the collection of 6,000,000 signatures in support of a Federal holiday in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., which Stevie Wonder and Coretta Scott King presented to Congressional Leadership in 1982;

Whereas ultimate enactment of legislation designating the third Monday of January as a Federal holiday in observance of Dr. Marin Luther King, Jr. was realized on November 3, 1983, when such legislation was signed into law;

Whereas the first Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal holiday was observed on January 20, 1986, and celebrated with a concert headlined by Stevie Wonder, who has, in the years since, continued his commitment to promoting peace and equality, for which he has been recognized with a Lifetime Achievement Award from the National Civil Rights Museum in Memphis, Tennessee;

Whereas the legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. is continued today, as evidenced by the work of organizations like the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, which is currently led by Dr. King's daughter, Bernice King, and was at one time led by Dr. King's son, Martin Luther King, III;

Whereas today, the very mission of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference states, ''In the spirit of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) is renewing its commitment to bring about the promise of 'one nation, under God, indivisible' together with the commitment to activate the 'strength to love' within the community of humankind''; and

Whereas in addition to organizations, the legacy of Dr. King continues on today with people in the United States and throughout the world, with individual acts of compassion, courage, and peace: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives—

(1) celebrates the life and work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. during the 30th anniversary of the Stevie Wonder song tribute to Dr. King, ''Happy Birthday'';

(2) recognizes that the legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. continues on with commitments to freedom, equality, and justice, as exhibited by Stevie Wonder and so many others; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to commemorate the legacy of Dr. King by renewing pledges to advance those principles and actions that are consistent with Dr. King's belief that ''all men are created equal''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker and Members, I have been doing this for quite a number of years now, and I asked my chief of staff how many years specifically it's been. But we're here again with the ranking member, LAMAR SMITH; with JOHN LEWIS, the last remaining King disciple that worked with Dr. King longer than any of us. Today, we rise to salute not only Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., but also recalling those days when we were marching for a King holiday. We salute Dr. King and Stevie Wonder for the wonderful inspiration he gave us all with his musical tribute to Dr. King, ''Happy Birthday.''

On Monday, we observed for the 25th year the Federal Martin Luther King, Jr., holiday bill that started off 3 days after his assassination when I made this proposal. It also coincides with the 30th anniversary of Stevie Wonder's 1980 song tribute to Dr. King. Stevie's song became the rallying cry for those fighting for a holiday for Martin Luther King, Jr. He was one of our greatest advocates.

I just wanted to recall—I don't know if JOHN LEWIS remembers—the day at that march we got a call from the White House and they wanted Stevie Wonder to come to the White House. Stevie Wonder said, Well, how come they haven't invited you to come to the White House instead of me? I said, Stevie, that doesn't matter. They want you, and this is what we have been marching for. So you come to the White House. He said, No, I'm not going. And we went back and forth. Finally, he didn't come.

But later, shortly thereafter, we began the negotiations with Jack Kemp of New York, with the Republicans in the White House, and this agreement was struck: That if the House and the Senate could pass a King holiday bill, the President would sign it into law. We felt we could get it through the House, but the other body was another story entirely. Finally, it did happen.

I don't know if you remember the day that Coretta Scott King and all the kids, and Abernathy, Lowery, Julian Bond, we were all over in the other body and the speeches went on and on. Everybody was acclaiming King. You'd have thought he was a native son of all the speakers. It finally ended. They had far more time to consume than we did. A reporter asked me, What took you so long? Everybody seemed to have been for this bill all the time. Of course, I resisted losing my nonviolent disposition to respond to him, because

it took 15 years before that bill was finally taken up by the body. But it was because of the people, it was because of the spirit of the people in the public schools and the city councils, the counties. And the States even passed resolutions for us to do that.

□ 1245

Finally, the pressure built up so much throughout the country that we finally had the bill passed in the other body. The President then, true to his word, signed the bill. It was a great moment in history. I am still proud to say that we seriously honor King with this third Monday of every January. I will put the rest of my remarks in the RECORD.

House Resolution 1010 celebrates the work of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and salutes Stevie Wonder for his song tribute to Dr. King, ''Happy Birthday.''

On Monday, we observed, for the 27th year, the Federal Martin Luther King Jr. Holiday. This particular commemoration of the King holiday coincides with the 30th anniversary of Stevie Wonder's 1980 song tribute to Dr. King.

Stevie Wonder's song became the rallying cry for those fighting for a Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal holiday, and he proved to be one of the holiday's greatest advocates.

And so, 30 years later, it is fitting that we consider a resolution both honoring Dr. King and saluting Stevie Wonder.

Today, I would like to touch on three significant points. First, having just observed the King Holiday, we are reminded of the more equal and just society that we live in today as a result of Dr. King's life work.

Dr. King's struggle led to the enactment of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the 1965 Voting Rights Act, and the 1968 Fair Housing Act. From buses to motels, his work brought an end to state-sanctioned segregation and discrimination in public accommodations that were the hallmark of the Jim Crow system.

Personally, and I'm sure like many, I pursue my own life's work in the spirit of Dr. King.

When I first ran to represent the 14th Congressional District of Michigan in 1963, it was with the endorsement of Dr. King that I won.

It was through Dr. King that I got to know Rosa Parks, the mother of the Civil Rights Movement, who would work in my Detroit office for over 20 years.

On my second point, despite the great contributions Dr. King made, the pursuit of a Federal holiday in Dr. King's honor was long fought.

Significantly, it was Stevie Wonder's song tribute to Dr. King, ''Happy Birthday,'' that played a large role in galvanizing public support for a Federal holiday.

Just four days after the assassination of Dr. King, on April 8, 1968, I introduced legislation to observe the life and work of Dr. King with a Federal holiday. Until it became law in 1983, there was a persistent legislative drive for the King Holiday.

Stevie Wonder was one of the leading advocates at the helm during this fight. On September 29, 1980, he released the album, ''Hotter than July,'' containing a song he wrote in honor of Dr. King ''Happy Birthday.''

Mr. Wonder dedicated the album sleeve for ''Hotter than July'' to Dr. King with an inscription, and also encouraged the establishment of a Federal holiday in recognition of Dr. King.

Right on the album cover, he wrote, ''I and a growing number of people believe that it is time for our country to adopt King Holiday legislation, both in recognition of what he achieved and as a reminder of the distance which still has to be traveled.''

That growing number of people equated to 6 million signatures in support of the King Holiday, which Stevie Wonder and Coretta Scott King presented to Congress in 1982.

On the 15th anniversary of Dr. King's assassination, and the 20th anniversary of the March on Washington, Congress passed King Holiday legislation in 1983, with a vote of 338 to 90 in the House and a vote of 78 to 22 in the Senate. That November, it was signed into law.

At the first King Holiday observance, on January 20, 1986, Stevie Wonder headlined a concert in honor of Dr. King. And his commitment to advance the King legacy did not stop there.

Stevie Wonder has gone on to address such social and racial ills as apartheid in South Africa, hunger in Africa, and HIV/AIDS. In fact, his musical and social contributions are so significant that I feel Stevie Wonder is deserving of a Congressional Gold Medal.

Finally, we must continue the legacy of Dr. King—not just on the third Monday in January each year, but every day. It is each and every day that we should work to advance the ''Beloved Community'' that Dr. King envisioned.

Dr. King said, ''Life's most urgent and persistent question is: What are you doing for others?'' Let us ask ourselves this question, and act; and not just today, but every day.

I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, JOHN LEWIS, for joining me in introducing this bipartisan resolution.

I would also like to acknowledge the many Members of the Judiciary Committee that join us in supporting this resolution—in particular, the gentleman from Texas, our Ranking Member, LAMAR SMITH.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I support House Resolution 1010. This resolution celebrates the life and work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. It also celebrates the 30th anniversary of the release of Stevie Wonder's song tribute to Dr. King entitled ''Happy Birthday.'' Dr. King was the leading champion of a historic nonviolent revolution in the United States. Throughout his life, he fought for racial harmony and equal justice. While advancing this historic movement, Dr. King endured many forms of hatred and even suffered physical abuse. Despite this violence, Dr. King peacefully continued to pursue justice and equality for all.

As a pastor, Dr. King's religious beliefs were essential to the success of his nonviolent efforts. It is doubtful that such a long and enduring movement could have survived without the power of religious inspiration and conviction behind it. From 1957 to 1968, Dr. King traveled over 6 million miles and spoke thousands of times about justice and equal freedom under the law. During those years, he led large protests that drew the attention of the world.

On August 28, 1963, Dr. King led a peaceful march of 250,000 people through the streets of Washington, D.C.; and it is here in this city where he delivered a speech that spoke for all Americans, regardless of the color of their skin. ''I have a dream,'' he said, ''that my four little children will one day live in a Nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.''

Dr. King opened the door of opportunity for millions of Americans. In his ''I Have a Dream'' speech, Dr. King called the march the ''greatest demonstration for freedom in the history of our Nation.'' Four days after the assassination of Dr. King, Representative JOHN CONYERS, now our Judiciary Committee chairman and the cosponsor of the resolution we are now considering, introduced legislation to recognize Dr. King's life's work with a Federal holiday that coincided with Dr. King's birthday, January 15.

Madam Speaker, I just want to say today that I think Chairman CONYERS has been too modest about his significant role in establishing that holiday. In 1980, Stevie Wonder released his song tribute to Dr. King called ''Happy Birthday'' to bring attention to the movement to enact a Federal holiday in honor of Dr. King. Stevie Wonder sang that Dr. King's vision of peace should be celebrated throughout the world and that a holiday would help achieve Dr. King's dreams of integration and love and unity for all of God's children. On November 3, 1983, legislation was signed into law, designating the third Monday of January as a Federal holiday in observance of Dr. King.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend LAMAR SMITH for his significant contribution and his work as a co-leader on the Judiciary Committee for all the other things that we work on as well.

I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), a gentleman whom I knew before he was a Member of Congress, and he knew me before I was a Member of Congress as well.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and to celebrate the 30th anniversary of Stevie Wonder's song ''Happy Birthday.'' That song was such a fitting tribute to Dr. King and a rallying cry to create the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday that we celebrated last weekend and on Monday.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was my friend. He was my big brother. He was a prophet, and he was my hero. And above all, he was a simple human being filled with love, peace, and compassion for all humankind. Madam Speaker, I want to take the opportunity to thank my colleague, the chairman, Mr. CONYERS, for the great and unbelievable role that you have played in making

this holiday possible. When the historians pick up that pen and write about this period, they would have to write that you, JOHN CONYERS, paved the way to make it possible for people all over America and around the world to stop and celebrate the work of Martin Luther King, Jr.

We, as a Congress, as a Nation, and as a people are deeply indebted to you; and we will never, ever forget the role that you played. Stevie Wonder's song reminds us that there is a better way: the way of love, the way of nonviolence. Mr. Chairman, JOHN CONYERS, you never gave up. You never gave in. You and Stevie Wonder kept the faith, and you kept your eyes on the prize. Out of Detroit, out of that unbelievable city, you had the right stuff, the good stuff.

The King holiday is a day of reflection. We all took time to reflect on the legacy of this man who, through his love and his leadership, made our country a better place. It also becomes a day of service. Dr. King preached a doctrine of nonviolence and civil disobedience to combat segregation, discrimination, and racial injustice. Stevie Wonder's song 30 years later still reminds us that we have come a distance, but we still have a long road to travel until we reach the world that was Dr. King's dream.

So it is fitting and appropriate that we pause as a Nation and as a people to remember the life of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. And through the music, through the song, ''Happy Birthday'' by Stevie Wonder, we all continue to be inspired, as Dr. King inspired a Nation and changed America forever.

Madam Speaker, we all spent some time in reflection this weekend and on Monday, but today we encourage all citizens to try to live the teachings of Dr. King. Our Nation will move us closer to Dr. King's dream of creating the beloved community, a community of justice based on human dignity and at peace with itself.

Again, I thank Chairman CONYERS for his work and for bringing this piece of legislation before us today.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Madam Speaker, I did not prepare or plan to speak on this resolution, but I saw my friend JOHN LEWIS on the floor. I went 2 days ago, on this year's M.L. King Day, and I was moved beyond measure to stand on the very spot where Dr. King lost his life, the National Civil Rights Museum in Memphis, Tennessee, at the Lorraine Motel, to tour there and spend a couple of hours. It is an extraordinary museum, an extraordinary place. I would encourage all Americans to go see that, to experience it much more than I had ever dreamed. I had not been there. Even though I'm a Tennessean, even though I feel like, as an American who believes in equality and justice, I feel like a sojourner with my friend JOHN LEWIS, as the cosponsor with LACY CLAY of the Civil Rights Trail legislation which is pending before this House; cosponsor with JESSE JACKSON JR. of the naming of Emancipation Hall; cosponsor with JOHN LEWIS of the Green McAdoo legislation in Tennessee, recognizing the Clinton 12 and the bravery on the road that we're on.

But to me, Martin Luther King Day is all about equality and justice, the traits of our great Nation that we hold so dear. That process and that journey is not complete. It is not over. We all know it. But great strides have been made, including the election of our President, a crowning achievement in this movement. But I was so moved by how a single bullet from across the street, and I went there as well, changed history but also how at that moment so many things began to happen.

Now Dr. King even knew somehow in his heart, heading into that moment, that it was going to happen. I never realized the depth of that until I went there for 2 hours. A powerful, powerful way to celebrate this progress, this man and this part of our history is to go there. And of course JOHN LEWIS is all over it. You thank Chairman CONYERS. Man, do I ever want to thank you, brother, for your life, for your courage, for the youth movement, for the freedom rides, for all that you have been involved in, for your book, for your legacy, for your service. JOHN LEWIS, a great American.

Obviously, I don't always agree with you, but I respect you immensely. Thank you for how far you have brought us and for all the people who invested their lives in the civil rights movement. Thank you from all of us, from everywhere for the progress that has been made. It's so very important that we continue to fight for equality and justice for all. That's what people from around the world look to our country in amazement about. Our national character is not born out of our greatness and our power and our tall buildings and our military might. It's born out of our character which comes from lessons learned and wrongs made right. That's this journey that we're on. And to all that have given blood and have sacrificed mightily, the United States of America honors you in honoring Dr. King in his legacy.

In many ways, he may have had to give his life to see these things happen, and that's why we honor the life of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I just want to tell our colleague from Tennessee, Mr. ZACH WAMP, that that was the most amazing recapitulation of what happens to people when they go and trace these incredible moments in history that many of us have lived through. I particularly appreciate his recollection and his feelings and how they have impacted on his work here in the Congress. I just wanted to thank him for that myself.

And for all of our colleagues, many of whom are submitting statements, I'm going to put into the RECORD the remarks of President Obama on January 17 as he recalled that day of celebrating the life and legacy of Martin Luther King, Jr., and the article in Politico that also recapitulated the history of the struggle that King led, which is not over.

And although the raw violence that accompanied that struggle in those days—remember, the men, women and children who were in the struggle were risking their lives. This wasn't a philosophical discussion or a theoretical examination of where they were in history. This was an unbelievably brutal period of our history.

□ 1300

We recall that not in bitterness, but in honest reflection. I remember the trilogy written on King. Taylor Branch wrote three volumes on King, and I recommend it strongly to anybody who wants to read it. There have been many, many other records of this part of our history, but to JOHN LEWIS and me, Taylor Branch seemed to capture it with the detail and passion that few others were able to summon up.

[From the White House, Jan. 17, 2010]

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT IN REMEMBRANCE OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning. Praise be to God. Let me begin by thanking the entire Vermont Avenue Baptist Church family for welcoming our family here today. It feels like a family. Thank you for making us feel that way. (Applause.) To Pastor Wheeler, first lady Wheeler, thank you so much for welcoming us here today. Congratulations on Jordan Denice—aka Cornelia. (Laughter.)

Michelle and I have been blessed with a new nephew this year as well—Austin Lucas Robinson. (Applause.) So maybe at the appropriate time we can make introductions. (Laughter.) Now, if Jordan's father is like me, then that will be in about 30 years. (Laughter.) That is a great blessing.

Michelle and Malia and Sasha and I are thrilled to be here today. And I know that sometimes you have to go through a little fuss to have me as a guest speaker. (Laughter.) So let me apologize in advance for all the fuss.

We gather here, on a Sabbath, during a time of profound difficulty for our nation and for our world. In such a time, it soothes the soul to seek out the Divine in a spirit of prayer; to seek solace among a community of believers. But we are not here just to ask the Lord for His blessing. We aren't here just to interpret His Scripture. We're also here to call on the memory of one of His noble servants, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Now, it's fitting that we do so here, within the four walls of Vermont Avenue Baptist Church—here, in a church that rose like the phoenix from the ashes of the civil war; here in a church formed by freed slaves, whose founding pastor had worn the union blue; here in a church from whose pews congregants set out for marches and from whom choir anthems of freedom were heard; from whose sanctuary King himself would sermonize from time to time.

One of those times was Thursday, December 6, 1956. Pastor, you said you were a little older than me, so were you around at that point? (Laughter.) You were three years old—okay. (Laughter.) I wasn't born yet. (Laughter.)

On Thursday, December 6, 1956. And before Dr. King had pointed us to the mountaintop, before he told us about his dream in front of the Lincoln Memorial, King came here, as a 27-year-old preacher, to speak on what he called ''The Challenge of a New Age.'' ''The Challenge of a New Age.'' It was a period of triumph, but also uncertainty, for Dr. King and his followers—because just weeks earlier, the Supreme Court had ordered the desegregation of Montgomery's buses, a hard-wrought, hard-fought victory that would put an end to the 381-day historic boycott down in Montgomery, Alabama.

And yet, as Dr. King rose to take that pulpit, the future still seemed daunting. It wasn't clear what would come next for the movement that Dr. King led. It wasn't clear how we were going to reach the Promised Land. Because segregation was still rife; lynchings still a fact. Yes, the Supreme Court had ruled not only on the Montgomery buses, but also on Brown v. Board of Education. And yet that ruling was defied throughout the South—by schools and by States; they ignored it with impunity. And here in the Nation's capital, the Federal Government had yet to fully align itself with the laws on its books and the ideals of its founding.

So it's not hard for us, then, to imagine that moment. We can imagine folks coming to this church, happy about the boycott being over. We can also imagine them, though, coming here concerned about their future, sometimes second-guessing strategy, maybe fighting off some creeping doubts, perhaps despairing about whether the movement in which they had placed so many of their hopes—a movement in which they believed so deeply—could actually deliver on its promise.

So here we are, more than half a century later, once again facing the challenges of a new age. Here we are, once more marching toward an unknown future, what I call the Joshua generation to their Moses generation—the great inheritors of progress paid for with sweat and blood, and sometimes life itself.

We've inherited the progress of unjust laws that are now overturned. We take for granted the progress of a ballot being available to anybody who wants to take the time to actually vote. We enjoy the fruits of prejudice and bigotry being lifted—slowly, sometimes in fits and starts, but irrevocably—from human hearts. It's that progress that made it possible for me to be here today; for the good people of this country to elect an African American the 44th President of the United States of America.

Reverend Wheeler mentioned the inauguration, last year's election. You know, on the heels of that victory over a year ago, there were some who suggested that somehow we had entered into a post-racial America, all those problems would be solved. There were those who argued that because I had spoke of a need for unity in this country that our nation was somehow entering into a period of post partisanship. That didn't work out so well. There was a hope shared by many that life would be better from the moment that I swore that oath.

Of course, as we meet here today, one year later, we know the promise of that moment has not yet been fully fulfilled. Because of an era of greed and irresponsibility that sowed the seeds of its own demise, because of persistent economic troubles unaddressed through the generations, because of a banking crisis that brought the financial system to the brink of catastrophe, we are being tested—in our own lives and as a nation—as few have been tested before.

Unemployment is at its highest level in more than a quarter of a century. Nowhere is it higher than the African American community. Poverty is on the rise. Home ownership is slipping. Beyond our shores, our sons and daughters are fighting two wars. Closer to home, our Haitian brothers and sisters are in desperate need. Bruised, battered, many people are legitimately feeling doubt, even despair, about the future. Like those who came to this church on that Thursday in 1956, folks are wondering, where do we go from here?

I understand those feelings. I understand the frustration and sometimes anger that so many folks feel as they struggle to stay afloat. I get letters from folks around the country every day; I read 10 a night out of the 40,000 that we receive. And there are stories of hardship and desperation, in some cases, pleading for help: I need a job. I'm about to lose my home. I don't have health care—it's about to cause my family to be bankrupt. Sometimes you get letters from children: My mama or my daddy have lost their jobs, is there something you can do to help? Ten letters like that a day we read.

So, yes, we're passing through a hard winter. It's the hardest in some time. But let's always remember that, as a people, the American people, we've weathered some hard winters before. This country was founded during some harsh winters. The fishermen, the laborers, the craftsmen who made camp at Valley Forge—they weathered a hard winter. The slaves and the freedmen who rode an underground railroad, seeking the light of justice under the cover of night—they weathered a hard winter. The seamstress whose feet were tired, the pastor whose voice echoes through the ages—they weathered some hard winters. It was for them, as it is for us, difficult, in the dead of winter, to sometimes see spring coming. They, too, sometimes felt their hopes deflate. And yet, each season, the frost melts, the cold recedes, the sun reappears. So it was for earlier generations and so it will be for us.

What we need to do is to just ask what lessons we can learn from those earlier generations about how they sustained themselves during those hard winters, how they persevered and prevailed. Let us in this Joshua generation learn how that Moses generation overcame.

Let me offer a few thoughts on this. First and foremost, they did so by remaining firm in their resolve. Despite being threatened by sniper fire or planted bombs, by shoving and punching and spitting and angry stares, they adhered to that sweet spirit of resistance, the principles of nonviolence that had accounted for their success.

Second, they understood that as much as our Government and our political parties had betrayed them in the past—as much as our nation itself had betrayed its own ideals—Government, if aligned with the interests of its people, can be—and must be—a force for good. So they stayed on the Justice Department. They went into the courts. They pressured Congress, they pressured their President. They didn't give up on this country. They didn't give up on Government. They didn't somehow say Government was the problem; they said, we're going to change Government, we're going to make it better. Imperfect as it was, they continued to believe in the promise of democracy; in America's constant ability to remake itself, to perfect this union.

Third, our predecessors were never so consumed with theoretical debates that they couldn't see progress when it came. Sometimes I get a little frustrated when folks just don't want to see that even if we don't get everything, we're getting something. (Applause.) King understood that the desegregation of the Armed Forces didn't end the civil rights movement, because black and white soldiers still couldn't sit together at the same lunch counter when they came home. But he still insisted on the rightness of desegregating the Armed Forces. That was a good first step—even as he called for more. He didn't suggest that somehow by the signing of the Civil Rights that somehow all discrimination would end. But he also didn't think that we shouldn't sign the Civil Rights Act because it hasn't solved every problem. Let's take a victory, he said, and then keep on marching. Forward steps, large and small, were recognized for what they were—which was progress.

Fourth, at the core of King's success was an appeal to conscience that touched hearts and opened minds, a commitment to universal ideals—of freedom, of justice, of equality—that spoke to all people, not just some people. For King understood that without broad support, any movement for civil rights could not be sustained. That's why he marched with the white auto worker in Detroit. That's why he linked arm with the Mexican farm worker in California, and united people of all colors in the noble quest for freedom.

Of course, King overcame in other ways as well. He remained strategically focused on gaining ground—his eyes on the prize constantly—understanding that change would not be easy, understand that change wouldn't come overnight, understanding that there would be setbacks and false starts along the way, but understanding, as he said in 1956, that ''we can walk and never get weary, because we know there is a great camp meeting in the promised land of freedom and justice.''

And it's because the Moses generation overcame that the trials we face today are very different from the ones that tested us in previous generations. Even after the worst recession in generations, life in America is not even close to being as brutal as it was back then for so many. That's the legacy of Dr. King and his movement. That's our inheritance. Having said that, let there be no doubt the challenges of our new age are serious in their own right, and we must face them as squarely as they faced the challenges they saw.

I know it's been a hard road we've traveled this year to rescue the economy, but the economy is growing again. The job losses have finally slowed, and around the country, there's signs that businesses and families are beginning to rebound. We are making progress.

I know it's been a hard road that we've traveled to reach this point on health reform. I promise you I know. (Laughter.) But under the legislation I will sign into law, insurance companies won't be able to drop you when you get sick, and more than 30 million people—(applause)—our fellow Americans will finally have insurance. More than 30 million men and women and children, mothers and fathers, won't be worried about what might happen to them if they get sick. This will be a victory not for Democrats; this will be a victory for dignity and decency, for our common humanity. This will be a victory for the United States of America.

Let's work to change the political system, as imperfect as it is. I know people can feel down about the way things are going sometimes here in Washington. I know it's tempting to give up on the political process. But we've put in place tougher rules on lobbying and ethics and transparency—tougher rules than any administration in history. It's not enough, but it's progress. Progress is possible. Don't give up on voting. Don't give up on advocacy. Don't give up on activism. There are too many needs to be met, too much work to be done. Like Dr. King said, ''We must accept finite disappointment but never lose infinite hope.''

Let us broaden our coalition, building a confederation not of liberals or conservatives, not of red states or blue states, but of all Americans who are hurting today, and searching for a better tomorrow. The urgency of the hour demands that we make common cause with all of America's workers—white, black, brown—all of whom are being hammered by this recession, all of whom are yearning for that spring to come. It demands that we reach out to those who've been left out in the cold even when the economy is good, even when we're not in recession—the youth in the inner cities, the youth here in Washington, D.C., people in rural communities who haven't seen prosperity reach them for a very long time. It demands that we fight discrimination, whatever form it may come. That means we fight discrimination against gays and lesbians, and we make common cause to reform our immigration system.

And finally, we have to recognize, as Dr. King did, that progress can't just come from without—it also has to come from within. And over the past year, for example, we've made meaningful improvements in the field of education. I've got a terrific Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan. He's been working hard with states and working hard with the D.C. school district, and we've insisted on reform, and we've insisted on accountability. We we're putting in more money and we've provided more Pell Grants and more tuition tax credits and simpler financial aid forms. We've done all that, but parents still need to parent. (Applause.) Kids still need to own up to their responsibilities. We still have to set high expectations for our young people. Folks can't simply look to government for all the answers without also looking inside themselves, inside their own homes, for some of the answers.

Progress will only come if we're willing to promote that ethic of hard work, a sense of responsibility, in our own lives. I'm not talking, by the way, just to the African American community. Sometimes when I say these things people assume, well, he's just talking to black people about working hard. No, no, no, no. I'm talking to the American community. Because somewhere along the way, we, as a nation, began to lose touch with some of our core values. You know what I'm talking about. We became enraptured with the false prophets who prophesized an easy path to success, paved with credit cards and home equity loans and get-rich-quick schemes, and the most important thing was to be a celebrity; it doesn't matter what you do, as long as you get on TV. That's everybody.

We forgot what made the bus boycott a success; what made the civil rights movement a success; what made the United States of America a success—that, in this country, there's no substitute for hard work, no substitute for a job well done, no substitute for being responsible stewards of God's blessings.

What we're called to do, then, is rebuild America from its foundation on up. To reinvest in the essentials that we've neglected for too long—like health care, like education, like a better energy policy, like basic infrastructure, like scientific research. Our generation is called to buckle down and get back to basics.

We must do so not only for ourselves, but also for our children, and their children. For Jordan and for Austin. That's a sacrifice that falls on us to make. It's a much smaller sacrifice than the Moses generation had to make, but it's still a sacrifice.

Yes, it's hard to transition to a clean energy economy. Sometimes it may be inconvenient, but it's a sacrifice that we have to make. It's hard to be fiscally responsible when we have all these human needs, and we're inheriting enormous deficits and debt, but that's a sacrifice that we're going to have to make. You know, it's easy, after a hard day's work, to just put your kid in front of the TV set—you're tired, don't want to fuss with them—instead of reading to them, but that's a sacrifice we must joyfully accept.

Sometimes it's hard to be a good father and good mother. Sometimes it's hard to be a good neighbor, or a good citizen, to give up time in service of others, to give something of ourselves to a cause that's greater than ourselves—as Michelle and I are urging folks to do tomorrow to honor and celebrate Dr. King. But these are sacrifices that we are called to make. These are sacrifices that our faith calls us to make. Our faith in the future. Our faith in America. Our faith in God.

And on his sermon all those years ago, Dr. King quoted a poet's verse:

Truth forever on the scaffold
Wrong forever on the throne . . .
And behind the dim unknown stands God
Within the shadows keeping watch above his own.

Even as Dr. King stood in this church, a victory in the past and uncertainty in the future, he trusted God. He trusted that God would make a way. A way for prayers to be answered. A way for our union to be perfected. A way for the arc of the moral universe, no matter how long, to slowly bend towards truth and bend towards freedom, to bend towards justice. He had faith that God would make a way out of no way.

You know, folks ask me sometimes why I look so calm. (Laughter.) They say, all this stuff coming at you, how come you just seem calm? And I have a confession to make here. There are times where I'm not so calm. (Laughter.) Reggie Love knows. My wife knows. There are times when progress seems too slow. There are times when the words that are spoken about me hurt. There are times when the barbs sting. There are times when it feels like all these efforts are for naught, and change is so painfully slow in coming, and I have to confront my own doubts.

But let me tell you—during those times it's faith that keeps me calm. (Applause.) It's faith that gives me peace. The same faith that leads a single mother to work two jobs to put a roof over her head when she has doubts. The same faith that keeps an unemployed father to keep on submitting job applications even after he's been rejected a hundred times. The same faith that says to a teacher even if the first nine children she's teaching she can't reach, that that 10th one she's going to be able to reach. The same faith that breaks the silence of an earthquake's wake with the sound of prayers and hymns sung by a Haitian community. A faith in things not seen, in better days ahead, in Him who holds the future in the hollow of His hand. A faith that lets us mount up on wings like eagles; lets us run and not be weary; lets us walk and not faint.

So let us hold fast to that faith, as Joshua held fast to the faith of his fathers, and together, we shall overcome the challenges of a new age. (Applause.) Together, we shall seize the promise of this moment. Together, we shall make a way through winter, and we're going to welcome the spring. Through God all things are possible. (Applause.)

May the memory of Dr. Martin Luther King continue to inspire us and ennoble our world and all who inhabit it. And may God bless the United States of America. Thank you very much, everybody. God bless you. (Applause.)

[From POLITICO, Jan. 15, 2010]

HEED KING: CUT POVERTY FOR ALL

(By Wade Henderson and John Podesta)

The Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. and his Southern Christian Leadership Conference decided in November 1967—less than five months before he was assassinated—to take their civil rights movement in a new direction. King set sail on a voyage to ''lead waves of the nation's poor and disinherited to Washington, D.C., in the spring of 1968 to demand redress of their grievances by the United States government and to secure at least jobs or income for all.''

As early as 1966, King conveyed his concern, in speeches and private conversations, about the link between poverty and social instability and was readying an effort to expand his movement to include poverty reduction among all races. King had come to understand a reality that continues to plague American society more than 40 years after his death: that entrenched poverty and joblessness damage our country's social fabric.

These same issues remain an ugly stain on our nation, despite considerable racial progress in many areas over the past 40 years. In 2008, almost 40 million Americans lived beneath the poverty line, and nearly one in four children lived in a household struggling against hunger.

Poverty reduction across all races is critically important, but we must also be brutally honest about the racial disparities that continue to separate black and Hispanic Americans from white Americans. While the poverty rate among whites was 8.6 percent in 2008, 24.7 percent of blacks and 23.2 percent of Latinos lived in poverty.

Unemployment rates are also stubbornly divergent based on race. The unemployment rate for white men over 20 was an unhealthy 9.3 percent in December 2009, but for Latino men it was 12.8 percent, and for black men it was an unconscionable 16.6 percent.

And while some educational achievement gaps have narrowed slightly over time, there remain massive racial disparities, representing a threat to our long-term economic growth. In eighth-grade math, for instance, black students are roughly three grade levels behind their white peers.

Such disparities demand serious, committed and prompt action, starting with a strategy to create good jobs that provide decent wages, benefits and pathways out of poverty in the hardest-hit communities.

Last year's recovery legislation played a critical role in averting disaster and curbing job loss, but we now know that there is a longer-term need than was originally imagined. As Congress moves to address the unemployment crisis, any jobs bill that aims to secure our economy from the bottom up must include three key elements: direct job creation, assistance for struggling families and aid to states and localities.

A plan to directly create jobs must balance the need to put people to work right away with a long-term strategy to create living-wage jobs for low-income and minority communities. The former can be accomplished through strategies such as funding for temporary jobs that meet needs in distressed communities, summer jobs and national service opportunities for unemployed youth. The latter will require investments in job training for high-growth fields and programs that combine work and learning.

In addition, economists tell us that the best way to spur economic growth is to help struggling families through extended unemployment benefits, refundable tax credits and food stamps. Not only do such investments help sustain the most vulnerable workers and families, but those workers' increased spending also ripples through the

economy to help all Americans by increasing business income and creating more jobs.

We must also avert additional job losses and service cuts stemming from state and local government deficits. Without federal aid, approximately 900,000 more jobs will be lost in a sector that offers employment opportunities and critical public services to low-income and minority communities.

Finally, we need a commitment from the federal government to cut poverty in half between 2010 and 2020. Our organizations collaborate on the Half in Ten Campaign because we believe that a goal of cutting the poverty rate in half over the next decade provides focus and accountability in the fight to rebuild this country's middle class and ensure that low-income and minority communities are not left behind during economic recovery. By setting a target, our government can also create a vision for shared prosperity that breaks down silos across government agencies, engages the private sector and inspires innovative solutions.

Any plan to halve poverty must also aim to reduce racial and ethnic economic disparities. America will be a majority-minority country by 2050. We must be vigilant about addressing disparities now, not only because it is the right thing to do but because the fate of communities of color is intertwined with our future as a nation.

King wrote in 1967, ''The time has come for us to civilize ourselves by the total, direct and immediate abolition of poverty.'' Just as King came to advocate, Congress must promptly act to alleviate poverty, create jobs, and eliminate racial disparities.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the resolve to commemorate Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. during the 30th anniversary of the Stevie Wonder tribute to Dr. King, ''Happy Birthday''. This resolve was introduced by chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, JOHN CONYERS. Like myself, Chairman CONYERS is a longtime musician and music aficionado.

Dr. King worked his entire life to make the world a better place, and to create equality for those who did not have it. We have come a very long way since he began his work. However, we still have a long way to go before we make his ''dream'' become a reality. It is always important to recognize and remember those who have done great things for our great country, and recognizing Dr. King's accomplishments and dreams during the 30th anniversary of Stevie Wonder's tribute to him would be very fitting. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, and as a musician, I find this resolution to be of special significance, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Although Dr. King's life ended in Memphis Tennessee, it began in Atlanta, Georgia on January 15, 1929. He spent his life working to end racial segregation and racial discrimination through civil disobedience and non-violent protests. On April 28, 1963, he gave one of the most famous civil rights speeches of all time in his ''I Have a Dream'' speech. The speech painted a picture of a future that we are still trying to achieve where people will be ''not judged by the color of their skin, but the content of their character''. Dr. King was assassinated on April 4, 1968, in Memphis Tennessee. Dr. King was one of many significant people from Georgia that are remembered in history. It is important that we take time to remember the contributions he made to our society. His contributions have already brought him many accolades. In 1964, he won the Nobel Peace Prize, becoming the youngest person to have been awarded this honor, and in 1965 he was awarded the American Liberties Medallion by the American Jewish Community. In 1963, he was named Time Person of the Year. The list of awards and recognitions he has received is very long and prestigious, and it is only fitting for us to recognize his achievements as well.

Stevie Wonder wrote, produced and performed the song ''Happy Birthday'' in 1981. It was performed to let the world know how important it was to him that Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday be celebrated as a national holiday. It is for this reason that the timing of this commemoration of Dr. King is so significant. As a member of the Judiciary and a long time musician, I urge my colleagues to support this resolve.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1010.

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.

## HONORING SEVEN AMERICANS KILLED IN AFGHANISTAN ON DECEMBER 30, 2009

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1009) honoring the seven Americans killed in Khost, Afghanistan, on December 30, 2009, for their service to the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1009

Whereas the men and women of the Central Intelligence Agency are dedicated professionals who work tirelessly to protect the United States;

Whereas many of the individuals serving the Central Intelligence Agency do so under harsh conditions, far from home, and on the front lines of the battle against terrorists;

Whereas these public servants face great risks in the line of duty on a daily basis;

Whereas seven Americans in the service of the Central Intelligence Agency gave their lives for their country in a bombing that took place in Khost, Afghanistan, on December 30, 2009;

Whereas six additional Americans were wounded in the attack, some of them suffering serious injuries;

Whereas the loss of these highly trained counterterrorism experts will be deeply felt throughout the Intelligence Community; and

Whereas the entire Nation owes an enormous debt of gratitude to these proud Americans, their families, and their loved ones for the quiet, dedicated, and vital service they offered to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors the seven Americans who died in the bombing that took place in Khost, Afghanistan, on December 30, 2009, and the families of those patriots for their service and their sacrifice for the United States;

(2) expresses condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of those killed in the bombing;

(3) offers support and hope for a full recovery for those who were wounded in the bombing; and

(4) shares in the pain and grief felt in the aftermath of such a tragic event.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, on December 30, while many of us were watching football, traveling back from holiday visits with our families, or preparing to usher in the new year with loved ones, seven members of the Central Intelligence Agency family had their lives cut short in an attack on Forward Operating Base Chapman in Khost, Afghanistan. This was the deadliest day for the CIA since the bombing of the Beirut Embassy in 1983.

The news of this tragic loss was of particular personal sadness and difficulty for me. I had the privilege to meet the Khost team when I last visited Afghanistan on a committee oversight trip. I can attest that these men and women were among the finest America has to offer. They did not shy from the dangers they knew existed, and they believed in the mission they were asked to perform. They worked tirelessly in an environment that is always dangerous. I am proud of the work that they did and the work that their colleagues continue to do today to keep our country safe.

The officers who died in Khost were true professionals. They were savvy officers who relied on years of experience to make judgments and to calculate risk. These men and women were deployed to an area of great danger and hardship, and they did so knowing that the worst could happen. But, they did it anyway, because we as a Nation are relying on them and colleagues like them to make the United States safe from the threat of terrorism.

I realize that many people have a distorted vision of what it means to be part of the CIA family. Movies and books have made the life of a CIA officer seem exciting. It wasn't until I

joined the Intelligence Committee that I fully understood the unique sacrifices that the men and women of the CIA and their families are willing to make in service to our Nation. In addition to the inherent dangers of the job, there are long separations from family and loved ones, often without explanation and on very short notice. Birthdays and holidays are spent in foreign corners of the world.

To those who were wounded in the attack, let me just add my personal thanks for your service and wish you a full and speedy recovery.

To the families of those who lost their lives on December 30, you have our deepest appreciation and gratitude. In this time of grief, please know that you are in our prayers and that this tragic loss will never be forgotten. It is my hope that you can find solace in the selfless, quiet devotion that these brave men and women gave for the safety and protection of our great Nation. They made the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of all of us. And all Americans owe them, and you, a great debt for their commitment and dedication to a job that very rarely receives any kind of public recognition.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's introducing this resolution and bringing it to the floor. It has been cosponsored by all Republican and Democrat members on the Intelligence Committee, and I think it is an appropriate way to honor the sacrifice of those who were killed or wounded in this tragic accident.

Madam Speaker, those in the intelligence community work, serve our Nation, indeed, in dangerous places and in dangerous circumstances. I will never forget an incident shortly after I first joined the Intelligence Committee in this House. I had been on a trip to Iraq where I had gotten to see firsthand more of what our intelligence community members as well as our members of the military do in that conflict, and on my way back home to Texas, I was on a commercial flight where there was a soldier who was on leave going back home. When the plane landed in Amarillo, all of the passengers stayed seated, let the soldier get off first, and applauded him. There were some tears around the plane, all of which was very, very appropriate. But in the back of my mind, I was always thinking about those people who serve our Nation who do not wear a uniform, whose brave acts will never be known and will never get the public recognition that our military sometimes get. It is, in fact, tragic that it is only in death that these individuals are honored in this more public way, but they clearly do a job that is essential to our country's security, and especially to the fight against terrorists to prevent further terrorist acts here.

I think it is also important, Madam Speaker, to point out that these individuals gave their lives doing exactly the kind of intelligence gathering that is absolutely essential to stopping terrorists. They were trying to gather human intelligence, information from human sources. And to gather that kind of information, you often have to deal with some rather unsavory-type characters in dangerous places. But the fact of the matter is that we will not be successful in stopping terrorists unless we gather that sort of information. And so these Americans who were willing to put themselves into dangerous places, dangerous circumstances, were gathering exactly the kind of information we have to have to secure our country.

There has been a lot of talk since the Fort Hood shooting and the attempt at bombing an airliner in Detroit about connecting the dots. Well, the truth of the matter is the more information we can gather closer to the front lines, closer to the center of where terrorists operate, the easier it is to connect those dots. And gathering that information out on the front lines at the tip of the sword, as it is sometimes said, that is exactly what these officers were doing.

So I think it is important for us all to resolve to support them in that effort. Certainly to try to find ways to encourage and support their efforts, not to appoint special prosecutors to go after people who are getting that kind of information, but to support their efforts.

The other point I would like to make is I think in this situation there is an extra burden placed on families. Because these officers were undercover, there is a lot of media interest and so forth, the families cannot go through the traditional kind of grieving process like other families can. As the chairman mentioned, I hope they know that they are certainly in our prayers even as we honor their loved ones who served our Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the Chair of the Select Intelligence Oversight Panel and a member of our Intelligence Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for bringing this resolution forward, and I rise in support of the resolution and to offer my condolences to the families, friends, and colleagues of the seven clandestine service officers who were killed by a suicide bomber in Khost, Afghanistan, a couple of weeks ago, and to offer support and appreciation and best wishes for those recovering from their injuries.

As Chair of the Select Intelligence Oversight Panel and a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I am well aware, as we all are here, of the risk to forward-deployed clandestine service employees, a risk they face on a daily basis.

These seven employees gave their lives in the line of duty, and our thoughts and prayers remain with their loved ones. May they find comfort in part in the knowledge of the high service these people have given to their country.

Let me also take a moment to express my wishes for a full and speedy recovery to those wounded in the bombing and my appreciation to all Americans, civilian and military, who are serving our Nation in Afghanistan. We look forward to the day when their presence in Afghanistan will no longer be needed and that they will return home safely to their families.

I thank Chairman REYES for offering this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to a member of the Intelligence Committee and the ranking member of the Terrorism Subcommittee on the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

□ 1315

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As we Members come to the floor from time to time to pass resolutions, to talk about resolutions supporting athletic events or special occasions, it is always difficult for us to come to the floor to talk about people who have given their lives in the defense of this country, who have been injured in the duty that they are performing for this Nation.

Being at a forward operating base for someone within the intelligence community or the CIA is about as far outside the wire as you can get. In some of the most austere conditions, men and women are asked to ascertain intelligence so that we here in the United States of America can remain safe and secure in our homes and our business places. Seven individuals gave that ultimate sacrifice. It is altogether fitting that this House would pause to give honor to those seven individuals and their families, and to the individuals who have been injured. And as my colleagues have already said, I wish them a speedy recovery, but also to say thank you.

Thank you to the men and women of the clandestine services who are willing to do what they do 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. We in this House, we as Americans, owe them a debt of gratitude that we will never be able to repay.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, it is now my honor to recognize for 1 minute a former ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, and certainly someone that knows and understands the sacrifices that our men and women in the CIA make every day. We are fortunate to have her as the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank him for giving us the privilege to come to the floor to honor the

lives, the leadership, the service and sacrifice of the seven CIA officers killed, and those who were wounded in Afghanistan on December 30, 2009.

For those of us who have worked closely with members of the intelligence community, visited them and their stations around the world, some undercover, some not, we know the sacrifice that they make. Like so many of the dedicated men and women in the intelligence community, these officers worked far from home, close to the enemy, and on the front lines of the fight for freedom and security around the world.

They were mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers, sons and daughters, friends and loved ones. They never asked for recognition or credit, for medals or awards. They simply sought to fulfill their duty to protect our Nation, to secure the blessings of a brighter future for our people, to bear any burden, as President Kennedy said, in the name of our safety, our shared values, and our common ideals.

Go back a number of years before terrorism became such an important part of our intelligence gathering, go back a couple of decades, force protection was one of the primary responsibilities of the intelligence community. When they were sent into harm's way or in anticipation of that, the intelligence community was the advance team and the ongoing force protector. And so as we honor on every occasion, and we will later today, our men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan, we know that there are people taking risks to protect them as we talk about honoring them. These are the members of the intelligence community in their various manifestations.

The stories of these intelligence officers, theirs were stories of sacrifice, tales of bravery in the face of danger, and valor in the face of great peril. In carrying out their mission, they gave hope to children, families, and complete strangers. We are the land of the free and the home of the brave because of them. In performing acts of extraordinary courage, they advanced the cause of peace. In answering the calls of service, they became heroes.

These officers knew we live in a time of peril at home and around the world. As the attack on them in Afghanistan, the failed plot on Christmas Day, and the shootings at Fort Hood remind us, intelligence must remain the first line of defense against terrorism and other threats to global security and peace.

We must continue to support those still in the field, the men and women who, taking inspiration from their fallen colleagues, keep pursuing their mission on every front. In the words of this resolution, the entire Nation owes an enormous debt of gratitude to these proud Americans, their families, and their loved ones for the quiet, dedicated, and vital services offered to the United States. May their proud and selfless acts be a source of strength and inspiration to all Americans. May those so painfully touched by this event find comfort in knowing the thoughts and prayers of our entire Nation are with them at this very sad and difficult time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) a member of the Intelligence Committee and the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

I rise in strong support of this resolution.

As the gentleman from Texas indicated earlier, it is unfortunate that it is only at times like this that many of the American people realize just what an outstanding service is performed by the men and women of the Central Intelligence Agency day in and day out, year in and year out. They perform missions and they put themselves at risk in ways that many of us cannot even imagine.

I have only been a member of the Intelligence Committee for less than a year, but during that time I have had the opportunity to visit with members of the CIA at remote outposts, seeing the type of conditions under which they live, seeing the burdens they bear, seeing the risks that they endure. And it should be reminded to all of us that not only do we honor these seven men and women who were murdered in the line of duty, not only do we offer our condolences to the family members of those who were killed, and not only do we pray for those who are recovering from their wounds, but we should also, I think, take an extra moment to express our solidarity for those that are in the field today, those who are doing, as we are standing here on the House floor here today speaking, as we go back to our apartments tonight, as we go back to our districts over the next several days and be with our families, that there are men and women out there who will not be with their families, who will not be living in the comfort we take for granted in this Nation.

And it also should be reminded to us that we should not find ourselves being Monday morning quarterbacks or second-guessing these men and women who were on the field, who have to make literally life and death decisions at any moment. And sometimes looking back on them years later we can say they should have done this, they should have done that. The reality is they are the people on the front lines. They are the people actually, as Congressman MILLER said, almost beyond the front lines. They are as remote as you can be in many instances, and also have to take extraordinary risks, as they did in this situation.

Because if we are going to win the war against terrorism, we have to obtain the intelligence. We have to get that information that is so vital to heading off attacks. And we can't do it just by intercepts. We can't do it always in a neat and easy way. It has to be done by people putting themselves on the line, actually going out and meeting with those who may turn out to be, as in this case, double agents or triple agents.

So let's just again express our heartfelt admiration, our sympathy, our sense of condolence for all these people who, again, died so tragically, these brave men and women. But also keep in mind that there are many, many more brave men and women out in the field today doing this exact same type of work. And they deserve our support. So it is not only at times like this, in times of tragedy, that we acknowledge them, but we acknowledge them 365 days a year for the work that they do.

With that, again, I am proud to support the resolution.

Mr. REYES. It is now my honor to yield 2 minutes to my colleague on the Intelligence Committee, Mr. SCHIFF from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I join my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Intelligence Committee, in honoring the seven American intelligence professionals who lost their lives at Forward Operating Base Chapman on December 30, and their six colleagues who were wounded in the attack.

It is the nature of service in the intelligence community that the American public will never know the names of some of the dead and wounded. These patriots served quietly, often undercover, and when they are lost, their families and colleagues must mourn them in private.

It is a blessing, I think, of service on the Intelligence Committee that we get the chance to visit intelligence officials here at home and around the world. We have the chance to get to know them, to see the courage that they exhibit. More than that, we have a chance to thank them. But we also get a chance to see the strain it puts on their lives and on the lives of their families, a sacrifice that is not rewarded with the kind of public attention and public thanks that their colleagues in uniform often receive. But we are here today to express our profound gratitude for their service and to share in the grief that has been suffered and visited upon their families.

In the coming months, seven stars will be etched into the CIA's memorial wall, joining 90 other employees who died in service to the United States. Even today, 35 of the 90 stars honor the sacrifice of officers whose identities still remain classified. I hope that all of our colleagues will join us in expressing our deepest condolences to the families of those who were lost, and friends, and to pay homage to these patriots, whose service and sacrifice has made each one of us more secure.

I yield the floor and thank, again, the chairman for his sponsorship of this resolution.

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

Mr. REYES. I now yield 3 minutes to the former ranking member on the Intelligence Committee and the current Chair of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Intelligence, a lady that I have had the privilege of traveling with around the world to visit our men and women in the intelligence community, Ms. HARMAN from California.

Ms. HARMAN. I thank Chairman REYES for yielding to me and for the nice things that he says not only about me but surely about the women and men who serve our intelligence community around the world. And I thank him for authoring this resolution.

Madam Speaker, every single time I enter CIA headquarters in Langley, Virginia, the first thing I do is to look at the wall of stars displayed in the lobby, each star, as we just heard, signifying a loss somewhere in the world of an agency employee. Some of those stars have no names attached, underscoring the sensitivity and singular importance of the missions undertaken by CIA women and men. On my most recent visit to Langley, in late December, I asked my host if any new stars had been added to the wall. Yes, he said, simply. Sadly, the next time I or anyone else enters CIA headquarters, seven more stars will be on that wall, stars honoring patriots I probably met on one of my many trips that I made as ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, and more recently as chair of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Intelligence.

On those trips I always meet with our intelligence officers to hear firsthand about their work and to thank them for their service and sacrifice. When a suicide bomber took those seven lives at Forward Operating Base Chapman, Americans got a rare glimpse of the dangerous reality that our intelligence community faces on a daily basis. There is no question, Madam Speaker, that their work has saved and will continue to save American lives.

So on behalf of a grateful Nation, our profound gratitude goes to the families of Harold Brown, Elizabeth Hanson, Dane Paresi, Scott Roberson, and Jeremy Wise, and to those of two others whose names are not disclosed. We also salute those who were wounded in the attack and their families.

Madam Speaker, accurate, actionable, and timely intelligence is America's first line of defense, the so-called tip of the spear.

□ 1330

These intelligence professionals died in an effort to penetrate the top leadership of al Qaeda. I believe that the best way to honor them is by supporting their colleagues, who continue to put their lives on the line in the service of the American people and defense of our Nation. Let us do so this afternoon by supporting this bipartisan resolution.

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

Just to emphasize the point made earlier by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), as we come today to honor those who sacrifice their lives and their families for their sacrifice, as we come today to honor and express our appreciation for those who are wounded and wish them a speedy recovery, it is also important that we reaffirm our support to those who are all over the world also in dangerous places, in dangerous circumstances, carrying out the Nation's business in the intelligence community. I think we are uniquely situated in Congress, not only to oversee their activities, but to support and encourage the work that they do that can never be shared with the outside world. So I think it's appropriate to have this resolution, but I think it's also important for all Members of this body to reaffirm our support for those who serve our Nation in this way.

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

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the time and for your leadership.

Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of H. Res. 1009. Today we are honoring the seven members of our intelligence community who were tragically killed on December 30 and their colleagues who were injured by a suicide bomber at our CIA base in Khost, Afghanistan. In honoring these brave men and women, we also seek to express our deep support and appreciation to all the civil servants who dedicate their lives to protecting our Nation. We mourn the loss of all of these seven brave heroes.

Along with the Congresswoman from the 13th District of Ohio, I would like to take a moment to reflect on the loss of Scott Roberson, an Ohio native who was among those killed in this tragic attack. Scott dedicated his life to serving and protecting. He spent many years as a police officer before serving with the U.N. Security Forces in Kosovo. He also served several tours in Iraq as a security officer before his assignment in support of U.S. efforts in Afghanistan.

Members of Scott's family reside in my district. When I had the deep honor of attending his memorial service some days ago, as I sat among his family and friends, I listened to those who knew him best speak of his character and unwavering commitment to protecting the safety and security of all Americans. By all accounts, Scott was an exceptional person who, along with his selfless colleagues, sacrificed beyond measure to protect us.

He left behind a loving wife expecting their first child, a child who will know her father through our hero's family and friends and through this resolution passed in honor of the service and sacrifice that he and his colleagues have given on our behalf and on behalf of our great Nation.

For those families who cannot publicly mourn their loss, please know that our hearts, our thoughts, and our prayers are with you. And to all of the families, know that the sacrifice of your parent, your child, your sibling or spouse does not go unrecognized and will not be forgotten.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to a valiant member of the Intelligence Committee and the chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the bravery and sacrifice of the seven CIA officers and contractors who gave their lives in the line of duty during the December 30 bombing of a CIA base in Khost, Afghanistan. My thoughts and prayers are with them and with their families. I also want to recognize those Americans who were injured in the blast and offer my best wishes for a full and quick recovery.

Madam Speaker, as we have all learned by now, a suicide bomber who was believed to possess valuable information critical to counterterrorism operations entered the U.S. forward operating base in Khost, where he activated explosives that took the lives of seven Americans, including one of our Nation's top counterterrorism experts as well as a Jordanian intelligence officer. Six other Americans standing nearby were also injured in the explosion.

The men and women of our intelligence community do critically important work behind a veil of secrecy, yet as this tragic incident reminds us, they're still exposed to the dangers that come from the difficult and often thankless job of protecting our Nation. Unlike our soldiers in uniform, these public servants must keep their many victories secret while their rare failures and raw grief make headlines.

My thoughts and prayers again are with the families of these brave men and women. They and all the other patriots who serve so honorably in our intelligence community have my unending gratitude and my unwavering support. And I, I know along with all of my colleagues, will continue to do everything in our power to ensure that they have the tools and the resources and the encouragement they need to continue to keep America safe.

May God bless those who lost their lives and those who are injured.

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

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank all my colleagues for their great words and condolences and sympathy in honor of those who were killed in Khost.

Again, personally, I extend my condolences to the families and friends

who are forever impacted by this tragic loss. And to those who are recovering today from injuries they received in this attack, I wish you a full and fast recovery.

We, as Members of Congress, recognize that we have a tremendous responsibility to provide our men and women in the intelligence community all the tools that they need to carry out their mission. We are forever grateful. We are blessed to have these men and women serving, protecting our great Nation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) women and men who were killed recently in Khost, Afghanistan.

I recently returned from a House Intelligence Committee oversight visit to various locations in Europe and the Middle East. I met with a number of CIA officers, who provided me with exhaustive briefings on the December 30 bombing in Khost, Afghanistan.

That bombing killed seven of their CIA colleagues and wounded a number of others, several grievously.

Many others have offered words of praise for the selfless patriots who gave their lives for their country, and words of condolence to their families and loved ones. In memorial services and private funerals scheduled for the coming weeks, many more will surely do the same. I am honored to add my voice to this chorus.

I have met with hundreds of CIA professionals in my years on the Intelligence Committee. I can tell you that they are invariably brave, committed patriots who have dedicated their lives to the protection of this nation. Their jobs are difficult and dangerous in the best of times. In others—as the recent tragedy reminds us their missions require the ultimate sacrifice.

We owe the seven Americans killed in Khost our thanks and praise. We owe their families our condolences and our prayers. And we owe their colleagues our respect, admiration, and gratitude.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, seven brave Americans were killed in the line of duty on December 30, 2009, in Khost, Afghanistan.

On that day, we lost good and honorable public servants, whose contributions to our national security will be dearly missed. We lost productive citizens—loving parents, siblings, children of Americans who will never see their loved ones again.

We honor their records of service and their sacrifice. We honor their willingness to serve our country during turbulent and dangerous times.

I extend on behalf of my constituents sincerest condolences to the families of those who have died.

Nothing we say here can heal the wounds of those who loved them. But decisions we make here can ensure that their lives were not lost in vain.

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1009. One of those individuals honored today in this resolution spent her formative years in the northern Illinois Congressional district that I am proud to represent. Miss Elizabeth C. Hanson of Rockford, Illinois deployed to Afghanistan as part of America's war against terrorist extremists. On December 30, 2009, Elizabeth, along with six colleagues from the Central Intelligence Agency and a Jordanian liaison officer, was killed when a suicide bomber attacked the base where they were stationed.

Elizabeth Hanson was born in February 1979 and graduated from Keith Country Day School in 1997. She attended Colby College during the time of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. Elizabeth joined the CIA as a specialist tasked with collecting information on terrorists, and she was part of a team dedicated to defeating America's worst enemies.

Elizabeth Hanson served her country with passion, dedication, and conviction. Elizabeth will be sorely missed by her family, friends, and all who had the privilege of knowing her. I am enclosing for the RECORD a copy of a recent local newspaper editorial that honored her service.

[From the RRStar.com Editorial, Jan. 17, 2010]

BRAVE, REMARKABLE WOMAN WENT FROM KEITH TO THE CIA

In the weeks since CIA employee Elizabeth Hanson died in a suicide bombing in Afghanistan, her college placement adviser at Keith Country Day School has reflected on what the loss meant.

Sally Hoff's words should shed new light on the heroism that Hanson exhibited in the dark corners of Afghanistan.

Hanson, 30, was among seven CIA employees who died Dec. 30 when a double agent detonated an explosive device at a remote base near the Pakistan-Afghanistan border.

Hoff worked closely with Hanson for two years at Keith, a private college preparatory school, before Hanson graduated in 1997.

At first, the former counselor's deep sadness was paired with shock that Hanson worked for the CIA. Then it seemed to fit.

She recalled Hanson's courage, energy and resolve—traits unusual for most teenagers.

''Although she was involved in many activities and had a lot of friends, I was aware of a strong sense of independence and self-reliance in her,'' Hoff wrote in an e-mail to the Editorial Board.

''As we moved through the college selection process, she was clearly the captain of her destiny; she made her own decisions without seeking much input from family and friends.

''There's a marked amount of bravery in that for a 17-year-old,'' Hoff wrote.

Hanson went on to attend Colby College in Maine, a highly selective liberal arts school where she majored in economics. She graduated in 2001. A professor at Colby told The Associated Press that Hanson didn't study economics as a path to a lucrative job in the financial world. Her concern wasn't so much the raw data, Michael Donihue said, but the behaviors behind it.

''There are some who come into economics because they're interested in making money,'' he said. ''Others want to look at the world in a different way.''

At Keith, Hanson was known as Bitsy. She was a vivacious, generous, friendly young woman who seemed to enjoy challenging herself in academics and extracurriculars, according to Hoff.

''I feel honored to have known this remarkable young woman!'' Hoff wrote.

This community is honored that Hanson gave her life trying to unlock the secrets of al-Qaida and its terrorist network. Our condolences to her family and friends. May the pride that her hometown feels in her sacrifice be some comfort.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the seven brave Americans who recently lost their lives in Afghanistan.

I was deeply saddened to learn of the seven Americans who died in the December 30th suicide blast at Forward Operating Base Chapman. This tragic bombing was the deadliest single attack on U.S. intelligence personnel in decades.

Over and over again, the men and women who serve the Central Intelligence Agency have shown their dedication to their mission and the protection of the United States.

These seven Americans served with distinction at a facility on the front lines in the Khost province, an area which borders North Waziristan and is believed to be al-Qaeda's home base.

Unfortunately, this terrible event also has a connection to my home state. We've been hit hard in the Northwest. Over 60 service members from Washington State or assigned from Washington military installations have died in Afghanistan. Of that, 32 were killed in the past year from Fort Lewis, a major Army base in my district.

Regrettably this tragic event only adds to that total. One of the victims, Dane Clark Paresi, was a DuPont, Washington resident and former Fort Lewis soldier. Paresi retired from 1st Special Forces Group at Fort Lewis in 2008, concluding 27 years in the Army. He is survived by his wife, two daughters, parents and five siblings.

I would like to take this opportunity to extend my heartfelt sympathy to his family and the families of the other brave Americans who lost their lives. Their service will not be forgotten.

For the six additional Americans that were injured in the attack, I would like to offer my support and hope for their full recovery.

The men and women of the CIA have done everything their country has asked of them and more. We all should have the utmost respect and admiration for their service and sacrifice. The loss of these highly trained counterterrorism experts will be deeply felt throughout the Intelligence Community.

And with that, Madam Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker I rise today in support of H. Res. 1009, honoring the seven Americans killed in Khost, Afghanistan in a suicide attack on December 30, 2009. I extend my sincere condolences to their families and friends, as well as to the entire intelligence community.

The men and women of the clandestine services face great personal danger to protect the United States. Their work is largely done in the shadows and seldom do they receive the credit and recognition they so deeply deserve. We owe them a debt of gratitude for their courageous service.

As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I have seen firsthand the work these men and women are doing to protect Americans on the frontlines of international conflicts. While their names may never be made public, their memory and the impact of their service will not be forgotten.

The loss of seven American men and women in the December 30th attack is a tragedy for both the intelligence community and our country, and my thoughts and prayers are with the families of those who were killed.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1009.

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.

## HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002 AMENDMENT

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2611) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Securing the Cities Initiative of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2611

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

***SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF SECURING THE CITIES INITIATIVE.***

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Title XIX of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:*

***''SEC. 1908. AUTHORIZATION OF SECURING THE CITIES INITIATIVE.***

*''(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:*

*''(1) The Securing the Cities Initiative of the Department uses next generation radiation detection technology to detect the transport of nuclear and radiological material in urban areas by terrorists or other unauthorized individuals.*

*''(2) The technology used by partners in the Securing the Cities Initiative leverages radiation detection technology used at ports of entry.*

*''(3) The Securing the Cities Initiative has fostered unprecedented collaboration and coordination among its Federal, State, and local partners.*

*''(4) The Securing the Cities Initiative is a critical national capability to detect the dangerous introduction of nuclear and radiological material.*

*''(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Director of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office of the Department for the Securing the Cities Initiative such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year, including—*

*''(1) for each city in which it has been implemented by fiscal year 2009—*

*''(A) $40,000,000 for fiscal year 2010;*

*''(B) $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2011; and*

*''(C) not less than $10,000,000 in sustainment assistance for each fiscal year thereafter; and*

*''(2) for additional Securing the Cities initiatives to be implemented in not fewer than 2 sites participating in the Urban Area Security Initiative, such sums as may be necessary each fiscal year to implement and sustain each additional initiative.''.*

*(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1907 the following new item.*

*''Sec. 1908. Authorization of Securing the Cities Initiative.''*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2611, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2611, a bill authorizing the Securing of the Cities Initiative, was introduced by Representative PETER KING, the ranking member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, on May 21, 2009 and marked up and ordered reported by the committee on November 11, 2009.

The Securing the Cities (STC) Initiative is a unified effort among Federal, State, and local law enforcement in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to defend against the threat of a radiological or nuclear device. DHS, the New York Police Department, the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey and officials from three States and 91 localities are involved in this partnership.

The concept behind the STC is to build rings around New York City to provide a layered defense against the smuggling of a nuclear weapon. The more law enforcement officials who have the ability to detect and are on the lookout for nuclear and radiological material in and around New York City, the better chance that law enforcement has to prevent a successful nuclear attack.

The STC has procured thousands of basic handheld radiation detectors which have been distributed to police officers throughout the region. Advanced vehicles, including trucks and boats with radiation detectors capable of distinguishing different radioactive materials, are also in use in Manhattan and the surrounding area.

More than 1,400 local officers have received training in radiation detection operations under STC. STC funding is given to the New York Police Department, which acts as the grant distributor for the funds. State and local entities around New York City are eligible to receive STC funding.

Participants in STC conduct periodic aerial screening in addition to the checkpoints that the NYPD sets up twice a day on Manhattan roadways as a defensive, training, and deterrence measure.

Today, STC is limited to jurisdictions in and around New York City. An amendment offered by Mr. GREEN of Texas and included in the legislation before us today will broaden the scope of the STC program to include at least two additional Urban Area Security Initiative cities in the program. The bill authorizes appropriations of $40 million per city for the first year, with smaller sums available for sustainment in the following years.

The STC is a great example of a successful Federal, State, and local partnership. We are in the early stages, and much work remains to be done. That said, the positive initial results justify the continuation and gradual expansion of the program directed in this bill.

During the second session of the 110th Congress, the House passed a measure similar to the one before us today. I urge my colleagues to again support this important Homeland Security legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

At the outset, let me thank Chairman THOMPSON of the Homeland Security Committee and my good friend from New York, Congresswoman CLARKE, for her strong efforts on this legislation, which is truly bipartisan. The addition of two additional cities makes it truly a national program in scope.

Madam Speaker, when we look at London, when we look at Madrid, it becomes clear that a very likely means of attack by terrorists in the United States would be from suburban areas into urban areas. And certainly in New York, which is the number one terrorist target in the world, enormous steps have been made to protect us against that type of attack, specifically a dirty bomb attack coming from outside the city through the highways, the parkways, the tunnels, the bridges, actually into Manhattan itself, which has already, as we know, devastatingly on September 11, also in 1993, been attacked by Islamic terrorists. But also a number of other plots against New York City have been thwarted.

New York City is definitely the main target in the country, but any number of other cities are as well. That is why I believe the program, which has been implemented in New York, can be a model for other cities throughout the country.

Now, I was very concerned last year when the administration decided to zero out all money for this funding in its budget. This was, I believe, a serious mistake. Fortunately, Congress, by appropriating $40 million in this House and finally $20 million when it came back from conference committee, did continue to fund this program, because we need these radiological detectors on the highways, the toll plazas, the bridges and the tunnels.

□ 1345

I have had the privilege of attending a number of these drills and training sessions when they are conducted. As Representative CLARKE said, we're not just talking about New York City. We're talking about a large number of police departments and first responders—fight departments, EMS services—from not just New York City but from Long Island, from Connecticut, from New Jersey. We're talking about the State police, and we're talking about Federal support as well, seeing them

all working together in a cohesive way to stop what would be the absolutely devastating impact of a dirty bomb attack, the human toll that that would take, the devastating economic impact it would have, the fact that it would make parts of the city unlivable for extended periods of time, and the fact that it would, in effect, cut off transportation into New York City.

All of these are reasons that we have to go ahead and continue with this Securing the Cities program. It's no guarantee, but it's another layer of defense that we need to protect ourselves against a terrorist attack.

As we know, the terrorists are constantly adapting, and we have to try to stay one step ahead of them. We have to always be on our guard. Actually, we have to be lucky all the time. They only have to be lucky once. We have to rely on more than luck. We have to have preparation, and we have to have a layered defense.

That's why I am so proud to support this legislation which will, in effect, almost set in stone the importance of the Securing the Cities program. We will expand it beyond New York City because, again, while Congresswoman CLARKE and I feel that those of us in the New York area are the main targets, the fact is that a human life is a human life; an American life is an American life. Whether it's New York City or any other city in this country, any, certainly, major urban area, I believe this program is adaptable and compatible to those areas.

So I thank Congresswoman CLARKE for her effort. I thank the bipartisan support that we have for this legislation, and I, certainly, strongly urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, as you have heard, the measure under consideration is important Homeland Security legislation that has previously received and that again deserves the support of the Members of the House of Representatives.

In closing, I encourage my colleagues to vote ''aye'' on passage of the bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2611, permanently authorizing the Securing the Cities initiative. I thank Chairman THOMPSON, Ranking Member KING and my New York colleagues and cosponsors Representatives ISRAEL and CLARKE for their efforts to bring this bill forward.

Securing the Cities was created to design and implement a layered approach for the detection and interdiction of illicit radiological materials in New York. While this program was initially a pilot and significant progress has been made, unfortunately detection technology and systems are not yet fully in place. Given the known threats that New York faces, it is no surprise that NYPD considers this initiative the most important federal security program. We must continue Securing the Cities until all technology and systems are fully operable.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security, I have fought to fund this security imperative, and passing this bill will help ensure that funding continues in future years.

I thank my colleagues for their hard work and dedication to ensure our most threatened cities are adequately protected, and I urge a yes vote on H.R. 2611.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would like to express my strong support of H.R. 2611, a bipartisan measure authorizing the Department of Homeland Security's Securing the Cities initiative.

I would like to recognize my colleague, Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON, for his leadership on the House Homeland Security Committee and his commitment to protecting the citizens and homeland of our great nation.

I would also like to acknowledge and thank Ranking Member PETER KING for introducing this important legislation which includes an amendment I offered that would expand the scope of the Securing the Cities program to include at least two additional high-risk urban areas, making it a national program.

Launched in 2006, Securing the Cities is a unified effort among Federal, state and local law enforcement officials in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to defend against the threat of a radiological or nuclear attack. Presently, Securing the Cities operates only in New York City and its surrounding areas.

While it appears that New York City remains the prime target for terrorist activity, it is important to ensure that other densely populated areas and those housing critical infrastructure are equally protected from dirty bombs. My amendment would benefit even more high-risk urban areas by providing the necessary resources to detect and intercept illicit radiological material before it is used in a weapon by would-be terrorists.

Through a ring of detectors on highways, bridges, tunnels and on mobile units around the city, Securing the Cities provides a layered defense against the smuggling of a nuclear weapon. The idea behind Securing the Cities is that the more law enforcement officials are on the lookout for nuclear material outside New York City, the better chance law enforcement has to prevent a successful nuclear attack.

Like New York City, Houston is among the highest threat cities in the nation. Our region is extremely dense with critical infrastructure assets, which includes our large energy and petrochemical sectors. By replicating the success of Securing the Cities in more places like Houston, we can bolster law enforcement capabilities to combat potential terrorist activity and protect our communities.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2611.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2611, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## NUCLEAR FORENSICS AND ATTRIBUTION ACT

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 730) to strengthen efforts in the Department of Homeland Security to develop nuclear forensics capabilities to permit attribution of the source of nuclear material, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

***SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.***

*This Act may be cited as the ''Nuclear Forensics and Attribution Act''.*

***SEC. 2. FINDINGS.***

*Congress finds the following:*

*(1) The threat of a nuclear terrorist attack on American interests, both domestic and abroad, is one of the most serious threats to the national security of the United States. In the wake of an attack, attribution of responsibility would be of utmost importance. Because of the destructive power of a nuclear weapon, there could be little forensic evidence except the radioactive material in the weapon itself.*

*(2) Through advanced nuclear forensics, using both existing techniques and those under development, it may be possible to identify the source and pathway of a weapon or material after it is interdicted or detonated. Though identifying intercepted smuggled material is now possible in some cases, pre-detonation forensics is a relatively undeveloped field. The post-detonation nuclear forensics field is also immature, and the challenges are compounded by the pressures and time constraints of performing forensics after a nuclear or radiological attack.*

*(3) A robust and well-known capability to identify the source of nuclear or radiological material intended for or used in an act of terror could also deter prospective proliferators. Furthermore, the threat of effective attribution could compel improved security at material storage facilities, preventing the unwitting transfer of nuclear or radiological materials.*

*(4)(A) In order to identify special nuclear material and other radioactive materials confidently, it is necessary to have a robust capability to acquire samples in a timely manner, analyze and characterize samples, and compare samples against known signatures of nuclear and radiological material.*

*(B) Many of the radioisotopes produced in the detonation of a nuclear device have short half-lives, so the timely acquisition of samples is of the utmost importance. Over the past several decades, the ability of the United States to gather atmospheric samples—often the preferred method of sample acquisition—has diminished. This ability must be restored and modern techniques that could complement or replace existing techniques should be pursued.*

*(C) The discipline of pre-detonation forensics is a relatively undeveloped field. The radiation associated with a nuclear or radiological device may affect traditional forensics techniques in unknown ways. In a post-detonation scenario, radiochemistry may provide the most useful tools for analysis and characterization of samples. The number of radiochemistry programs and radiochemists in United States National Laboratories and universities has dramatically declined over the past several decades. The narrowing pipeline of qualified people into this critical field is a serious impediment to maintaining a robust and credible nuclear forensics program.*

*(5) Once samples have been acquired and characterized, it is necessary to compare the results against samples of known material from reactors, weapons, and enrichment facilities, and from medical, academic, commercial, and other facilities containing such materials, throughout the world. Some of these samples are available to the International Atomic Energy Agency*

*through safeguards agreements, and some countries maintain internal sample databases. Access to samples in many countries is limited by national security concerns.*

*(6) In order to create a sufficient deterrent, it is necessary to have the capability to positively identify the source of nuclear or radiological material, and potential traffickers in nuclear or radiological material must be aware of that capability. International cooperation may be essential to catalogue all existing sources of nuclear or radiological material.*

***SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS FOR FORENSICS COOPERATION.***

*It is the sense of the Congress that the President should—*

*(1) pursue bilateral and multilateral international agreements to establish, or seek to establish under the auspices of existing bilateral or multilateral agreements, an international framework for determining the source of any confiscated nuclear or radiological material or weapon, as well as the source of any detonated weapon and the nuclear or radiological material used in such a weapon;*

*(2) develop protocols for the data exchange and dissemination of sensitive information relating to nuclear or radiological materials and samples of controlled nuclear or radiological materials, to the extent required by the agreements entered into under paragraph (1); and*

*(3) develop expedited protocols for the data exchange and dissemination of sensitive information needed to publicly identify the source of a nuclear detonation.*

***SEC. 4. RESPONSIBILITIES OF DOMESTIC NUCLEAR DETECTION OFFICE.***

*(a) ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES.—Section 1902 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (as redesignated by Public Law 110–53; 6 U.S.C. 592) is amended—*

*(1) in subsection (a)—*

*(A) in paragraph (9), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;*

*(B) by redesignating paragraph (10) as paragraph (14); and*

*(C) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:*

*''(10) lead the development and implementation of the national strategic five-year plan for improving the nuclear forensic and attribution capabilities of the United States required under section 1036 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010;*

*''(11) establish, within the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, the National Technical Nuclear Forensics Center to provide centralized stewardship, planning, assessment, gap analysis, exercises, improvement, and integration for all Federal nuclear forensics and attribution activities—*

*''(A) to ensure an enduring national technical nuclear forensics capability to strengthen the collective response of the United States to nuclear terrorism or other nuclear attacks; and*

*''(B) to coordinate and implement the national strategic five-year plan referred to in paragraph (10);*

*''(12) establish a National Nuclear Forensics Expertise Development Program, which—*

*''(A) is devoted to developing and maintaining a vibrant and enduring academic pathway from undergraduate to post-doctorate study in nuclear and geochemical science specialties directly relevant to technical nuclear forensics, including radiochemistry, geochemistry, nuclear physics, nuclear engineering, materials science, and analytical chemistry;*

*''(B) shall—*

*''(i) make available for undergraduate study student scholarships, with a duration of up to 4 years per student, which shall include, if possible, at least 1 summer internship at a national laboratory or appropriate Federal agency in the field of technical nuclear forensics during the course of the student's undergraduate career;*

*''(ii) make available for doctoral study student fellowships, with a duration of up to 5 years per student, which shall—*

*''(I) include, if possible, at least 2 summer internships at a national laboratory or appropriate Federal agency in the field of technical nuclear forensics during the course of the student's graduate career; and*

*''(II) require each recipient to commit to serve for 2 years in a post-doctoral position in a technical nuclear forensics-related specialty at a national laboratory or appropriate Federal agency after graduation;*

*''(iii) make available to faculty awards, with a duration of 3 to 5 years each, to ensure faculty and their graduate students have a sustained funding stream; and*

*''(iv) place a particular emphasis on reinvigorating technical nuclear forensics programs while encouraging the participation of undergraduate students, graduate students, and university faculty from historically Black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, Tribal Colleges and Universities, Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-serving institutions, Alaska Native-serving institutions, and Hawaiian Native-serving institutions; and*

*''(C) shall—*

*''(i) provide for the selection of individuals to receive scholarships or fellowships under this section through a competitive process primarily on the basis of academic merit and the nuclear forensics and attribution needs of the United States Government;*

*''(ii) provide for the setting aside of up to 10 percent of the scholarships or fellowships awarded under this section for individuals who are Federal employees to enhance the education of such employees in areas of critical nuclear forensics and attribution needs of the United States Government, for doctoral education under the scholarship on a full-time or part-time basis;*

*''(iii) provide that the Secretary may enter into a contractual agreement with an institution of higher education under which the amounts provided for a scholarship under this section for tuition, fees, and other authorized expenses are paid directly to the institution with respect to which such scholarship is awarded;*

*''(iv) require scholarship recipients to maintain satisfactory academic progress; and*

*''(v) require that—*

*''(I) a scholarship recipient who fails to maintain a high level of academic standing, as defined by the Secretary, who is dismissed for disciplinary reasons from the educational institution such recipient is attending, or who voluntarily terminates academic training before graduation from the educational program for which the scholarship was awarded shall be liable to the United States for repayment within 1 year after the date of such default of all scholarship funds paid to such recipient and to the institution of higher education on the behalf of such recipient, provided that the repayment period may be extended by the Secretary if the Secretary determines it necessary, as established by regulation; and*

*''(II) a scholarship recipient who, for any reason except death or disability, fails to begin or complete the post-doctoral service requirements in a technical nuclear forensics-related specialty at a national laboratory or appropriate Federal agency after completion of academic training shall be liable to the United States for an amount equal to—*

*''(aa) the total amount of the scholarship received by such recipient under this section; and*

*''(bb) the interest on such amounts which would be payable if at the time the scholarship was received such scholarship was a loan bearing interest at the maximum legally prevailing rate;*

*''(13) provide an annual report to Congress on the activities carried out under paragraphs (10), (11), and (12); and''; and*

*(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:*

*''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:*

*''(1) ALASKA NATIVE-SERVING INSTITUTION.—The term 'Alaska Native-serving institution' has the meaning given the term in section 317 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059d).*

*''(2) ASIAN AMERICAN AND NATIVE AMERICAN PACIFIC ISLANDER-SERVING INSTITUTION.—The term 'Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-serving institution' has the meaning given the term in section 320 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059g).*

*''(3) HAWAIIAN NATIVE-SERVING INSTITUTION.—The term 'Hawaiian native-serving institution' has the meaning given the term in section 317 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059d).*

*''(4) HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTION.—The term 'Hispanic-serving institution' has the meaning given that term in section 502 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1101a).*

*''(5) HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.—The term 'historically Black college or university' has the meaning given the term 'part B institution' in section 322(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061(2)).*

*''(6) TRIBAL COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.—The term 'Tribal College or University' has the meaning given that term in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b)).''.*

*(b) JOINT INTERAGENCY ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENT TO CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT.—*

*(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1907(a)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 596a(a)(1)) is amended—*

*(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;*

*(B) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and*

*(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:*

*''(C) the Director of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office and each of the relevant departments that are partners in the National Technical Forensics Center—*

*''(i) include, as part of the assessments, evaluations, and reviews required under this paragraph, each office's or department's activities and investments in support of nuclear forensics and attribution activities and specific goals and objectives accomplished during the previous year pursuant to the national strategic five-year plan for improving the nuclear forensic and attribution capabilities of the United States required under section 1036 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010;*

*''(ii) attaches, as an appendix to the Joint Interagency Annual Review, the most current version of such strategy and plan; and*

*''(iii) includes a description of new or amended bilateral and multilateral agreements and efforts in support of nuclear forensics and attribution activities accomplished during the previous year.''.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of concurring in the Senate amendment to H.R. 730.

H.R. 730, the Nuclear Forensics and Attribution Act, was first introduced in the 110th Congress by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

To strengthen our Nation's ability to prepare for and to respond to a conventional nuclear or dirty bomb threat, that measure, H.R. 2631, was marked up and adopted unanimously by the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity, and Science and Technology in October 2007, which is the subcommittee I now chair.

It was unanimously approved by the full Committee on Homeland Security on May 20, 2008, and in the House of Representatives on June 18, 2008. Though the measure was taken up, amended and passed by the Senate in late September, the stars didn't align, and it didn't clear the last hurdle to arrive on the President's desk. In this Congress, we started early and brought the measure directly to the floor where it passed on March 24, 2009. Now the Senate has acted, and it is time to pass this bill into law.

I would like to congratulate Congressman SCHIFF and my colleagues on the committee for recognizing the need to move quickly.

We know that our enemies, both terrorists and rogue nations, are interested in developing and using nuclear or radiological weapons. In the case of an attempted or, heaven forbid, a successful nuclear or radiological attack, rapid attribution is critical. Our government must have the capacity to quickly determine the source of the nuclear material so that key decisionmakers have the information needed to respond.

The deterrent effect of a robust nuclear forensics capability should not be underestimated. Certainly, if terrorists know that we have a nuclear forensics capability that can pinpoint their role in creating a bomb, they are bound to have second thoughts. Unfortunately, today, the U.S. must rely on forensic expertise and technology developed during the Cold War to address both nuclear weapons and the emerging threat of a radiological dirty bomb.

The nuclear weapons workforce is aging just as its mission has shifted from traditional deterrent policy to the more complicated challenge of containing the terrorist threat. Our Nation's capabilities in the scientific fields of radiochemistry and geochemistry must be fostered to meet this new threat. That is the purpose of this bill. H.R. 730 expresses the sense of Congress that the President should pursue international agreements and develop protocols to share sensitive information needed to identify the source of a nuclear detonation.

I am heartened that the Obama administration has indicated its willingness to engage in and to reenergize such activities.

It also tasks the Secretary of Homeland Security with the mission of developing methods to attribute nuclear or radiological material both within the Department's Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, DNDO, and in partnership with other Federal agencies.

The legislation emphasizes that the development of a robust nuclear forensics capability depends chiefly on an expertly trained workforce in this area, and it provides support for education programs relevant to nuclear forensics.

H.R. 730 also authorizes the National Technical Nuclear Forensics Center, NTNFC, to enhance the centralized planning and integration of Federal nuclear forensics activities. It requires the Secretary to report annually to Congress on the Federal Government's efforts to enhance its nuclear forensics capabilities, including the status of workforce development programs; and it authorizes $30 million per year for the next 3 fiscal years for this effort.

H.R. 730 continues the Homeland Security Committee's practice of authorizing programs and offices within DHS that are of value to the agency's mission in order to assure that the work can continue and that progress can be achieved in the years to come.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of New York. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, again, let me thank Congresswoman CLARKE for her leadership on this. Let me also thank Ranking Member DAN LUNGREN for his work.

Let me especially thank Mr. SCHIFF for his efforts on this and for so many other efforts on behalf of our national security. I have the privilege of serving with Mr. SCHIFF on the Intelligence Committee, so I have firsthand knowledge of the dedication which he brings to issues such as this.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 730. Let me just say that, in many ways, this is the other side of the same coin. We just adopted H.R. 2611, which is to prevent nuclear attacks against our cities. H.R. 730 will enable us to detect where those nuclear devices came from. It's absolutely essential that we deal with the process of determining the source of confiscated nuclear material. This is a grave, grave threat to our homeland, and it must be addressed immediately and robustly. We must have a rigorous attribution program to find the culprits of these crimes and to offer a deterrent to nuclear terrorism.

The one concern I do have is that the bill, as amended, coming back from the Senate does not authorize the appropriation of $30 million. I believe that is important. It is essential that we have it; but, again, this is a major step forward, so I am pleased to support the legislation even though I wish that the $30 million had been included in it.

This bill targets an ongoing threat in a unique way. It will reinvigorate the workforce pipeline to guarantee the Nation a resource of technical experts in this vital and critical field, and it will strengthen America's attribution capabilities.

Again, this is a bipartisan effort. It's the Homeland Security Committee working with Mr. SCHIFF and the Intelligence Committee. It is important that we pass this and that we really, again, send a strong signal of how we do believe in layered defenses, of how we realize the need of staying ahead of the terrorist threat and of doing all we can to protect the American people in a way which certainly transcends Republican or Democrat lines or liberal-conservative lines. It is an issue that should galvanize all Americans.

So, with that, I strongly urge support of H.R. 730.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the author of this bill.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, at the outset, I want to thank and congratulate the Homeland Security Committee and Chairman THOMPSON. The committee has taken an important step forward towards preventing nuclear terrorism by persevering with this legislation, and I appreciate all of the hard work that the chairman and staff have put into it.

I also want to thank other Members who have contributed greatly to the effort, one being the ranking member, PETER KING.

Mr. KING, once again, I thank you for your leadership in this area.

I want to thank the former chairman of the Emerging Threats Subcommittee, an early supporter, JIM LANGEVIN; the current chairwoman of that subcommittee, YVETTE CLARKE; as well as the ranking member of the subcommittee, DAN LUNGREN; and in the last Congress, MICHAEL MCCAUL.

The Nuclear Forensics and Attribution Act will help us fight one of the most important national security threats we face, that of nuclear proliferation. Countries around the world now have access to technology that was once the realm of the few; and dangerous nuclear materials are, unfortunately, sprinkled around the world. This is not a new problem. Illicit nuclear material has been intercepted in transit out of the former Soviet Union many times since the end of the Cold War, and the material we catch is surely only a small fraction of the total amount trafficked.

Last year, Graham Allison wrote in Newsweek that the only thing that could keep nuclear bombs out of the hands of terrorists is a brand-new science of nuclear forensics. He continued that the key to a new deterrent is coming up with some way of tracing the nuclear material backward from an explosion in New York City to the reactor that forged the fissile material, even to the mines that yielded the original uranium ore.

The Nuclear Forensics and Attribution Act is designed to do just that. It is aimed at the decision-makers in

North Korea, Pakistan, Iran or elsewhere who could sell nuclear material, as well as the smugglers and corrupt officials around the world who could steal it. Those parts of the nuclear network can be deterred by the knowledge that, if their material is later intercepted, the United States will find out and will hold them responsible.

This bill expands our ability to determine the source of nuclear material by authorizing the National Technical Nuclear Forensics Center in the Department of Homeland Security. This center will coordinate the various agencies, and it will ensure an efficient combined response when nuclear material is intercepted or used, God forbid, in a weapon. It will also advance the science of nuclear forensics, bringing in new radiochemists and physicists to rejuvenate a rapidly aging workforce and funding research on new methods to identify materials. It also takes an important step toward building the nuclear forensic database we will need to effectively track nuclear material.

The bill asks the President to negotiate agreements with other nations to share forensic data on their nuclear materials, both civilian and military.

This effort is vital, and the National Technical Nuclear Forensics Center must play a key role in negotiations to ensure that the data we obtain is the data we need for quick attribution and response.

□ 1400

Nuclear terrorism is an indistinct threat of devastating consequence and therefore difficult to guard against. But as communications and transportation revolutions bring us ever closer to our allies, they bring our enemies close as well. I believe this bill will help make sure that our ability to prevent a nuclear terror attack keeps up with our enemies' ability to attempt one.

Again, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for their leadership and urge all Members to support the bill.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I would like to close by stating that all of us realize that a terrorist attack is a nightmare scenario.

The fact that we came so close to the loss of life on Christmas Day reminded us dramatically of the dangerous world in which we live. Those of us from New York will never forget September 11, 2001. But just think of the ultimate nightmare scenario, and that would be a nuclear attack. That is almost beyond our imagination. That is why everything must be done to stop those attacks, and to also have the deterrent, as Congressman SCHIFF said, the deterrent of retaliation against any country, against any entity, against any individual, any organization, which was in any way involved in providing nuclear weaponry to be used against the United States.

I strongly urge the adoption of this legislation.

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

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I would encourage my colleagues to vote ''aye'' on the pending question. Doing so will allow this important homeland security legislation to be sent to the President's desk for his signature without delay.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 730.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

ordering the previous question on H.R. 1017, by the yeas and nays;

adoption of H.R. 1017, if ordered;

motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 3726, by the yeas and nays;

motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 3538, by the yeas and nays.

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

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3254, TAOS PUEBLO INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACT; FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3342, AAMODT LITIGATION SETTLEMENT ACT; AND FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1065, WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1017, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 175, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—239

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—175

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)

Cole
Conaway
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Abercrombie
Barrett (SC)
Boehner
Bonner
Cleaver
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Inglis
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Murphy, Patrick
Radanovich
Ros-Lehtinen
Stark
Young (AK)

□ 1429

Messrs. POSEY, JONES, and SMITH of Texas changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 9 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CASTLE NUGENT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ESTABLISHMENT ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3726, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3726, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 173, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—241

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boccieri
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—173

Aderholt
Alexander
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Abercrombie
Akin
Barrett (SC)
Bonner
Cleaver
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Hare
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Murphy, Patrick
Radanovich
Space
Stark
Wilson (OH)
Young (AK)

□ 1444

Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and in Afghanistan and their families, and all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

There was no objection.

## IDAHO WILDERNESS WATER RESOURCES PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3538, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3538, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 191, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—225

Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fallin
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Himes
Hinchey
Hodes
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Massa
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rehberg
Reichert
Richardson
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Speier
Stearns
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Titus
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walden
Wamp
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (FL)

NAYS—191

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Clyburn
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
Klein (FL)
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lofgren, Zoe
Luján
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Polis (CO)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Abercrombie
Akin
Barrett (SC)
Bonner
Cleaver
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Murphy, Patrick
Radanovich
Stark
Westmoreland
Young (AK)

□ 1456

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4191

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a sponsor of H.R. 4191.

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

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 tomorrow.

□ 1500

## EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO HAITI

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1021) expressing condolences to and solidarity with the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake of January 12, 2010.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1021

Whereas on January 12, 2010, a 7.0 magnitude earthquake struck the country of Haiti;

Whereas according to the United States Geological Survey (USGS) the earthquake epicenter was located approximately 10 miles southwest of the capital, Port-au-Prince;

Whereas the earthquake has been followed by dangerous aftershocks, including two of 5.9 and 5.5 magnitude, and with the most severe to date, at 6.1, coming on January 20, 2010;

Whereas casualty estimates, still being compiled, as well as infrastructure damage, including to roads, ports, hospitals, and residential dwellings, place this earthquake as the worst cataclysm to hit Haiti in over two centuries;

Whereas an estimated 3,000,000 people have been directly affected by the disaster in Haiti, nearly one-third of the country's population, who are currently at risk of long-term displacement and vulnerability;

Whereas the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH) headquarters collapsed with approximately 150 staff members inside, including the head of the mission, Hedi Annabi, causing the largest loss of life in United Nations history;

Whereas an unknown number of individuals remain trapped under collapsed buildings, as rescue teams work around-the-clock to locate and extract survivors;

Whereas the destruction of infrastructure, particularly to the port, airport, roads, and telecommunications, continues to hinder the immediate delivery of humanitarian assistance in Haiti;

Whereas Haiti is the poorest, least developed country in the Western Hemisphere,

and prior to the earthquake was ranked 149 out of 182 countries on the United Nations Human Development Index;

Whereas prior to the earthquake, Haiti was still in the process of recovering from a ruinous recent series of hurricanes and tropical storms, food shortages and rising commodity prices, and political instability, but was showing encouraging signs of improvement;

Whereas in addition to the pressure to secure communities and prevent looters from causing further harm to their citizens who are struggling to recover, Haiti's penitentiary collapsed and spilled untold numbers of criminals into an already disturbing security situation;

Whereas a number of children legally confirmed as orphans are eligible for intercountry adoption, and the uncertain welfare of children who are already in the process of being adopted is of urgent concern to their prospective adoptive parents in the United States;

Whereas it is in the interests of these orphans and their prospective adoptive parents to facilitate and expedite legal adoptions of Haitian orphans to the United States;

Whereas President Obama vowed the ''unwavering support'' of the United States and pledged a ''swift, coordinated and aggressive effort to save lives and support the recovery in Haiti'';

Whereas the response to the tragedy from the global community has been overwhelmingly positive;

Whereas the initial emergency response of the men and women of the United States Government, led by the United States Agency for International Development and United States Southern Command, has been swift and resolute;

Whereas MINUSTAH peacekeepers, while still trying to rescue their colleagues in their headquarters, have taken a leading role to assist in clearing roads and providing security around Port-au-Prince to facilitate aid into the earthquake disaster zone;

Whereas the United States Department of Homeland Security has temporarily halted the deportation of Haitian nationals to Haiti in response to the devastation caused by the earthquake;

Whereas the United States Department of Homeland Security granted the designation of Temporary Protected Status for Haitian nationals who are in the United States and unable to return to their country due to the destruction and humanitarian crisis in Haiti;

Whereas individuals, businesses, and philanthropic organizations across the United States and throughout the international community have responded in support of Haiti and its populace during this time of crisis, sometimes in innovative ways such as fundraising through text messaging;

Whereas throughout this terrible calamity, the Haitian people continue to demonstrate unwavering resilience, dignity, and courage; and

Whereas once proper surveys and assessments are conducted, the initial and crucial emergency relief response will likely move to a comprehensive mission requiring sustained assistance from the United States and the international community for reconstruction and development efforts: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its deepest condolences and sympathy for the horrific loss of life and the physical and psychological damage caused by the earthquake of January 12, 2010;

(2) expresses solidarity with Haitians, Haitian Americans, and all those who have lost loved ones or have otherwise been affected by the tragedy, including United States Embassy personnel, United Nations peacekeepers, and humanitarian workers;

(3) commends the efforts and honors the sacrifice of the men and women of the Government of Haiti, the United States Government, the United Nations, and the international community in their immediate response to those affected by this calamity;

(4) commends the efforts of the American people, including the Haitian-American community, to provide relief to families, friends, and unknown peoples suffering in the country;

(5) supports the efforts of the Administration to provide and coordinate international humanitarian assistance and to provide relief to affected communities;

(6) expresses support for the recovery and long-term reconstruction needs of Haiti;

(7) recognizes that the recovery and long-term needs of Haiti will require a sustained commitment by the United States and international community based on comprehensive assessments of the development needs for Haiti;

(8) urges those who hold debt against Haiti, including the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and all other regional and international institutions and countries, to immediately suspend further debt payments, and to develop processes to cancel all remaining debt; and

(9) urges the President—

(A) to continue to make available to United States agencies, nongovernmental organizations, private voluntary organizations, regional institutions, and United Nations agencies the resources necessary to confront the effects and consequences of this natural disaster;

(B) to provide, when the emergency subsides, assistance in partnership with the Government of Haiti and in coordination with other donors to begin the reconstruction of Haiti;

(C) to undertake comprehensive assessments of the long-term needs for recovery and development in Haiti, ensure transparency and accountability, and lead coordination efforts with international actors who share in the goal of a better future for Haiti and are willing to support the costs of meeting those needs; and

(D) to utilize new and innovative thinking in providing long-term assistance to Haiti, including tapping into the insight and immense potential of the Haitian Diaspora, to help Haitians rebuild upon the strongest possible foundation, in order to promote a stable and sustainable future for Haiti.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LEE of California. Madam 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 gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution which expresses our deep condolences and solidarity with the people of Haiti, and all of those who have lost loved ones or have otherwise been affected by the tragic earthquake of January 12, 2010.

Let me first thank our Speaker, Chairman BERMAN, Chairman PAYNE and Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN for helping to bring this resolution to the floor today. Also I want to express my deep gratitude to our staffs for working on this to make sure that the resolution came forward today. I would also like to recognize my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus.

The CBC has a long history of working with the Haitian people and the Haitian American community and the Haitian Government. And many of us have traveled to that country many, many times. During the current crisis, the CBC has and will continue to work closely with the Obama administration and outside organizations to provide whatever assistance is needed for ongoing relief and recovery efforts. And I am very proud of the fact that each and every member of the Congressional Black Caucus has signed on as original cosponsors of this resolution.

More than a week has passed since the 7.0 earthquake. Again, many aftershocks, just today another 6.1 aftershock, which has devastated the country of Haiti. We have all seen the horrific images, and our hearts are heavy for the Haitian people and all of those affected by this tragedy. An estimated 3 million people have been directly affected by this catastrophe, leaving over 1 million homeless, and many at risk of long-term displacement and vulnerability.

The latest figures estimate 200,000 people may have been killed as a result of this disaster. The massive number of casualties, as well as the extensive infrastructure damage, including to roads, ports, hospitals, residential dwellings, marks this earthquake as the worst natural disaster to strike Haiti in over two centuries.

Currently, our government is engaged now in one of our largest humanitarian relief efforts in our history. To date, USAID has provided $100 million to Haiti for relief efforts, and more is likely on the way. So I have to commend at this time the men and women of the Government of Haiti, of our own government, of our Armed Services, the United Nations, the international community, our NGOs, our neighbors in the Caribbean and Latin America, and throughout the world in their immediate response to assist those affected by this calamity.

We continue to work around the clock to provide as much food, water, and emergency health care as possible under these unimaginable circumstances. So it is important that these emergency supplies be expedited, and not caught up in bureaucratic hurdles. The same goes for many relief and rescue organizations trying to evacuate survivors for emergency care. The red tape must be cut to save as many lives as possible.

Let me applaud the Haitian American community for providing relief to family and friends and the entire country. Also I have to praise the efforts of the American people at large, who have once again demonstrated their compassion by providing aid to people they have never met, never met, but who are suffering nonetheless just miles off our shore.

This resolution summarizes the unfortunate facts that have occurred in Haiti, but also, in addition to supporting the efforts of the Haitian people and being in solidarity with the Haitian Government and the Haitian people at this point during this rescue and recovery phase, this resolution also recognizes, in a bipartisan way, support for the recovery and long-term reconstruction of Haiti, and also recognizes that the recovery and long-term needs of Haiti will require a sustained commitment, mind you a sustained commitment by the United States and the international community, based on a comprehensive strategy based on what the Haitian people and the Government of Haiti have deemed necessary and required for their full recovery and reconstruction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today proudly as the lead Republican sponsor of House Resolution 1021, expressing condolences to and solidarity with the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake on January 12, 2010. Last week Haiti was hit by the largest earthquake to strike that Nation in over two centuries. Today Haiti was affected by a 6.1 magnitude quake or aftershock.

When the original quake hit last week, it was a day like any other. With elections on the horizon, a sense of stability slowly starting to be felt on the island, some believed that things were finally starting to look up for Haiti. And then without a warning tens of thousands were suddenly victims. Millions were left homeless, or hungry, or both. Buildings collapsed, countless disappeared, and the world was left asking how and why. The tremendous loss caused by this tragedy will stay with us long after the roads have been cleared and the physical wounds have healed.

My most sincere prayers and thoughts go to all who have been impacted by this horrible catastrophe. The desolation left in its wake is beyond words. And yet there is one thing that has been made clear. The people of Haiti are not alone in this trouble. Since news of the earthquake reached our shores, the American people have opened their hearts and their wallets to help earthquake-ravaged Haiti. Both through the many donations of money, food and water, volunteer work, and through the U.S. agencies providing disaster relief assistance, our Nation has been working around the clock to provide immediate help to all who have been affected by this horrific tragedy.

U.S. Coast Guard aircraft began arriving almost immediately to transport injured persons and conduct aerial assessments of the situation on the ground. Coast Guard cutters with medical and other humanitarian supplies arrived soon after, followed by our USAID Disaster Assistance Response Team, multiple U.S. urban search and rescue teams, including two from my area of Miami-Dade County, the 82nd Airborne Division and Marine contingency, emergency medical teams and food assistance, and of course the remarkable contributions made by private U.S. citizens and corporations, totaling over $40 million as of last week and still growing.

In addition, we have seen an outpouring of support from countries and people around the world. Among many steps taken by countries around the world, Israel sent a 220-person medical delegation and set up a much-needed field hospital. The European Union has reportedly pledged 200 million euros to help rebuild Haiti, over and above emergency aid that is already being sent by them. The British Government will triple its aid to Haiti to $10 million.

Israel quickly set up a full-service field hospital, as I mentioned before. But let me tell you, Madam Speaker, what it was equipped with: operating rooms, an intensive care ward, a maternity ward, a pediatrics ward, incubator units, a pharmacy, x-ray equipment, 10 tons of medical equipment, 90 beds, 66 intensive care beds, two delivery beds, approximately 250 personnel, including 40 doctors and specialists, 20 nurses, and several paramedics.

The search and rescue teams of the Israeli Defense Forces were also quickly deployed to Haiti, and include about 30 operators, and dozens of operations personnel, comprising logistics, information technology, communications, and even canine units. More IDF delegations are scheduled to depart to Haiti this very week.

As a result, this resolution importantly calls for certain accountability measures to be put into place in order to ensure that the support is delivered in a way that is immediate, that is targeted, that is coordinated, and that is transparent.

Now more than ever it is critical that our assistance go where it is supposed to go, when it is supposed to get there, and how it is supposed to get there. We have a responsibility to the people we represent and to the people we wish to help to ensure that the aid reaches its intended recipients and is used for its intended purposes. This is particularly important moving forward.

Again, I extend my most heartfelt condolences to all of those who are impacted by this series of earthquakes, and I reiterate the pride I feel as I look at how the American people, our constituents, have responded to the cries of anguish and the cries for help of the Haitian people.

Madam Speaker, with that I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my colleague from California.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, expressing my condolences on the situation in Haiti and praising Fairfax County's urban search and rescue team that is in Haiti, 80-strong plus, and having saved a number of lives already.

In the aftermath of the 7.0 magnitude earthquake that struck Haiti, the men and women of these highly skilled teams worked together in a chaotic environment to save fifteen people (as of Tues. Jan 19).

On January 12, 2010—one day after the devastating earthquake that struck Haiti—the men and women of Fairfax County's urban search and rescue team, Virginia Task Force 1, deployed to Haiti.

The task force consisted of 72 personnel, 6 search and rescue canines, and about 48 tons of rescue equipment and supplies. The team rescued a United Nations security guard and assisted a French search and rescue team in removing seven Americans from a hotel.

Two days after the earthquake, a second team of 42 men and women from Fairfax County deployed to Haiti. Both Fairfax County urban search and rescue teams merged and rescued a 21 year-old female who was trapped in a multi-story building.

I commend the men and women of USAR Team 1 on their heroic effort, mourn for those who lost their lives, and pray for those awaiting aid. To the Fairfax team and all first responders in Haiti, I say "Stay Safe" and "Go with God."

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I would now like to yield such time as he may consume to the Chair of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa and Global Affairs, also the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus's International Affairs Task Force, a real leader who has worked on Haiti all of his life, Congressman DONALD PAYNE from New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you very much. And let me thank the Chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus for the outstanding job that she has done in this whole effort, Chairman BERMAN, Ranking Member ROS-LEHTINEN, and all of those who have come to show their support and what they have been doing up to now and what we intend to do in the future.

Madam Speaker, I rise to extend my deepest condolences to the people of Haiti, Haitian Americans, and all of those who have been affected by the earthquake that hit Port-au-Prince on Tuesday, January 12.

Words certainly cannot describe the pain and psychological trauma of the tragedy and its cause, and there is no way that we can just envision the tragic loss of life from this devastating 7.0 Richter scale earthquake.

The other thing about the earthquake is that it was only 6 miles below the surface, which many earthquakes go as far as 100, 150 miles down. So the trauma of this earthquake was just totally devastating. Actually, we have had several aftershocks, a 5.9 and a 5.5. We had another one today of 6.1 on the Richter scale. So this is far from over.

□ 1515

It has been estimated that over 3 million people have been directly affected by the disaster in Haiti. Nearly one-third of the country's population is at risk for long-term displacement and vulnerability, not to forget the unknown numbers of individuals who remain trapped in collapsed buildings.

I want to thank the rescue teams, the nongovernmental organizations, and other emergency responders who are working around the clock to locate and extract survivors. I certainly commend the efforts of the humanitarian response that is currently underway, particularly the efforts of all persons and relief organizations. Donors so far have contributed over $220 million to this effort. And by simply texting on phones, $22 million has been raised at $5 and $10 a clip. This is really showing the great heart of the American people. Even today, the Dominican Republic just announced $2.5 million that they are donating, and as you know that is a country that struggles financially themselves.

The disaster was a tremendous setback. Haiti was starting to move into a new beginning, and we now will see many of the problems of high food prices and food shortages that have been caused by this natural disaster. We certainly need to really remain very committed to this community at this very difficult time.

Haiti has a longstanding history with the United States. We heard the chargé today talk about Haiti and its relationship to the United States. It fought for the independence of our country. It was responsible for Napoleon selling the Louisiana Territory to the United States because they were cash-poor after the war that they lost. The whole question of Lewis and Clark was able to move forward.

And so we are intertwined with Haiti. We have a great deal of connection with Haiti. Once again, I would like to certainly praise the chairperson of the CBC. And let me correct, the Democratic Republic of Congo was the country that had recently made the contribution; even more spectacular because of the tremendous problems that we have seen there.

We wish to say to President Preval, who is doing everything that he can, and the Haiti Government, that we will work as partners with them. This is just the beginning. We are going to stay involved with them until we see a completion of what they need.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I am so pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), an esteemed member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentlewoman.

I wanted to rise in support of this resolution, but I also wanted to commend those who are involved in the rescue effort and the international communities, the governments, and the nongovernmental organizations, as well as the private rescue teams who have been on the ground.

I also want to give high marks to those people who had already been down in Haiti. One of them is Pastor Freddie Hebron from Savannah, Georgia, whose church has an ongoing missionary down there. Pastor Hebron was actually unaccounted for for about 38 hours, and the community was very concerned about him, but he is okay. He is still down there, although communication with him is a little bit spotty.

We also had another group, Pastor Bowman with Islands Church of Christ, who is down there led by Dr. John Rowlett and Dr. Brian Kornblatt, 14 American citizens who were down there and located outside of Port-au-Prince when the earthquake hit. And yet from their area, they started immediately dispensing medicine to the victims of the earthquake, eventually ran out of medicine, and then were stuck in an area isolated from the American Embassy, about 25 miles. They were able to get let out of there on Saturday at somewhat great danger and peril to them because at that point the street situation was beginning to deteriorate, with gangs and mobs that were out there and a lot of chaos. Richard Towns, who is a former marine, was one in their group and was able to get inside the Embassy. Once they got near it, and after a number of other obstacles, this group was able to return home to Savannah, Georgia, on Saturday with lots of prayer.

However, sadly, we still have two constituents from my area of Georgia who are unaccounted for; one is Courtney Hayes, who is a college student with Lynn University. She is a native of Douglas, Georgia. And another is a businessman named David Apperson, who is from Adel, Georgia. Both of them were staying in the Hotel Montana. Hotel Montana has suffered many losses. The rescue crew has brought out eight people from Hotel Montana, but there are others who are believed to be still trapped inside there.

In a conference call with the families yesterday we were told that the search-and-rescue teams—and some are private, some are international, and some are American; one of them is from Florida, one is from Fairfax County, and one is from Los Angeles—they're doing everything they can with scope cameras and listening devices and dogs and so forth to try to find whatever cavities remain in this rubble and focus on those areas where somebody could be trapped and surviving. The cavity question is actually more important right now than food or water, and so they're focusing on that.

A major concern of the families is what happens when the Government of Haiti, which is what we were told yesterday, the Government of Haiti decides that there is no point in further looking for survivors at the Hotel Montana. What we're concerned about as Americans is that we should make that decision, not the Haitian Government. I have written a letter today to the President, along with Congressman ROONEY and Congressman MICA, who also have constituents in there, to not call off that search because we believe it is very important that the American Government do everything that it can for the Haitians and the other international citizens, but also do everything we can foremost for Americans who are down there who are unaccounted for.

So I would ask that formally of my colleagues—that Hotel Montana we know has some American citizens trapped in there, we do not know their condition, I hope that other Members of Congress will join me in calling for that search to continue. I also would call on the administration to do that, and commend the good work that they are doing all around and realize the challenge ahead of them. But my concern right now is the Hotel Montana. And I would ask for your prayers for Courtney Hayes, a college student, and David Apperson, who is a businessman from Georgia, who are both down there and still unaccounted for.

With that, I commend you in support of this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. I would like to yield 1 minute now to our majority leader, Representative HOYER from the great State of Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and congratulate her for her leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus and her service on the Appropriations Committee, and for the focus that she brings to making sure that we do not forget those who are less fortunate than we.

We all join together in expressing our sorrow over last week's earthquake, which shattered the lives of so many of the people in Haiti, and as has been mentioned, others who were visiting Haiti. I do so fully knowing that no words we say here can rebuild a collapsed home or heal the wounds of the living or bury the dead.

At times like these, we say words fail; they fail to capture the true scope of devastation and suffering, and they fail to effect any change for the better. Nevertheless, it is still important to express the responsibility we feel to the 3 million Haitians killed, injured or displaced by this disaster, the same responsibility we hope that others would feel toward us in a time of need. That is why America is joining with the

international community, NGOs, and the United Nations to provide disaster relief and aid in rebuilding. That is why President Obama has pledged $100 million in disaster aid, and why American personnel are on the scene saving lives and aiding in the recovery.

The Los Angeles Daily News reported this week on the California firefighters whose backbreaking work gives us all something of which to be proud. I quote from that article: They were bone weary from digging through the rubble for 5 hours Sunday, losing faith fast. When the cheering began, it was like a shot of adrenalin, ''USA, USA,'' the large Haitian crowd standing in the street yelled as Los Angeles County Fire Captain Bill Monahan and his search-dog rescue team finally freed a young woman trapped under her collapsed hotel for 5 days. ''Bill said it brought him to tears,'' said Debra Tosch, who is the executive director of the Search Dog Foundation.

We know that there are stories of grief and loss to go alongside such stories of hope. We know that Haiti's crisis goes far deeper than the earthquake. But we also know that when our words fail in the face of a tragedy of this scope, it is our responsibility and our honor and our moral duty to act.

I urge the House to pass this resolution. I urge the Obama administration to give its urgent attention to coordinating and overseeing America's part in the relief effort. And then, when some degree of civility and stability has returned to that country, let us not forget that the road ahead will be long and difficult, but it is a necessary one if the Haitian people are to return to a life which will give them the kinds of opportunities and stability that we wish for ourselves.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank and applaud the American people for the generosity and the compassion they have shown in the wake of this horrific tragedy. According to our State Department, the American Red Cross effort has received over 2 million contributors and raised over $23 million so far. In addition, we continue to see admirable contributions from many American corporations and businesses. My own district of Miami, Florida, has sent two urban search-and-rescue teams to Haiti and has pledged $60,000 to relief efforts. The Port of Miami and Miami International Airport are waiving certain fees for relief-related efforts. Also, several other assets from south Florida are also being utilized, including U.S. Southern Command, or SOUTHCOM, which is serving as the operation center for the U.S. response in Haiti. Coast Guard Key West and Coast Guard Miami Beach, also Homestead Air Reserve Base, a departure point for the C–130s that are carrying relief, supplies, and personnel to Haiti, are playing an important role in this relief effort.

And just today, the USNS *Comfort* received its first Haitian patients, a 6-year-old boy and a 20-year-old man. They were flown via helicopter to the hospital ship. This is a nearly 900-foot floating hospital. The *Comfort* is reported to be carrying about 550 medical staff and about 60 civilian mariners.

So the American people have opened up their hearts and their wallets to help earthquake-ravaged Haiti. As a people and as a Nation, the United States will continue to move hand in hand with the people of Haiti to swiftly respond to and recover from this tragedy.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. I would like to now yield 1 minute to our great Speaker from the State of California, Speaker NANCY PELOSI.

□ 1530

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlewoman, Congresswoman LEE, for her leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor as Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus and as a leader on this issue as well.

To Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, ranking member on the Foreign Relations Committee, once again, thank you for your leadership.

DONALD PAYNE, our leader—my goodness, what a conscience he is and has been on this subject for a very long time and, really, for the alleviation of poverty and the eradication of disease throughout the world.

Madam Speaker, obviously the thoughts and prayers of this entire Congress are with the people of Haiti, who are suffering from a devastating earthquake that hit their country on January 12. Members of Congress are committed to helping the Haitian people recover from this tragedy and to rebuild their homes, communities and lives in the days, weeks and years to come.

Again, I thank Congresswoman LEE, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, and Congressman PAYNE for their leadership today and throughout the years in support of the people of Haiti.

It is a source of pride to the Americans that when President Obama spoke about this subject, he said to the Haitian people, ''You will not be forsaken. You will not be forgotten.''

What a beautiful sentiment reflecting the values of our country, the concern of the President, personally, that he had for the people of Haiti, the leadership he provided as Commander in Chief to deploy the forces necessary to help bring order there, and as President of the United States to speak with heads of state from other countries to coordinate the effort of relief for Haiti.

We are still learning the staggering extent of the devastation. The Government of Haiti estimates the death toll is close to 200,000 souls—200,000 people made in the image and likeness of God, 200,000 people whose families have been devastated by this loss. It's just such a staggering snuffing out of life, and more than 1.5 million people homeless.

Anyone who has ever visited Haiti has seen the extreme poverty there, the poorest country in this hemisphere; but with the poverty that they have economically and with the hope that they have otherwise, anyone who has visited there can testify to the fact that the sparkle in their eyes and their hopes for the future and their love of their children and their love of life is very special. It stands out.

I've been to many countries to visit the poor and to see what our efforts nationally and globally are to alleviate poverty and eradicate disease; and in Haiti you see a sparkle that is so special, and that's why this seems so very, very sad. We know for certain that too many Haitians are suffering right now. Far too many are injured and hungry. Far too many grieve the loss of loved ones.

Again, I am proud of the swift coordinated response that the President had. He extended TPS, at long last, temporary protection status. We've been asking for that for a long time, long before President Obama was President, for Haitians living in the U.S., and it ensures that no one will be sent back against their will to the devastation. I talked earlier about the President's leadership in this regard. At this tragic time, we can take steps right away to ensure a brighter future for Haiti.

I do believe, as one who comes from earthquake country—California, where we've experienced earthquakes; right, Congresswoman?—that there is a possibility that Haiti can leapfrog over all the physical devastation there to an economy and a future that is so very bright that this can create a boom economy for the people there and make a big difference in their lives. This can only happen if we all help.

Already today, the House has passed bipartisan charitable tax deduction legislation to encourage and incentivize assistance from the American people to the people of Haiti. I hope the Senate will soon follow and send this bill to the President's desk.

Next, the International Development Bank should move forward with full debt cancellation for Haiti. International institutions should be removing obstacles to Haiti's enormous long-term reconstruction challenges, including providing the new assistance in the form of grants and not loans.

Third, I will be asking the appropriate committees to work together with the administration and the Haitian Government to see how Congress can support long-term sustainable development plans for Haiti; and aren't we fortunate that Congresswoman LEE serves on one of those appropriate committees, and the chairwoman is here, Congresswoman LOWEY, of the subcommittee that is so important to this.

A compassionate and generous response from the United States is essential to stabilizing Haiti. While there has been a strong initial response to

the crisis, there must be an initiative to provide sustainable assistance that empowers Haiti's institutions and the Haitian people to build a future that is better than the past.

We value the strong relationship between Haiti and the United States. Our countries share a long and difficult history in some respects, but that binds us together. Wherever Haiti immigrants have settled, they have thrived, and they have contributed to the welfare and the well-being of their new home country, never forgetting their Haitian legacy.

We know about the artistic genius and entrepreneurial spirit of the Haitian people—Michael Jong, are you listening?—as so many others. They will succeed if they are only given the opportunity. Today, with this resolution, we are saying to the Haitian people: In your hour of greatest need, America stands with you.

Again, I thank Congresswoman LEE for her leadership on this important issue and Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN as well.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the Chair of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on The Western Hemisphere, the gentleman from New York, Chairman ENGEL.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, as chairman of The Western Hemisphere Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 1021, which expresses condolences to and solidarity with the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the horrific and devastating earthquake of January 12.

It is with great sorrow that we come to the floor today to lament the catastrophic blow to Haiti from last week's natural disaster. Tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of people have died; and hundreds of thousands are homeless in the wake of the earthquake. Our hearts go out to the Haitian people as they cope with the calamity that has befallen their nation.

While we mourn the great loss of life in Haiti, we must resolve to stand with the Haitian people as they rebuild their lives. Due to my long experience with Haiti from hearings in my subcommittee, visiting the country and, most importantly, my relationship with my Haitian American constituents—I have a large Haitian American community in my district in Spring Valley, New York—I know that Haiti will overcome this tremendous adversity.

However, Haiti and its people will need U.S. and international help for the foreseeable future. It is reassuring to see that the Obama administration has quickly marshaled the resources of the U.S. Government in coordination with the international community.

I thank President Obama and Secretary Clinton for their tireless efforts.

It is also important to recognize the generosity of millions of private American citizens who have responded immediately to this crisis, and we must thank the dedicated U.S. military and government personnel and the thousands of NGO volunteers and staff for their truly valiant efforts.

We should also remember that the challenges faced by Haiti will continue past this immediate period and will extend into the long term. The U.S. and global community will need to offer robust assistance to make sure Haiti can rebuild from this shocking disaster.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to praise President Obama's decision to grant temporary protection status, or TPS, to Haitian nationals living in the U.S. Representative RANGEL and I led the New York congressional delegation in writing to President Obama in support of this TPS designation.

On behalf of my constituents and Haitian Americans around the country, I offer my gratitude to the President, and I urge my colleagues to do the same in supporting this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Before recognizing the next speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise to voice my condolences and pledge to stand in solidarity with Haiti.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution and to express my sincere condolences to the Haitian people and to their friends and family around the world, including Haitian-Americans living in my district. Throughout my time in Congress, I have worked with them on ways to improve the live of Haitians, and I know we will continue that work together.

Last week's 7.0-magnitude earthquake was an almost unimaginable tragedy for Haiti. The capital city was flattened, tens of thousands of people were killed, and countless others lost what few possessions they had as homes, business, and schools crumbled.

I have traveled to Haiti several times, most recently last spring, and I am always struck by the incredible resilience of the Haitian people in the face of extreme poverty and devastating natural disasters. Still, this most recent tragedy is absolutely heartbreaking, particularly at a time when glimmers of light were beginning to appear for Haiti's future.

Emergency assistance in the coming days, weeks, and months will be critical. Earthquake survivors desperately need food, water, and medicine. But that cannot be the end of the story. Even before the earthquake, Haiti was the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere, with 80 percent of the population living on less than $2 per day. In recent years Haiti has weathered serious food riots after rising prices forced parents to feed mudcakes to their children, as well as a series of devastating storms.

So long as Haiti remains a country without a viable economy, it will remain dependent on assistance. We must continue to work to make sure that food, water, and medicine reach those who desperately need it right now, but, in the months and years ahead, we also need to work to bring real economic development to Haiti.

Madam Speaker, I extend my sincere condolences to the people of Haiti, and I join with my colleagues and the Obama administration in pledging U.S. support in the days, months, and years ahead.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, I stand proudly with my colleagues in supporting H. Res. 1021, which extends our heartfelt condolences and support for the people of Haiti and for those who are there serving humanitarian relief.

This is an opportunity for us, in the midst of all this tragedy, to address one of the poorest nations in the world, and it is located in the Western Hemisphere. It is time for us not only to meet the emergent needs but to fulfill our commitment to this country from now on in perpetuity.

So I commend the speedy work of the Congressional Black Caucus, of all of the Members of this House, and of those on the other side of the aisle for addressing these needs and for collaborating with the world to bring the kind of relief that is needed for our neighbor to the south. Congratulations.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, also Chair of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the chairwoman very much, and I thank her for her leadership on this issue, joined with the chairman of the full committee and the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Chairman BERMAN; the Congressional Black Caucus; and so many Members who have issued their outpouring of support. I thank Chairman PAYNE for his continued efforts, and I thank all of the Members who have sizable populations of Haitians in their districts.

There is a very active Haitian American population in Houston, Texas. We have been working. We have been pouring out our hearts, but we've also rolled up our sleeves. I believe there are several issues, as we support this resolution, that should be focused on.

One, we must have a long-term response, a Marshall Plan, in essence, to help rebuild Haiti. Two, we must deal

with the immediate crisis, emergency, loss of life, loss of loved ones, the ability to have medical care, and, yes, protecting our offerings.

So my community met on this past Saturday with the county government, the State government, the city government, Mayor Annise Parker and her representatives, the fire department, and our National and Texas Reserve, committing ourselves the resources and assets to be able to be of assistance. I was delighted to have been able to send from Texas two plane-loads of doctors, nurses and medical supplies, led by Dr. Richard Toussaint, where this past weekend they were able to do 150 surgeries and 600 visits.

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

Ms. LEE of California. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 10 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Moving forward, we will focus on relief efforts for the children, providing more medical care and, yes, insisting on making sure that we rebuild this great city and this great nation. We can do this. We are standing by their side. We will not leave them alone.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1021—"Expressing Condolences to and Solidarity with the People of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating Earthquake of January 12th, 2010."

As you know, on Tuesday, January 12th, a massive, 7.0 magnitude earthquake struck Haiti near the capital of Port-au-Prince. There is still no official estimate of death or destruction but the damage to buildings is extensive and the number of injured or dead is estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands.

Haiti sits on a large fault that has caused catastrophic quakes in the past, but this one was described as among the most powerful to hit the region within the last 200 years. With many poor residents living in tin-roof shacks that sit precariously on steep ravines and with much of the construction in Port-au-Prince and elsewhere in the country of questionable quality, the expectation was that the quake caused major damage to buildings and significant loss of life.

The dimensions of the disaster are still unfolding, but Haiti's Prime Minister Jean-Max Bellerive told CNN that he believes there are well over 100,000 dead, and leading senator Youri Latortue estimated the number at possibly as high as 500,000, according the Associated Press.

America is responding, and will continue to respond with immediate humanitarian assistance to help the people of this struggling island nation rebuild their livelihoods. I send my condolences to the people and government of Haiti as they grieve once again in the aftermath of a natural disaster. As Haiti's neighbor, I believe it is the United States' responsibility to help Haiti recover, and build the capacity to mitigate against future disasters.

America and her allies have already initiated a comprehensive, interagency response to the earthquake. The State Department, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Coast Guard, USAID—all worked overnight to ensure critical resources were positioned to support the response and recovery effort, including efforts to find and assist American citizens in Haiti.

Within days of last week's devastating earthquake, U.S. Southern Command deployed a team of 30 people to Haiti to support U.S. relief efforts in the aftermath of one of the largest natural disasters in the western hemisphere. The team included U.S. military engineers, operational planners, and a command and control group and communication specialists arriving on two C–130 Hercules aircraft. Since, there has been a tremendous interagency response with support and partnering with U.S. Embassy personnel as well as Haitian, United Nations and international officials to assess the situation and facilitate follow-on U.S. military support.

Our friends in the international community must also be commended for their efforts. The United Nations is releasing $10 million from its emergency funds. The European Commission has approved C3 million ($4.37 million) with more funds likely. Countless other nations from Germany, to China, to Israel to Mexico to have also pledged support. I commend each of these nations for coming to our neighboring nation in dire need of assistance.

Many of my constituents have asked what they can do to help, or how they can find their loved ones. Those who are interested in helping immediately can text 'HAITI' to '90999' and a donation of $10 will be made automatically to the Red Cross for relief efforts. The donation will be charged to your cell phone bill.

The outpouring of support and funding from the American people was both instant and sustained. According to the Washington Post, the text messaging effort raised $5 million in its first day, breaking the previous one-day record of about $450,000. Text-message donations continue to play a larger-than-expected role in the push for earthquake relief in Haiti. As of late Sunday, the American Red Cross said that it had collected pledges of about $103 million, including $22 million through the text donation program. Each donor should be proud of their contribution to help their brothers and sisters in Haiti.

Financially, 2009 was not an easy year for many Americans. Although thousands of jobs were created and we are back on the road to economic recovery, Americans lived on tighter budgets than usual. This legislation passed today will allow those Americans who have generously donated money to Haiti to receive their tax break this year instead of next year.

In January of 2005, Congress enacted this type of relief for individuals that made charitable contributions to victims of the Indian Ocean tsunami that occurred in late December of 2004. That bill (H.R. 241 in the 109th Congress) passed the House of Representatives without objection and subsequently passed the Senate by unanimous consent. I hope that this legislation, like our response to the 2004 tsunami, will encourage Americans to contribute more money to Haiti. As Haiti starts on its long recovery, every dollar is critically important. Americans have responded in great numbers, and I am proud to represent such a compassionate and generous nation.

Americans are not only giving their money, they are also giving their time and expertise as well. This weekend, I arranged for a team of seven doctors, six nurses, two techs, and two search and rescue volunteers to fly to Haiti and provide immediate humanitarian support. This team led by Dr. Richard Toussaint from Forest Park Medical Center in Dallas Texas arrived in Haiti just after noon on Saturday. From there, the doctors made their way to Hospital Sacre-Couer where, in roughly two days, they performed about 70 amputations, surgically treated about 150 patients, and saw about 600 patients total. I commend this team of medical personnel for their selfless actions and willingness to spend their own time and money to come to the aid of people they had never met.

Additionally, I hosted a Houston-based Haiti relief effort called "Texans helping Haitians" with city leadership and the Haitian community in the aftermath of this horrible disaster. Groups included in the effort to provide supplies and medical assistance to Haiti were: Texas Medical Center, Texas Dental Association, Search and Rescue Organizations, the Haitian Multicultural Association, Haitian Caribbean Organization of Texas, Caribbean Impact Foundation, and Haiti Counts.

We also helped coordinate the safe return of six Houston Rotarians that were stranded in the mountains and we are now working with Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance on the transport of orphans to awaiting families here in the U.S.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have been highly involved in strengthening the relationship between the U.S. and Haiti. I have worked to establish positive and productive partnerships with local development officials, non-profit organizations, and the Haitian Diaspora to establish a strong web of support for the nation of Haiti. In collaboration with the Congressional Black Caucus, I have been a continual advocate of providing assistance to Haiti to strengthen their fragile democratic processes, continue to improve security, and promote economic development among other concerns such the protection of human rights, combating narcotics, arms, and human trafficking, addressing Haitian migration, and alleviating poverty.

Last year, I introduced H.R. 264, the "Save Immigration Comprehensive Act of 2009." Among other things, this act authorizes adjustment of status for certain nationals or citizens of Haiti as well as amends the Haitian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act of 1998 to: (1) waive document fraud as a ground of inadmissibility; and (2) address determinations with respect to children. In the wake of last week's earthquake, I am happy to see that the Obama Administration decided to extend temporary protection status to Haitians facing deportation.

Once again, I am devastated by the immeasurable tragedy that occurred in Haiti. Along with my colleagues, I hope to visit Haiti in the near future to meet with their leaders and see what the United States can do to rebuild the shattered livelihoods.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the Chair of the State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 1021, with appreciation for the leadership of BARBARA LEE, a member of my committee; DONALD PAYNE; and sincere condolences for the victims of last Tuesday's tragic earthquake and continuing aftershocks. Yet another

natural disaster has devastated this country and its people. My deep sympathy and prayers are with the people of Haiti and all those who have lost loved ones.

As the resolution notes, the U.S. Government and the American people stand in solidarity with the Haitian people and are committed to helping them in this great time of need. The intense challenges of delivering humanitarian relief are compounded in Haiti by weak infrastructure and government institutions that cannot provide the necessary support for relief.

I commend the swift response by the Obama administration, especially USAID, the State Department, HHS, the Department of Defense, as well as the international community, to quickly mobilize humanitarian and disaster relief in a complex humanitarian disaster.

I also want to acknowledge the outstanding work of many, many other countries; and I want to particularly commend Israel for its immediate response with search and rescue teams, fully equipped hospitals and doctors, Doctors Without Borders, and thousands of NGOs.

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

Ms. LEE of California. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. LOWEY. Lastly, in addition to the thousands of NGOs, I want to commend a group started by Danielle Butin in my district that has been collecting medical supplies and shipping containers daily with the help of many, many volunteers. This is a job for all of us, and I am very, very pleased that there are so many governments and individuals who are working to relieve this terrible, terrible effect of the disaster.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, before I recognize my next speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1021, expressing condolences to and solidarity with the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake of January 12, 2010.

Madam Speaker, Americans are deeply saddened by the tremendous damage and loss of life caused by the earthquake that struck Haiti on January 12th.

The earthquake was truly a devastating natural disaster. There are enormous needs in Haiti. Authorities say that the earthquake may have killed 200,000 people. Three million people in Haiti need food, water, shelter, and medical assistance, according to an estimate given by the United Nations.

Tens of thousands of people sleep in the streets or under plastic sheets in makeshift camps. The spread of disease has become a major concern in Haiti. Tens of thousands of children have been orphaned by the earthquake.

I join with my colleagues in expressing the sympathies of the Congress, recognizing the long-term need for American assistance, and urging the President to adopt multiple approaches to assisting those affected by this tragedy now and in the future.

It is important to have the federal government participate in the broad, international relief effort. Action by the federal government demonstrates leadership from the highest level of government in helping meet the deep need for humanitarian aid.

Booker T. Washington captured well the importance of assisting people in need when he said, ''The highest test of the civilization of any race is in its willingness to extend a helping hand to the less fortunate.''

I am very proud that the American response to the Haitian tragedy is not limited to our government. Individuals, businesses, and philanthropic organizations have joined with our global colleague to respond to this tragedy.

During this time of extreme difficulty in Haiti, charities have raised more than $210 million in donations for Haiti earthquake relief. A campaign using text messages brought in over $21 million for the Red Cross for relief efforts.

In Chicago, I know that many churches, especially the Church of God in Christ, are rising to meet the tremendous needs of the people affected by the Haitian tragedy. The international community has come together to assist Haiti by sending emergency funds, search and rescue teams, food and water, and medical teams.

I want to emphasize that this resolution recognizes that Haiti's needs will be great, both in the short-term and the long-term. I believe that Americans and our government will rise to help meet these immediate and future challenges.

The people of Haiti and the United States have a long and complex relationship dating back to pre-slavery days. Our cultures, and our respective economic histories and destinies, are deeply intertwined. It is natural and just for our nation to take the lead in extending a hand of immediate relief to the people of Haiti in the aftermath of this horrific disaster and ultimately a hand in rebuilding their shattered nation so that the Haitian people can join with the developed nations of the world in a 21st century standard of living and security.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a member of the Committee on Natural Resources, who is the second vice Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

□ 1545

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, in this time of sadness and tragedy for the people of Haiti and all of us who are their friends, I rise in support of Resolution 1021, expressing our condolences and solidarity with the people of Haiti and their families throughout the diaspora, and the people of the U.S. Virgin Islands join me on these sentiments.

On Martin Luther King Day, I joined some of our clergy in leading a prayer vigil for the people of Haiti, and I am proud to report on the funding that has been sent in, to report that the Haiti community support and teams of doctors and nurses from my district began a rotation of medical supplies immediately following the quake.

On Monday, a ship normally stationed at HOVENSA, the oil refinery on St. Croix, was commissioned to Port-au-Prince, and left, carrying supplies from several organizations including Rotary, Hispanos Unidos, and a group led by Haitian American Virgin Islander Andre McBean. We thank them and the Haitian American organization in St. Thomas led by Oskar Lalanne, Hans Oriol, and Gerard Bateau, who have also sent supplies and provided aid on the ground, including the assembling of creole speaking interpreters who are so needed during this disaster.

Today, with this resolution we signal the commitment of this Congress and the people of the United States to standing with Haiti——

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

Ms. LEE of California. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Not just now, during the immediate response, but for what will be a long and difficult recovery.

I thank our chairwoman, BARBARA LEE, for introducing the resolution and all of the Congressional Black Caucus and others for their leadership in support of Haiti, both before and since January 12.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding and also for her strong support and her assistance with this resolution.

Let me now yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York, a member of the Committee on Small Business, who also serves as an officer of the whip of the Congressional Black Caucus, hails from the Caribbean, a leader on so many issues, Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE.

Ms. CLARKE. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus and member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for bringing us together, along with the ranking member, for this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my heartfelt condolences and in support of the Haitian people, the Haitian American community in the United States and the Caribbean island nation of Haiti, and ask my colleagues to support Resolution 1021.

As the representative of the second largest Haitian American population in the United States, this crisis has truly and literally hit home. My office has been inundated and overwhelmed with

constituents calling, earnestly trying to find their loved ones. Many of them are hoping family members are still alive and safe, despite the many images of destruction they see in the media.

The situation on the ground remains unstable. Lives still hang in the balance, and a speedy and coordinated action is needed to maximize the recovery effort and to mitigate the loss of life.

With this resolution, we are sending a unified message to the Haitian people that we stand with them as they mourn the loss of their loved ones and prepare to rebuild their nation. This resolution lets the whole world know that Haiti is as much a part of us as we are a part of them.

Over the last week, the American people have been pouring out their hearts to the nation. I would like to commend our people, the U.S. military, Coast Guard, search and rescue teams, humanitarian NGOs, for all of their work. I would like to recognize the swift response from the Obama administration in providing immediate investment and thank them.

Ms. LEE of California. I now yield 2 minutes to the Chair of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, a leader on so many issues who has been involved with Haiti since I have known her, and that has been since the 1970s, who has led the charge for debt relief, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS.

Ms. WATERS. I would like to thank my good friend, the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus and a friend of Haiti's who has been working on behalf of Haiti for many years, BARBARA LEE.

I rise to support this resolution, which expresses the condolences of the House of Representatives with the people of Haiti following last week's devastating earthquake. I especially appreciate the fact that this resolution urges multilateral financial institutions to immediately suspend further debt payment from Haiti and to develop processes to cancel all of Haiti's remaining debt.

Haiti cannot begin to recover from the earthquake while continuing to make payments on debts owed to multilateral financial institutions like the IMF, the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank. Even before the earthquake occurred, debt payments were a tremendous burden that interfered with the ability of Haiti's Government to meet the needs of its people.

Haiti worked very hard over the past several years to qualify for debt relief. In order to qualify, the Government of Haiti successfully developed and implemented a comprehensive Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper under the direction of the IMF and the World Bank. As a result, multilateral financial institutions provided Haiti $1.2 billion in debt relief last June. Nevertheless, Haiti still owes a total of $664 million in debt to multilateral financial institutions.

The IMF offered Haiti a new $100 million loan for earthquake recovery efforts. Unfortunately, new loans that will add to Haiti's debt burden are not what Haiti needs at this critical time. I was encouraged to learn that IMF managing director, Dominique Strauss-Kahn, expressed support for canceling all of Haiti's debt, including the new loan, and I look forward to working with him to do so.

On behalf of the Black Caucus, I am introducing legislation to require the United States Secretary of the Treasury to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States within the multilateral financial institutions to cancel all of Haiti's remaining debt, and I hope all of my colleagues will support it. Canceling Haiti's debts will free up the country's meager resources, allowing it to begin meeting its immediate and long-term needs.

Again, I would like to thank my good friend and leader, BARBARA LEE, for introducing this legislation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Judge POE, a member of our House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding.

When this situation occurred in Haiti, when the earthquake came through and devastated the land, the buildings, and the lives of the people, there were over 30,000 Americans in Haiti at the time. Many of these Americans were there as volunteers to help this struggling nation. They were from churches throughout the United States. They were young people, civic organizations already there helping this struggling nation.

One group particularly, from my hometown of Houston, a group of Rotarians, had just gotten there to work in two places. They were going to work in the hospitals, to make the hospitals better and more convenient and more efficient, and they were also there to dig water wells for the Haitian people. And all of these people that were there from America, most of them, were volunteers.

It has been said that government can never replace a volunteer, and that is true. Americans are the most giving people on Earth, and they were helping Haiti. And I suspect Americans will go and help Haiti again, to volunteer, all of these civic religious organizations. And that is a good thing, because that is what we do in America. We help other people. We help our own people, and we help foreign nations and their people as well, because America in the time of crisis responds.

So I commend the Americans that are working, along with the NGOs and the officials of our government and other governments, in this struggling time to help the people of Haiti get their lives back together so that they can once again be a productive nation in the community of countries.

Ms. LEE of California. I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague and friend from California (Mr. SCHIFF), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I join my colleague from California (Ms. LEE) in expressing my profound sorrow at the tragedy that has been visited upon the people of Haiti.

Even now, a week after the earthquake that shattered Port-au-Prince and much of the surrounding area, rescuers are still pulling survivors from the rubble, including a 15-day-old baby girl who was pulled from her home, destroyed, yesterday, after 7 days without food and water. Happily, the baby has been reunited with her mother, who told the Wall Street Journal that her daughter's survival was ''the mercy of God.'' Hours later, 69-year-old Anna Zizi was dragged singing from the rubble of the Roman Catholic cathedral of Port-au-Prince, while Hotteline Lozama, age 25, was pulled from the ruins of a shopping center.

But, despite these miracles, the horror is overwhelming. Current estimates place the death toll at 200,000, and more than 1.5 million Haitians have been made homeless as a result of the earthquake. Major aftershocks, including a magnitude 6.1 tremor this morning, have hampered rescue efforts and kept survivors in a state of near panic.

The extent of the damage and totality of the need have overwhelmed the massive international aid effort that is racing to get food and water to more than 3 million people. Even as U.N. reinforcements and additional U.S. military and civilian assets scramble to the stricken island, an estimated 20,000 people a day are dying, most from lack of adequate medical care.

There is an unfortunate familiarity to the images that have been broadcast around the world in the aftermath of this tragedy: the pleading eyes, the fear, and the sorrow mixed with stoicism. We have seen them before in New Orleans after Katrina, in Southeast Asia after the tsunami, in Pakistan after the earthquake there, and the aftermath of countless other disasters.

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

Ms. LEE of California. I yield the gentleman 20 additional seconds.

Mr. SCHIFF. But even though the scenes are familiar and unsettling, we cannot turn away and we must not shirk our obligation to aid our neighbor in her hour of need. I urge the President to continue to press for faster deployment of aid and reconstruction personnel.

I thank my colleague for her leadership and her support of the resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from California (Ms. LEE) for the bipartisan approach to this terrible, terrible situation.

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

Ms. LEE of California. Before I close, I yield 1½ minutes to my friend from New Jersey, Chair of the African Global Health Subcommittee, Chairman PAYNE.

Mr. PAYNE. Let me, once again, express our deep appreciation for the outcry of Members of this legislative body on both sides of the aisle.

We have heard of the great work done by many of the countries mentioned. We have heard about the heroism and the heroic efforts of many of the people. We have seen isolated shots of some violence and disorder, but let me say that this is just a very small sliver of what is happening in Haiti. Most of the people are waiting patiently. Most of the people are orderly.

It is amazing, the resilience of the Haitian people from these overwhelming obstacles, that 99 percent of the people are just trying to make it through. So we need to engage with the government. We need to assist them as they start to recover politically and governmentally.

In addition to restoring the city, we need to take a look at perhaps a new city outside of Port-au-Prince, a city built for 50,000 people that has 2 million people. Can you imagine that? So this may be a way that we can have a planned approach. We have great colleges. Columbia University has the Earth Institute, and we would hope to try to encourage those groups to come in.

With that, let me commend our chairperson once again.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, let me thank all of the Members today for coming down to the floor in support of this resolution but, more importantly, in support of the people of Haiti.

I end by calling on all my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure to express our deepest condolences, our steadfast solidarity, and our sustained commitment to the people of Haiti in the wake of this ongoing tragedy.

□ 1600

As we move forward, let us not waiver in saying to the people of Haiti: Your resilience, your dignity, your courage, even during your darkest hour, continues to inspire us. And during your darkest hour, the United States, and the American people, will not abandon you as you continue to struggle for a brighter tomorrow.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the struggles of the Haitian people in the aftermath of the disastrous earthquake that hit the island nation on January 12, 2010. The images of the aftermath of the earthquake are startling and sobering reminders of the power of nature and of our obligation as human beings to assist those who are less fortunate.

In the short term, Haiti's emergency needs are overwhelming. Even with the death and casualty toll estimates still coming in, we know that there is an urgent need for food, medicines, water, emergency shelter, and equipment. The immediate response from our citizens has been gratifying. Within 24 hours following the quake, we saw Americans from a cross section of society—from elected officials in Washington to everyday residents all over New York City—reach out and offer assistance.

The Obama Administration, for its part, has pledged its full support for rescue and humanitarian assistance. I applaud President Obama's decision to pledge $100 million in relief aid. It is clear that there will be an even greater need for a long-term commitment to rebuild the nation's infrastructure, and to provide educational, security, and economic assistance. As the leader in our hemisphere and Haiti's most important political partner, the United States should lead the way in supporting these efforts.

There will come a time when the people of Haiti are no longer headlines in the media; and yet they will still be in desperate need of help from the international community. It is at this time that we must pull together and unite to help the citizens of Haiti rebuild their country. Similar to a national public works program, the building and repairing of roads and bridges, schools, hospitals and health care clinics, and the undertaking of massive reforestation should create much needed jobs for Haitians.

I would also like to thank President Obama and Secretary Napolitano for granting the thousands of Haitian nationals in America with Temporary Protective Status. This humanitarian gesture will allow our Haitian brothers and sisters, neighbors and friends, many of whom have been among us for several years, to remain here, work hard, and contribute to the efforts of rebuilding their homeland while in America.

Haiti has been a long-time friend and ally of the United States, and now it is our turn to exercise our friendship in their time of need.

Madam Speaker, I invite you and my colleagues in joining me to dedicate our efforts, and commit ourselves to supporting, the long-suffering Haitian people, now and into the future.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues and extend my deepest sympathies to the people of Haiti, and to their worried and grieving loved ones around the world, after the tragic earthquake that devastated so much of the nation last Tuesday. It is heartbreaking that a country that has suffered through so much in its history now must endure this unimaginable disaster. My thoughts and prayers also go out to the injured and missing Americans, Haitian-Americans with families impacted by this tragedy, and families and colleagues of the United Nations personnel who lost their lives.

I would also like to applaud President Obama's quick action in sending civilian and military personnel and humanitarian resources to help in rescue and recovery, and am ready to work with my colleagues in Congress to support the Administration's efforts. I call on all Americans to continue to show their support for the people of Haiti, whether by contributing to the Red Cross or other charitable organizations operating in Haiti, or offering products or services that may be needed.

In times of terrible suffering, the world community comes together to help those in need, and that is what we have seen in the aftermath of the Haiti earthquake. Now, we must ensure that our attention and our efforts do not waver. I thank Congresswoman LEE for her leadership in bringing this resolution to the Floor and urge all my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1021, a resolution expressing condolences to and solidarity with the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake there.

My sincerest condolences and prayers are with the citizens of Haiti, their friends and families on Long Island and throughout the United States as well as the many American citizens who live and work in Haiti.

In times of tragedy, it is essential that we come to the aid of our neighbors. have been proud of the response by U.S. Federal, State, and local agencies that have been centrally involved with providing emergency response to Haiti. Local law enforcement and first responders throughout Long Island and New York have pledged to lend their expertise to the relief efforts. After the initial emergency has passed, it is important that we stay committed to helping Haiti onto the path towards a full recovery.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is difficult to comprehend the depth of tragedy and sorrow that has visited the poor island of Haiti. It is difficult to convey the depth of our sympathy and shock at the catastrophe that has befallen the Haitian people.

Madam Speaker, the extent of the misery, destruction and death is nearly beyond imagination. It surely puts our own national trials and tribulations into perspective.

I am encouraged by the expression of solidarity that has sprung up across the United States. I hope that expression manifests not merely in words but in real action, real contributions, financial and otherwise, to aid our suffering Haitian brothers and sisters.

I encourage the Obama Administration to continue working closely with the United Nations and the international community to ensure that the provision of critical assistance to the most vulnerable, the grievously injured and homeless, is the top priority of aid efforts.

I encourage the American people to look with understanding and not with scorn upon the chaos that inevitably accompanies such disasters, wherever they occur.

And I pledge, on behalf of my constituents, the full power and influence of Georgia's Fourth Congressional District to the effort to relieve Haitian suffering and save Haitian lives as the toll of this disaster continues to rise.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of passing both H. Res. 1021 and H.R. 4462. During this time of terrible tragedy in Haiti, it is imperative that we stand with the Haitian people as they work to rescue, recover and eventually rebuild.

Haiti is the poorest, and perhaps most struggling of our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere. Although there has been much progress with the development of a democratic parliamentary system, there is still a long way to go and this natural disaster is undoubtedly a terrible setback to Haiti's development. Sadly, many casualties of this tragedy have been humanitarian workers and peacekeepers whose work was far from completed. With that in mind, it is imperative that we keep their mission alive by supporting greater resources for further aid workers and peacekeeping forces.

Since the day the earthquake occurred, I have been touched by the outpouring of support from Americans and am pleased that Congress is able to act so swiftly to pass legislation that speeds up the tax deduction for charitable contributions for Haiti. It is yet another way for us to help those who want to help the people of Haiti through this time of tragedy.

I urge my colleagues to pass both H. Res. 1021 and H.R. 4462 and to keep the people of Haiti in our thoughts and prayers.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues to express my profound condolences to the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating 7.0-magnitude earthquake that struck the nation on January 12, 2010.

I led a congressional delegation to Haiti in May 2009 to support that country's efforts to promote democracy, stability and prosperity. During that visit, I saw the many challenges Haitians face and how they meet those challenges with courage and determination.

Our delegation met with Haitian President Rene Preval at the National Palace and we also met with members of the Haitian Parliament at the Senate building. To now see photos of both of those buildings in ruins and to hear stories of members of the Senate being pulled out of the rubble has strengthened my resolve to continue to support Haiti and its people. The tragic images and on-the-ground news reports cannot but move us to action.

We also visited two Partners in Health, PIH, facilities. PIH brings modern medical care to poor communities around the world and has been working in Haiti for over 20 years. Thankfully, PIH facilities in the central plateau region of Haiti, while experiencing the strong shock of the earthquake, had no major building damage or staff or patient injuries. PIH was able to mobilize their resources and bring medical assistance and supplies to other areas of the island that have been hardest hit. None of this has been easy to do in a country where the infrastructure, subpar to begin with, was virtually destroyed. I thank PIH as well as all the other organizations and individuals for the difficult work they are doing in Haiti in the wake of this devastation.

President Barack Obama acted very quickly and decisively to send vital assistance to Haiti. The Administration's coordination of this international relief effort has been one of the largest in recent history.

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has said that our efforts to rebuild Haiti will be a long term investment and I stand by her commitment. Our country has a special responsibility to help our neighbor move beyond the poverty, despair, and dysfunction that have plagued Haiti for far too long.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of continued investment in the people of Haiti.

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, I rise in solidarity with my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus in support of the people of Haiti.

Last weekend, in my district, I held a citywide interfaith prayer service where we sought God's grace and mercy for the lives of those who were lost in last week's earthquake as well as for the survivors, the rescue workers and those who, miraculously, continue to be pulled alive from the rubble.

I strongly support the swift action, last week, by the Obama Administration to grant temporary protected status for Haitian immigrants already living in this country. I urge the Administration to continue to bring the full weight and resources of the federal government in support of a nation whose history intersects with that of the founding of the United States.

Haiti is a nation to whom our nation owes an enormous debt of gratitude. It was the brave people of Haiti who tirelessly fought French aggressors, in the early 1800s, thereby preventing that nation from advancing to the shores of America in the early years after the founding of our republic.

My commitment to Haiti is to do all I can do, in our nation's capitol and at home in Chicago, to help restore, rebuild and strengthen Haiti. My hope and prayer is that it will emerge stronger than it was before last week's tragic turn of events.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Madam Speaker, I want to join with the American people in paying tribute to the Haitian people. Who have suffered so much. But who have proven so strong. While the world does all it can to help, it is the Haitian people, first and foremost, who are saving themselves.

I also want to honor those who have rushed to Haiti's aid from across the globe: the diplomats and aid workers, the humanitarians, the volunteers, and the members of the military—particularly the United States Coast Guard.

Last but certainly not least, I want to pay tribute to the men and women of the United Nations peacekeeping mission known as MINUSTAH. They came to a foreign land. To help give a foreign people a better life. Now many of them are dead. Or injured. Or missing.

We must ensure that their sacrifice was not in vain. We must work with the Haitian people and the world to help Haiti recover. Because doing so is not just in line with our interests. It is in keeping with our most basic and cherished values of compassion and common decency.

Ms. LEE of California. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1021.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## CONDEMNING VIOLENT SUPPRESSION IN GUINEA

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1013) condemning the violent suppression of legitimate political dissent and gross human rights abuses in the Republic of Guinea, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1013

Whereas, on December 23, 2008, a military junta calling itself the National Council for Democracy and Development (CNDD) seized power in the Republic of Guinea hours after the death of longtime President Lansana Conté, suspended the national legislature and the constitution, and committed to hold free and fair national elections as part of a ''peaceful transition'' to a civilian-led government;

Whereas delays in electoral preparations and statements by CNDD leader Captain Moussa Dadis Camara that he might run for president, in contravention of earlier commitments that neither he nor any other member of the CNDD would run as a candidate in the elections, provoked increasing public discontent with the junta;

Whereas, on September 28, 2009, tens of thousands of unarmed civilians gathered at a the national soccer stadium in Conakry to protest against the CNDD;

Whereas security forces responded by surrounding the stadium and opening fire with live ammunition on the crowd, reportedly killing over 150 people and injuring over 1,000;

Whereas prominent opposition leaders were then beaten and arrested by soldiers; demonstrators and opposition party members were detained without charge; and at least 60 women were brutally raped, sexually molested, or killed by security forces, many of them in public and in full sight of their commanders;

Whereas an investigation by Human Rights Watch indicates that ''the [stadium] massacre and widespread rape were organized and premeditated'' and that armed forces had attempted to ''hide evidence of the crimes by seizing bodies from the stadium and the city's morgues and burying them in mass graves'';

Whereas the security forces responsible for the violence on September 28, 2009, reportedly included troops from the Presidential Guard and gendarmes working with the State Secretariat for Special Services, both of which answer directly to the presidency;

Whereas, on October 30, 2009, the United Nations Secretary-General announced the appointment of an international commission of inquiry to probe the violence of September 28, 2009;

Whereas the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) has appointed President Blaise Compaoré of Burkina Faso to mediate between the CNDD, opposition parties, and civil society in an effort to break the current political impasse;

Whereas the African Union, ECOWAS, the European Union, and the United States have imposed targeted sanctions, variously including travel restrictions, financial asset freezes, and an arms embargo, on CNDD members in response to the violent crackdown and perceived CNDD resistance to a democratic transition;

Whereas while others were imposing sanctions against the CNDD, it was announced in October that the China International Fund, a Hong Kong-registered company with ties to Chinese state-owned enterprises and government agencies, has signed a $7 billion deal with the CNDD to develop Guinea's vast mineral resources;

Whereas the CNDD reportedly has imported millions of dollars worth of weapons since the September 28, 2009, crackdown and junta members reportedly are recruiting militias, adding a troubling and potentially explosive ethnic dimension to the crisis;

Whereas targeted political killings reportedly have been carried out in Conakry since September 2009, opposition members continue to face the threat of arrest and violent assault, and the junta has banned all public protests;

Whereas, on December 3, 2009, Captain Moussa Dadis Camara was shot in the head in an apparent assassination attempt by his aide-de-camp Lt. Aboubakar Diakite (Toumba) and flown to Morocco for treatment, prompting analysts to warn of a potential counter coup and a further deterioration of security in Guinea;

Whereas a further deterioration of the political and security situation in Guinea could have catastrophic consequences not only for Guinea, but also for neighboring Liberia and Sierra Leone, both of which only recently emerged from deadly, protracted conflicts;

Whereas Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has referred to the September 28, 2009, crackdown as ''criminality of the greatest degree'', and stated that Guinea's military leaders must recognize ''that they cannot remain in power, that they must turn back to the people the right to choose their own leaders'';

Whereas, on January 6, 2010, interim junta leader General Sekouba Konate invited the opposition in Guinea to select a prime minister in advance of the formation of a transitional government and offered security guarantees to opposition leaders who had fled the country; and

Whereas, on January 15, 2010, the ''Declaration Conjointe de Ouagadougou'' to end the political crisis in Guinea, mediated by Burkina Faso's President Blaise Compaoré, was signed by opposition parties and junta leaders, and supported by the International Contact Group on Guinea, provides for the establishment of a government of national unity, led by a consensus Prime Minister, and the holding of presidential elections within six months in order to reestablish the rule of law and bring peace and stability to the people of Guinea: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the violent suppression of legitimate political dissent and gross human rights abuses, including mass murder and extreme sexual violence, perpetrated by forces under the command of the National Council for Democracy and Development (CNDD) in Guinea and demands that the perpetrators of these crimes be brought to justice;

(2) expresses grave concern about the further deterioration of security and rule of law in Guinea, particularly with regard to ongoing reports of—

(A) harassment of opposition figures, members of civil society, and journalists;

(B) rising ethnic tensions;

(C) growing cleavages within the CNDD and the military which raise the potential of a violent counter coup;

(D) recruitment of militias and other irregular forces from within Guinea and neighboring countries;

(E) importation of weapons despite an arms embargo on the region; and

(F) uncertainty about the prospects for restoring civilian rule through free, fair, and transparent elections;

(3) calls on China to cease its material support for the CNDD by publicly announcing the cancellation of the China International Fund's $7 billion minerals and infrastructure deal in Guinea;

(4) urges all Member States of the United Nations to join the United States, the European Union (EU), the African Union (AU), and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) to impose sanctions against the regime until constitutional order and rule of law has been restored in Guinea;

(5) supports the efforts of the ECOWAS and the AU to find a resolution to the current political crisis in Guinea;

(6) urges the leaders of the CNDD, the Force Vives Coalition, and all parties in Guinea to uphold and abide by the provisions included in the ''Declaration Conjointe de Ouagadougou'' and to facilitate the conduct of free, fair, and transparent elections that meet international standards and reflect the will of the Guinean people; and

(7) expresses solidarity with the people of Guinea during this time of extreme uncertainty and expresses deep regret for the victims of the September 28, 2009, crackdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the Chair of the Africa and Global Health Subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I want to begin by thanking the ranking member, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, for introducing this important and timely resolution. In December 2008, after the death of President Lansana Conte, a military junta seized power in the West African country of Guinea and suspended the national legislature and the constitution. The coup interrupted plans for upcoming democratic elections and threatened the fragile stability of the entire West African Mano River region, where decade-long wars in Liberia and Sierra Leone have displaced thousands of families, destroying the capacity of their governments to function. Fortunately, the Economic Community of West African States, the African Union, and the United Nations acted immediately to rebuke the coup, demand an immediate end to the violence, and a restoration of the rule of law.

After the horrific killing of 57 peaceful protesters in October, 2009, the U.S. Government, along with the Africa Union, imposed travel and financial sanctions against the junta. The swift and concerted action by the entire international community, including the United Nations, the European Union, and individual states, clearly caught the attention of the coup leader, Captain Moussa Dadis Camara and his junta. Unlike many previous African coups that were allowed to seize governmental control and consolidate military dictatorships, the Guinea coup was isolated by African States. And this is a move that—the Africa Union has decided that, in order to end military coups, they must treat rogue states with isolation.

This past weekend, Guinea's junta leaders agreed to relinquish power to civilian rule, establish an interim government, and support the restoration of the constitution. The military leaders also agreed to appoint as prime minister the opposition leader, Jean-Marie Dore, and to prepare for new presidential elections in 6 months.

Madam Speaker, we should commend the people of Guinea for standing fast in the face of military violence and demanding a return to the rule of law, and congratulate the international community for uniting so quickly in order to restore order in Guinea.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. First, I want to thank the ranking member, the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for introducing this resolution, and I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1013, which condemns the violent suppression of legitimate political dissent and gross human rights abuses in the Republic of Guinea.

Analysts have been warning that Guinea, an impoverished yet resource-rich country in West Africa, has been teetering on the brink of chaos for years. Throughout the 1990s, Guinea was flanked by brutal civil wars in neighboring countries. This aggravated existing ethnic tensions within Guinea and left the entire subregion awash with small arms and mercenaries for hire.

Demonstrations throughout the years 2006 and 2007 were brutally put down by military security forces, leaving hundreds dead and thousands injured. The ailing longtime president was so corrupt and unpopular that the citizens of Guinea reportedly readily embraced the military junta to replace him when he finally died in December of 2008. Unfortunately, the junta would not usher in peace. Despite initial positive signals, repeated delays in the elections and the timetable provoked increasing public discontent.

On September 28, 2009, tens of thousands of unarmed civilians gathered at the national soccer stadium to protest against the junta. Security forces responded by surrounding the stadium, blocking the exits, and opening fire with live ammunition on the crowds. In the chaos that ensued, over 150 people were killed; more than 1,000 people were injured; at least 60 women were brutally raped, sexually assaulted, or

killed by security officials in plain sight of commanding officers; and prominent opposition leaders were beaten and arrested while demonstrators and opposing party members were detained without any formal charge.

Almost immediately, the United States, the European Union, and the Economic Community of West African States imposed targeted sanctions against the junta and called for the return of a civilian government. The junta then reportedly starting importing millions of dollars of weapons and recruiting ethnic militias. This prompted analysts to warn that Guinea had become a tinderbox that could blow at any time, potentially taking neighboring Liberia and Sierra Leone with it.

On December 3, 2009, junta leader Dadis was shot in the head by an aide and was flown to Morocco, where he remained for nearly 6 weeks. In his absence, the acting junta leader announced that a transitional government would be formed and that the opposition had been invited to select a prime minister. Despite a political agreement between the junta and the opposition being signed this past weekend, the situation in Guinea remains extremely fragile. Details about the formation of a transitional government and eventual return to civilian rule remain unclear. The mere suggestion that Dadis would return to Guinea last week prompted the acting junta leader to threaten his resignation. The junta leadership and the military remain deeply divided. Ethnic militias remain well-armed.

The deterioration of security in Guinea threatens to undermine our massive investment in peace in Liberia, Sierra Leone, and the Ivory Coast. More importantly, a collapse of Guinea would create yet another pocket of opportunity for extremists and narcotraffickers who already exploit West Africa's weak institutions and vast ungoverned areas. To begin to address these issues, the ranking member, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN from Florida, has introduced H. Res. 1013. And this is what it does: It expresses grave concern over the deterioration of security and the rule of law in Guinea. It calls on China to cancel its $7 billion in minerals and infrastructure deal with Guinea. It urges member states of the United Nations to join the United States, the African Union, the Economic Community of West African States, and the European Union, in imposing sanctions against the ruling junta in Guinea until constitutional order is restored. It supports regional efforts to resolve the conflict. It calls on members of the ruling junta to uphold their pledges to organize free and fair and transparent elections to restore civilian rule in Guinea. And it expresses solidarity with the people of Guinea during this time of extreme uncertainty in their lives.

I want to thank the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. BERMAN, for supporting this measure and enabling it to come to the floor today. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan, uncontroversial, and timely resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARAMENDI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1013, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1615

## 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.

## TEAR DOWN THESE WALLS OF SECRECY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the deep, dark dungeons of this Capitol, the government trolls are writing bills behind closed doors. Their aim has always been to take away our liberty one step at a time. It's what bureaucrats do. They look for ways to grow and take over more of our lives to justify their existence. So these elite government trolls think they know better how to run our lives than we do, and they keep their bills in secret so we, the people, won't know what's in them until it's too late, until the legislation is forced upon an unwilling, misinformed people.

It has been decades since freedom and liberty faced a full frontal assault from a single piece of legislation, a bill that is so damaging in scope that by its passage, American freedom and American health will be sacrificed on the altar of more government control. Of course I'm talking about the universal government takeover of health care. This is the most important piece of legislation in modern history, and we were promised—we were promised that we in this House, we would have transparency. We would see what is taking place.

The administration promised us that transparency. In fact, the administration invited interested parties in health care to the White House to discuss health care. Of course, for some reason I wasn't on that invitation list because I'm always willing to discuss my position and the position of the people I represent. We were promised that cameras would film the transparency, cameras like C–SPAN, cameras like the ones here in the House of Representatives, down the hallway in the U.S. Senate so the American people can see what takes place. I believe in cameras so that the American public can see what happens in our Republic.

When I was a judge back in Texas, I was one of the first judges to allow cameras into the courtroom so the American people could see what took place in a criminal trial. I've offered legislation to have cameras in the United States Supreme Court, in their hearings, so the most important, most powerful Court in the United States and in the world, the people can see what takes place over there. Of course, that legislation hasn't gone anywhere.

And C–SPAN, what do they do? Well, they're not a news organization in the sense that they have commentators. They just film what takes place, and the American public decides. C–SPAN wants to film what is taking place somewhere in the dungeons of this Capitol where the trolls are writing yet another health care bill.

You know, Mr. Speaker, health care is more than about just government control of health care. It's about government control of our lives. It's more about government raising taxes, more government spending, more borrowing from the Chinese and from the Japanese and more oppression. A government takeover of health care is unhealthy, and it's not going to make the American health better. It's going to make the individual health of the American people actually worse, given that the government control over health and health care is not compatible with liberty.

Mr. Speaker, if we love the competence of FEMA and the efficiency of the post office and the compassion of the IRS, we're going to love nationalized health care. Allowing our rulers to construct these bills in secret is exactly how they will bring about these liberty-killing laws.

Patrick Henry, one of my heroes, said, ''The liberties of a people never were, nor ever will be secure when the transactions of their rulers may be concealed from them. Let me repeat that: ''The liberties of a people never were, nor ever will be secure when the transactions of their rulers may be concealed from them.'' And that's exactly what's taking place in this third health care bill that is supposedly being written by Members of the Senate and Members of the House somewhere in this Capitol.

When rulers plot against the people in secret, it makes it hard for the people to fight back because they really don't know what's going on. But, Mr. Speaker, the people are fighting back. They are fighting back with ballots and not bullets. That was proven yesterday in Massachusetts. The way things are running in Washington,

D.C., these days, the proof is purposely hidden from the people. And the question is why. Why can't the people see through C–SPAN what is taking place behind closed doors? Because it's giving power to government and not to the people. And that's why we're not being allowed to see what's taking place.

It's about changing the phrase ''We the People'' to ''We the Subjects.'' And that's why We, the People, aren't allowed to see what's taking place behind these closed doors in secret. So much for transparency. Spending, taxing, regulating and borrowing, that's what's taking place. There is nothing more these days that the taxocrats won't try to tax or regulate.

Ronald Reagan once said, ''Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We didn't pass it to our children in the bloodstream . . . It must be fought for, protected and handed on for them to do the same, or one day we will spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was like once in the United States where men were free.''

Legislation, Mr. Speaker, especially the most important in recent years, health care, should be done openly, openly so we can see what's taking place. So I say, open up the steel gates, quit hiding the facts from the citizens. Mr. President, open the gates of transparency and openness. And, Mr. President, tear down these walls of secrecy.

And that's just the way it is.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

## WALL STREET POLICE LINEUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the first hearing of the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission was held last week, and the four biggest bank chief executive officers were brought in for questioning, from Goldman Sachs, JPMorgan Chase, Bank of America and Morgan Stanley. The American people expect these men to be held accountable for what their banks did to our country. They came away with no sweat on their brow.

The bankers in the photo are, from left to right, Lloyd C. Blankfein of Goldman Sachs who says he's been doing God's work. He has been showering himself just since 2006 with $157.3 million in compensation. I often ask myself, What do they do with all that money? Jamie Dimon, next to him, of JPMorgan Chase last year officially took home $19.7 million on top of $95.7 million he raked in from 2005 to 2007. That brings him in at $115.4 million. John J. Mack of Morgan Stanley paid himself $78.9 million over the last 5 years, and Brian T. Moynihan of Bank of America is new to his position at that bank, but he pocketed $10 million in 2007 when serving as president of the Global Corporate and Investment Banking at the Bank of America. Can you imagine what he'll make now?

As they took America to the cleaners, the average worker in our country hasn't had a real wage increase in over a decade, much less a real increase in buying power. Meanwhile, Americans are being made to feel like they can't enter this debate because lots of fog is being generated by fancy terms that these bankers use, like basis points or collateralized debt obligations or securitization. And I'll tell you what, Americans might not know what those words mean, but they can recognize a lineup when they see one.

The average person often is cowered by the world of finance and turns away in fear and confusion. They can't see a path forward for our country, which they love so very much. And they are very worried. Congress must provide the clarity of that path forward to not only hold these bankers accountable but to get the administration to act to save people's homes and communities. The administration's current plan to fix the foreclosure crisis has been a dud. It is a dud because it has not addressed the root cause of the collapse. It continues. The wrongdoers, they aren't good at risk at all, but they're putting economic recovery at risk across this Nation as more people fall into foreclosure.

According to an analysis done by the Associated Press, almost a year later, only a handful, a fraction, of the 4 million Americans and counting, who have been foreclosed, have been able to complete Treasury's application process to try to rework their mortgage. Some might call that approach ''doomed to fail.''

With a national unemployment rate of over 10 percent, people are not getting the economic change they want. The current approach to the economy here in Washington is failing millions and millions of our citizens every day. People's financial futures are ruined. Their futures aren't ruined; they're getting rewarded. Our people are getting hurt by unemployment, home foreclosures and personal bankruptcies. They're not going bankrupt. Their banks didn't go bankrupt. We bailed them out. I didn't vote for that, but a majority of people in here did.

RealtyTrac Inc. reported last week that in 2009 a record 2.8 million households were threatened with foreclosure, which is up, not down, more than 20 percent since 2008. The more borrowers who can't be helped, the more foreclosed properties will be on the market across this country. Tragically, RealtyTrac expects another record number of homes to be threatened with foreclosure this year. This is not acceptable in America.

The administration's foreclosure prevention plan says it's going to help borrowers in financial trouble by making their payments more affordable and extending the repayment period. However, out of the millions and millions of people being affected across this country, just 7 percent of those who have signed up have completed the Treasury Department's program to try to rework these loans; and more than 49,000, or just 5 percent, have dropped out of the program entirely. Thousands more remain in limbo. But the biggest bank in the program, Bank of America, has completed modifications for fewer than 2 percent of the 200,000 borrowers they claim to enroll. Its big-bank buddies are in the same boat when it comes to modifying our people's mortgages. The people paying their bills and paying for their salaries aren't having their mortgages reworked. What's just about that?

In fact, it's clear, Wall Street bankers have no interest in modifying mortgages. They are making millions off other people's misery, and that's just fine with them. This Nation needs a national foreclosure prevention program that compels these bankers to act, not nicely request their assistance. As they conspire to avoid the consequences of their actions, here are two key findings by the Center for Public Integrity. At least 21 of the top 25 subprime lenders were financed by these same banks that received the bailout money through direct ownership, credit agreements or huge purchases of loans for securitization. They're all tied together.

And 21 of the top 25 subprime lenders have closed, stopped lending or been sold to avoid bankruptcy. Most were nonbank lenders. They didn't go bankrupt. They're letting the American people go bankrupt. Bailed out, getting bigger and bigger, they now have over 40 percent of the deposits in this country. These four banks plus one more. Think about that. What's happening to our country? And they're not being held responsible. Say, that's not bad work if you can get it.

Wall Street bankers create these unsavory schemes, reap huge profits from our people and advantage their companies while driving our economy, home prices, and the Nation's housing stock and the American people into the ground.

My colleagues, take a look at this lineup. Isn't it over time for Congress to finally hold Wall Street accountable?

## DEPARTMENT OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

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. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago I introduced a bill that would rename the Department of the Navy to be known as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps. This bill has passed the House for 8 years in what is called

the armed services bill. It has been supported by the former Armed Services chairman, Duncan Hunter, and is now being supported by the current chairman of the Armed Services Committee, IKE SKELTON.

For 8 years, the Senate has said ''no'' to the Marine Corps, that you do not deserve this recognition. Mr. Speaker, I think that's very sad. This year I am pleased to say to the House that with the help of 362 House Members who have joined me in legislation to rename this Department to be known as the Department of Navy and Marine Corps, and with the help of Chairman IKE SKELTON, we are hoping to send this bill to the Senate and let the Senate debate and think about the importance of honoring one fighting team.

Whenever we've held hearings on the Armed Services Committee, the CNO of the Navy, an admiral, and the commandant of the Marine Corps are there together saying, We're one fighting team. Well, if you're one fighting team, why don't you do what the Navy football team does, and that is to say, You both are recognized.

Mr. Speaker, I want to hold up a jersey from the Navy football team that I received, and this is the jersey of this year's team. I want to congratulate the team. They've had an excellent season. They've won a bowl, and I am very proud of them. On the left sleeve of the jersey is the Marine emblem, and on the right sleeve of the jersey is an anchor.

□ 1630

They understand at Annapolis that they are one fighting team, in this case a football team.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of other points I would like to make before closing. There are many medals that are named Navy and Marine Corps, such as Navy and Marine Corps Medal, Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal, Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, Navy and Marine Corps Good Conduct Medal, Navy and Marine Corps Expeditionary Medal, and Navy and Marine Corps Recruiting Service Ribbon.

And, Mr. Speaker, in 1959, the football field at Annapolis went from being known as the Navy Memorial Stadium to the Navy and Marine Corps Memorial Stadium.

Mr. Speaker, on a very serious note why this is so important, it is not only symbolism, but I am showing to my left an actual letter that was sent to the wife of a Marine captain who was killed in Iraq. This is a duplication of the letter. It says: The Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D.C., Navy flag extends its condolences to the marine's wife. If this becomes law, Mr. Speaker, what the condolence letter would then say, the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps, Navy flag and Marine flag extends its condolences.

It is time that the Senate follows the House and let's do what is right for the Marine Corps and give them the proper respect. Let's make them part of the family and part of one fighting team, the Navy and Marine Corps.

God bless our men and women in uniform; God bless their families; God bless the families who have lost loved ones in Afghanistan and Iraq; and may God continue to bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## REMEMBERING DARLA SMALLWOOD-WRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the constituents of the Third Congressional District of Florida and myself, I rise today to remember and honor the life of someone very dear to me, my congressional office, and so many people here in the Washington, D.C. area, as well as many, many people of the Third Congressional District of Florida: my scheduler, office manager, and executive assistant, Mrs. Darla Smallwood-Wran, who passed away from breast cancer this morning.

When I came to Washington and hired the scheduler of my predecessor, Congressman Charlie Bennett, I thought at the time she was overpaid. Quickly, however, I began to realize that there was no dollar amount that could be placed on the value of Darla. A scheduler, office manager, I discovered very quickly is the foundation of an effective congressional office. And Darla, with her strong, persistent personality, her organizational skills, dotting every ''i'' and crossing every ''t,'' she never missed a beat. For 17 years, Darla was the face of my Washington office.

I want to say to her family, her father who is a police officer here, her mother and sisters and her loving husband, we love her, we can't replace her, and we will deeply, deeply miss her.

As many times as I would have to change my flights, as often as the vote schedule changed, as frequently as meetings had to be coordinated, updated, rearranged, Darla was ever dependable, and always cool-headed, making everyone feel that the situation was always under control, even as my other staffers nervously buzzed in and out of the room.

Everyone who came in knew her, and certainly knew not to lean on her desk, touch the plants on her desk or worse than anything, interrupt her if she was on a call. I think everyone would agree that Darla was loved, and respected, by everyone who came into contact with her.

Her unmistakable smile, witty sense of humor and love of life blew fresh air and positive energy into the office.

My heart and prayers go out to Darla and to her family, in particular her mother and father, her sisters, and her loving husband Channing.

You are irreplaceable Darla, and you will be deeply missed.

In addition, I want to say that I am in support of the Haitian resolution before the House. I have always said to whom God has given much, much is expected. My thoughts and prayers go out to the people of the island of Haiti and to the Haitian community who live here in the United States and around the world. The loss of life and destruction of property in Haiti is unthinkable.

I want to thank the ministers, the business community, the organizations that have organized in our community, the Third Congressional District. We have seven tractor-trailers that will be going to Haiti filled with water, baby formula, dry cereal, blankets, tents, and sleeping bags. I want to say that the Royal Caribbean cruise line is carrying those goods over free of cost. I am very encouraged how the community is coming together to help the people of Haiti, and I can truly say, if you are interested in being helpful, go to the Web site and see how you can also participate.

In closing, I really do believe to whom God has given much, much is expected.

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.)

## FREE COMPETITION IN CURRENCY ACT

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to talk about a piece of legislation that I have recently introduced. That legislation is H.R. 4248. It is called the Free Competition in Currency Act. I believe long term this is a piece of legislation that will play an important role in the monetary reform that will be a necessity if we continue to do what we have been doing with our economy and our financial system.

We are in the middle of a financial crisis today. Some people think we have turned a corner, but, quite frankly, I do not believe that has occurred. Recently, though, we have just had the opening bells of an inquiry into what the cause of the crisis has been. It is the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission. It is a take-off of the Pecora Commission that was established in the 1930s to figure out why the crash occurred then. Of course, that commission met and talked to people. They tried to figure out what was the matter. And from my viewpoint, they came down with all of the wrong conclusions. They said that the Federal Reserve was

involved, that the Federal Reserve didn't print enough money fast enough and they didn't have a big enough bailout package and they needed a lot more regulation.

So they did all of those things for the first time in our history, under the two administrations, the Hoover and the Roosevelt administrations, and they prolonged the Depression. They took a 1-year depression/recession and turned it into a 15-year depression.

So I believe what we are going through right now is the same old song and dance. We are doing the same thing again. We have this new inquiry, and the members of the commission are people who didn't see it coming, didn't explain it, and didn't anticipate it. And the people who are coming before the commission, as far as I can see so far, had no anticipation or are acting surprised that the crisis came and that there was a bubble. So I can hardly see any good results coming from this.

My position over the many years has been that the Federal Reserve is a dangerous organization because it creates the bubble. Our country would be better off with a strong central bank like the Federal Reserve. I argue from a moral, economic, and a constitutional viewpoint that it has no right to exist and it is very dangerous to us.

I am very pleased, though, that one of the pieces of legislation I introduced, H.R. 1207, to audit the Federal Reserve, has met with a large amount of support. We have 316 cosponsors of that bill, and I think that is a major step in the right direction, looking to the Federal Reserve for the cause of our problem: the easy money system, the easy credit, the fixing of interest rates too low.

Now, the reason I am addressing this is because I believe the correction has a long way to run and that eventually we will have to have monetary reform. Now, in spite of my position being that we don't need the Federal Reserve, I am not in favor of closing the Federal Reserve down in one day or two. But I do believe the monetary system will close down this government and the monetary system and the Federal Reserve and a lot of other things if we continue on our profligate ways of spending and borrowing and inflating the currency and regulating the currency, and this will get much worse until we have a total collapse of the system.

So my bill, what it does is it introduces competition, competition in currencies. The Federal Reserve system and the dollar standard is run by a cartel, a monopoly. They don't allow competition because they know that they can't compete. Just as we have competition in the post office with FedEx and UPS, I think that the Federal Reserve deserves a little competition. The public school system has competition with private schools and it has competition with home schooling. There is no reason in the world that we can't enforce the Constitution, legalize the Constitution and say that we can have competitions in currencies, but there are three major things that we must do to do that, and the bill does this. We repeal legal tender laws and remove the monopoly control of the Federal Reserve. We legalize private mints so mints can mint coins, and they will be controlled by fraud laws and anticounterfeit laws.

Today, our government commits fraud and counterfeit by printing money at will. If a private organization did that, they would be imprisoned for the fraud they are causing.

But the other important reform that would have to occur for money to circulate and compete against the monopoly control of the Federal Reserve would be to take taxes off money. The Constitution says only gold and silver can be money, only that can be legal tender, so you can't tax it and allow it to be competitive.

So these things could occur, and if nobody wanted to use it they wouldn't have to and everybody could be happy with the Federal Reserve. But if the conditions get so chaotic and the people are looking for an alternative, they can go and start operating in another currency.

So this to me could provide a smooth transition. It would not be chaotic. It would be legalized in the Constitution. It would be good, sound economics; and, eventually, the most important thing it would do, it would restrain the spending of this Congress, because as long as you have a Federal Reserve over there willing to print up the money any time we spend more money that we don't have and we can't borrow, then the Federal Reserve will accommodate us. Therefore, I argue the case for competition in currency and strictly limit it in government.

## STUPAK-PITTS AMENDMENT

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. Mr. Speaker, last month I wrote Speaker PELOSI and insisted that the Stupak-Pitts amendment be preserved in any final version of health care reform legislation. The Stupak-Pitts amendment would maintain the current policy of preventing Federal funds, taxpayer dollars, from paying for elective abortion. This question is even more crucial after passage of H.R. 3590, the Senate health care bill, which allows Federal funds to subsidize elective abortion. Unfortunately, the Speaker has yet to respond to my inquiry.

So this week, the same week as the annual March for Life in Washington, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and I are again sending a request to the Speaker: Madam Speaker, please respond to our request for information regarding your intentions on the Stupak-Pitts amendment in health care reform negotiations. We continue to insist that you keep the exact language of that amendment which passed this House by a wide, bipartisan margin in any final version of health care legislation. Please do not ignore the voice of the American people or their Representatives on this very important issue.

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

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

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

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

## DIFFERENT FEDERAL APPROACH

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by offering the congratulations of myself and many others to Senator-elect SCOTT BROWN of Massachusetts who had a very exciting victory yesterday. And I know that he will be a good Senator for the people of that State, but his victory means so much more to so many more people, not only the people of Massachusetts who are very excited today, but also people all across the country because they viewed the election of Senator BROWN as an opportunity to send a message to this government, to this Congress, and to say to the Speaker of the House and the majority leader in the Senate and others that we need to take a different approach to health care reform and to the general direction of our Federal Government with regard to the out-of-control spending that we are experiencing here in Washington: last year's Federal deficit of $1.4 trillion and another $1.2 trillion projected for this year; in fact, for each year as far as the eye can see, deficits exceeding $600 billion a year as far out as we project them, 10 years from now.

□ 1645

At no time does this Congress offer a budget to the American people that would give them hope that we are going to get this problem under control. Instead, they have offered health care legislation that costs another, oh, some would say $800 billion. But the reality is that over 10 years the real cost of this legislation is more like $2 trillion-plus when you add in the fact that the taxes begin on this legislation sooner than the benefits begin.

And cuts in Medicare are unreal at a time when we are going to see a dramatic increase in the number of people

in this country who are eligible for Medicare, as the baby boomers start retiring this year, 2010, those born after World War II start retiring this year, and the number of people who are on Medicare and eligible for Medicare is going to skyrocket.

With all of this going on, the message to this Congress, to the Democratic leadership in this Congress is you need to change course, change direction, and make sure that you are reflecting the will of the American people. But instead, the leadership doesn't get that message. Even today, as Senator-elect BROWN prepares to come down here to be sworn into the United States Senate sometime in the next few days, the White House and Democratic Congressional leaders have once again retreated behind closed doors to make deals and finalize a single version of their government takeover of health care. That is not what the American people want.

Speaker PELOSI said today, in response to the election results, ''Clearly the election results last night spell out that we have not been as clear about our deficit reduction measures. And that will change.'' But the American people want to know what deficit reduction measures is she talking about when she continues, along with the other Democratic leaders here in the House and in the Senate and at the White House, to plot the expenditure of $2 trillion or more in additional expenditures over the next 10 years for a health care bill that robs Medicare recipients, that increases taxes, and will cost American jobs, that will do a whole host of things to regulate Americans' lives and how they will receive their health insurance, including mandating that they have to purchase health insurance whether or not they feel they want to, and telling them pretty much what that insurance is that they are going to have to purchase because of the fact that this health insurance will be regulated by a Federal Government health insurance commissioner, one of the more than 140 new Federal Government agencies and programs included under consideration in the bill that they are planning to try to move forward.

That is simply not what the American people are looking for. They want responsible leadership. They want a bipartisan effort to deal with this challenge of rising costs of health insurance and health care. And they want bipartisan, responsible leadership in looking to ways to make health insurance and health care available to more people.

The legislation they are considering doesn't do that. Instead, it busts the budget of our country. Yesterday's election results in Massachusetts calls for a new direction in health care and in that debate. Many believe the election of Senator SCOTT BROWN lessens the likelihood of passage of the current proposal that has been crafted by Democratic leadership. If this is indeed the case, Democrats and Republicans must work together toward health care reform that reduces costs and expands insurance coverage without reducing costs or adding to the national debt, rationing care, or putting the Federal Government between the patient and their doctor.

One such bill to consider is H.R. 3970, the Medical Rights and Reform Act, of which I am a cosponsor. The Medical Rights and Reform Act includes fiscally responsible health care reforms like medical liability reform, small business insurance pooling, and letting families and businesses buy insurance across state lines. These are ideas at that have strong bipartisan support, but have been absent from the bicameral health care negotiations. Most important, the Medical Rights and Reform Act is fiscally responsible. This alternative does not raise taxes, cut Medicare, or add to the deficit. And it lowers health care costs.

This Congress already gave us a $1.8 trillion debt. America cannot afford to spend another trillion dollars or $2 trillion as proposed by the majority, and our families cannot afford to put life and death decisions in the hands of bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, resetting the health care debate and working together in an open and transparent way would help Washington regain the public's trust.

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

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

## DEFICIT COMMISSION BY EXECUTIVE ORDER

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

Mr. WOLF. Today the press, Mr. Speaker, is reporting that a backroom deal has been cut with Democratic leadership to create a deficit cutting commission by executive order. I oppose this effort, and so will the American people.

In light of this news, the remarks that Representative LAMAR SMITH of Texas made on the House floor this morning ring truer and more urgent than ever. Representative SMITH offered a series of lessons to be learned from yesterday's special Senate election in Massachusetts. He said all true reform starts with the voice of the people. The people will not have a choice in a deficit commission established by executive order. He also said common sense trumps partisanship. A commission through executive order negotiated by one party is the height of partisanship. He also said voters can exercise real independence. Where is the voice of the people in a process that will not go beyond the Beltway?

Mr. SMITH correctly noted that one-party control leads to arrogance. We are seeing today an arrogance of power on a party that forecloses the minority from a seat at the table. To be fair, the Republicans in the majority were arrogant at times. And Mr. SMITH concluded that we should be listening to the people, not defying them. The people of Massachusetts spoke yesterday. They proved that when the people get mad enough, anything is possible, even in Massachusetts. Lawmakers in Congress on both sides of the aisle would be wise to hear that message loud and clear, yet the Obama administration doesn't seem to be listening.

There are a number of serious problems being exposed as details of the administration's executive order commission are revealed. Any commission should be authentically bipartisan, passed by the Congress. Press reports indicate that instead of putting every spending program and tax policy on the table, discretionary spending would be exempt. How can we have an honest conversation about the Nation's financial health without looking at discretionary funds that accounted for more than 33 percent of Federal spending in '09?

The $447 billion omnibus appropriations bill that was considered by Congress and signed into law in December corresponded with the Democrats' budget blueprint that increased nondefense discretionary spending by 12 percent over the previous year. When all appropriations spending is combined, the Democratic majority will have increased nondefense, nonveterans discretionary spending by 85 percent over the last 2 fiscal years. The American household has certainly not seen their income rise by 85 percent in recent years.

Simply put, discretionary spending, with the spending set by annual appropriations levels of Congress, matter. A deficit reduction commission that is barred from looking at one-third of the Federal budget is a fig leaf. The bipartisan commission process I have talked about for nearly 4 years puts everything, entitlements, tax policy, discretionary spending, everything on the table for discussion by the commission members.

Moreover, the American people will be cut out of the process under the President's plan. The SAFE Commission plan I have advocated for includes legitimate public engagement, mandating public town hall-style meetings. But under President Obama's plan the public voice will be nonexistent. There will be no input from the hardworking taxpayers in our communities. This is not the right way to form public policy.

Perhaps the most glaring sleight of hand, one I believe the American people will recognize and refute, is that the Democratic leadership intends to bring the commission recommendations up for a vote in Congress, but only after the mid-term elections and

before the new Congress begins in 2011. It would be a lame duck vote.

Lawmakers who are retiring or get defeated could vote on a set of recommendations with regard to entitlement spending and tax policy, but never be held accountable by the American people. Is it right for outgoing Members of Congress to consider proposals that could affect every single American knowing that days and weeks later they would no longer be answerable to the voters of the district they once represented?

Between the Democrats and Republicans in both chambers, over 30 Members have already announced they are retiring or running for another office, and this number will grow. During the lame duck session, some outgoing Members may already be looking for new jobs, which could well be lobbying special interest groups and other stakeholders that have a vested interest in the outcome of the vote on the commission's recommendations. Yet the Obama administration is setting up a process that would allow these outgoing lawmakers to vote on the commission's recommendations and run the risk of blurring the lines between what is best for the American people and best for their future employer.

Any recommendation put forward should be considered by the newly elected Congress, which would have to publicly stand by their vote on the commission's recommendation. This Congress has run up the country's credit card to a point of no return, and now the administration wants to be able to tout a bipartisan solution to spending for political cover to survive the upcoming elections.

A commission through executive order is political gamesmanship. It is a blatant effort by the administration to find political cover after advocating for the $787 billion economic stimulus, supporting health care reform being negotiated behind closed doors that could cost a trillion, and pushing other budget breakers that are wildly unpopular in the eyes of the American people.

In closing, the American people understand the depth of our financial problems. They recognize the spending gorge that Congress has embarked on since the Obama administration began, and they will not be fooled about by a fig leaf commission established by executive order. Just ask the people of Massachusetts.

## MARCH FOR LIFE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the March for Life, which will take place this Friday, January 22nd. It marks the 37th anniversary of the Supreme Court decision in Roe v. Wade. I will head to the march on Friday with the knowledge that abortions in this country are declining: 1.21 million a year in 2005, the latest reliable figures available show, compared to 1.36 million some 10 years ago.

But hundreds of thousands of pilgrims will be here to deliver one message: There is a right to life. It is an integral part of the Declaration of Independence so painstakingly penned by our Founding Fathers.

Busloads of those marchers of all stripes will be from my district in Pennsylvania. They will be leaving home at very early hours that morning, and actually the night before to get here to stand for that cause, to stand for life. And they will be joining the gathering of pro-life Americans to march down Constitution until they reach the steps of the Supreme Court.

Abortion has been a part of the health care debate, and may still keep current bills from passing. No taxpayer should be forced to pay for abortions in this country. That policy has been reaffirmed many times by this Congress, and should not be changed for the current circumstances. And I ask my colleagues to join in this march on Friday, and to help celebrate the gift of life.

On December 2, 2009, I joined 39 of my House colleagues in sending Speaker PELOSI a letter regarding a prohibition on the government funding of abortion in the final version of the health care legislation.

□ 1700

A significant majority of Americans, both those that identify themselves as pro-life and pro-choice, are opposed to the government funding of abortions.

The Senate-passed health care bill, H.R. 1362, would require Federal funds to subsidize elective abortion. This plan differs greatly from the House version that maintains the current policy of preventing the Federal funding of abortion and for funding of health care benefit packages that include abortion.

Mr. Speaker, any health care reform proposals that this Chamber agrees to must always place a high value on protecting innocent life. These provisions should include the language found within the Stupak-Pitts amendment, which passed this Chamber by a wide bipartisan margin of 240–194.

Mr. Speaker, as we take up any health care, let us preserve the Founders' dedication to the principle of life.

## DESECRATING DEMOCRACY

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would live to see the day when a commentator entrusted by a major broadcast network with the ability to reach millions of listeners would use his influence to incite voter fraud, but I'm afraid this week we passed that unfortunate milestone.

On Friday, January 15, MSNBC commentator Ed Schultz told his nationally syndicated radio audience, I tell you what, if I lived in Massachusetts I'd try to vote 10 times. I don't know if they'd let me or not, but I'd try to. Yeah, that's right. I'd cheat to keep these bastards out. I would.

Now, this could be dismissed as an unfortunate verbal excess brought on by the passion of the moment, except for the fact that when given the opportunity to retract the statement, Mr. Schultz embellished it in a way that makes it crystal clear that his words were deliberate and calculated. He said, I misspoke on Friday. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I meant to say, if I could vote 20 times, that's what I'd do.

Later he said, Let me be very clear, I'm not advocating voter fraud, I'm just telling you what I would do. Now, Mr. Speaker, exactly how does one not advocate voter fraud when three times on national broadcasts you say that's what you would do?

Mr. Speaker, this can only be interpreted as an incitement to commit voter fraud in a pivotal election in the course of our Nation. As such, it strikes at the very foundation of democratic traditions and our constitutional institutions. In every election, win, lose or draw, it is of utmost importance that the vote be fair, that it be accurate, and that it have the confidence of every citizen, both those in the majority as well as those in the minority. If we cannot trust the sanctity of the vote, we destroy the legitimacy of that vote—and with it the legitimacy of that government.

All of our governing institutions and all of their acts rest about a single foundation—fair and free elections which guarantee that those who exercise authority under our Constitution do so deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. It is this principle that Mr. Schultz has sought to desecrate and demean. His statements excusing voter fraud weaken the single most important mechanism of our democracy and undermine our form of government. His words deserve—indeed, they demand—the contempt and condemnation of every American. And they deserve immediate action by those who have accorded him his broadcast platforms and whose silence and inaction thus far can only be described as a disgrace.

## HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. AKIN. Good afternoon. Once again, we find ourselves here on the floor of the U.S. Congress and the subject before us, in spite of various events that have been of great interest to people yesterday—I'm thinking of the election of Massachusetts—still remains the question of health care.

There is discussion with the new political realignments that it may be that the House will take up and just pass the bill that was passed by the Senate. That is one possibility, which then of course would require the bill not to have to go back to the Senate.

And so we come back to this question of health care in America, something that has a lot of people's attention. It's not the top priority I think for many people. I think many people are worried about unemployment, they're worried about the economy, they're worried about excessive government spending, they're worried about terrorism and national security. But underneath those, perhaps, there is still some concern about health care, but particularly a fear that in an attempt to try to solve a problem we may make a bad situation worse. Indeed, when government does too much, we have found that we sometimes get some very bad side effects—inferior quality, inefficient allocation of goods, bureaucratic rationing, and of course excessive expenses.

Now, if health care is expensive now, just wait until it's free, some have said. We were promised by our President, Here's what you need to know: First, I will not sign a plan that adds one dime to our deficits either now or in the future. Sounds pretty definitive. It sounds like he says, hey, I understand about the deficit, I understand about the debt, I understand about excessive spending, and I am not going to add one dime to our deficit.

Well, the bill that's being proposed does not add a dime, so I guess technically this statement is correct. It adds, rather, either one or several trillion dollars. That may be a whole lot worse than the dime. So this particular statement, along with some others that we've heard, is not really precise in terms of what has been proposed, particularly the Senate and the House versions that we have seen.

In order to try to put a package together, there have been some compromises made, as tends to happen when you're writing large and complex pieces of legislation. This protects insurance companies in kind of an odd way. The legislation that is being considered in the Senate preserves the legal immunity of large insurance companies in the event of negligence or any other wrongful action even if their action results in injury or death of a patient.

Now, this is the language that's in the bill. What does that really mean? What it means is something that I think most Americans consider to be very undesirable, and that is, you walk in and you feel sick and you go see your doctor. You trust your doctor, you've known your doctor for some period of time, and so you have the doctor take a look. He runs some tests and he says, well, now, Congressman AKIN, this is the news: You've got this, this, and this, and I recommend we do this. And you check with him, ask a bunch of questions and say good, that seems like a good course of action.

Now, here's where the train comes off the tracks. Your insurance company says, but we don't really think that's necessary, we're not that concerned about you, Congressman AKIN. And your doctor, well, you know, he's probably being pretty cautious, but he's also being pretty expensive. And so we're going to say you really don't need to go to the hospital for this, we're going to recommend you just stay home for a while and take some aspirin and see what develops. Now, that's what we call something or somebody getting in the way of the doctor-patient relationship.

In this country, we have gotten spoiled. We have enjoyed contact with our doctors. We have enjoyed the process of getting to know the doctors and trusting them and soliciting their opinion. At times, we get multiple opinions from different doctors just to make sure. But we don't want some insurance company coming between the patient and the doctor; that's pretty bad when that happens. What's worse is when the government comes between you and your doctor. That's what a full-born socialized medicine bill will do.

This bill here says that these insurance companies can basically second-guess the doctors, and if things go wrong, guess what? They have no liability. Is that what we want in health care reform? I don't think so. Doctors can be sued if they make a bad diagnosis, but not insurance companies, even when they get in between the patient and the doctor. Is that something we want in a health care bill? I don't think so. And that's one of the reasons why a lot of Americans don't want this massive government takeover to pass, because it has these little loopholes like this in it. I don't think many of you would have known that that was in the bill, and yet it is.

There are also some other problems. We have a bill, when you start to get thousands of pages of legislation, there is a lot of room for mistakes and an awful lot of creation of bureaucracy. I don't know what the latest version of this is because a lot of this is negotiated behind closed doors, but we're talking about close to a 2,000-page bill passed with I don't know how many hours of public review—72 hours would be nice, I'm not so sure we'll have that. We have not had that on other major pieces of legislation.

This particular bill creates 118 new boards—that sounds like some bureaucracy, doesn't it—commissions and programs full of new mandates. One of the things in legislation that people who are legislators pay attention to is how many ''you musts'' and ''you shalls'' and ''you've got to's'' there are in a bill. This one contains the word ''shall'' 3,425 times. Obviously somebody has very strong opinions about what other Americans ought to do, and they're going to mandate it. And so you have here quite a large bill, many, many pages, 3,425 ''shalls,'' 118 new boards.

We tried to draw a picture of what that would look like. Now, you know they say a picture is worth a thousand words. I don't know if this picture is worth 1,000 or 2,000 pages, but this is an attempt at drawing a picture of what we've got. And the more you look at it, the more you look at all these colored boxes, which are some of the new agencies and all, it starts to look more and more like some sort of a maze. And you kind of wonder whether what's going on is, the consumers or people who are sick are somehow trying to get across this maze to find their doctor. It's almost like something you would be given at a restaurant with a Crayon, and you're supposed to plot the path, if you're a patient, to somehow get over to see the doctor. But this is the kind of complexity that is being created by what has been proposed over the last 7 or 8 months by the Democrats.

The reason this is so complicated is because of the overall strategic approach that health care started, and that was the idea that we're going to take what we have and pretty much pitch it, and we're going to redesign the whole thing and put the government in charge of it. So we're not going to go in and fix this or that that's broken; we're going to basically scrap it and start over.

Consequently, the result is a very complicated piece of legislation for the government to try to take over what is essentially close to one-fifth of the U.S. economy.

So that's one of the things that people are concerned with and one of the reasons why, not so much based on political party, but just based on good old American commonsense, there is a concern for the complexity and of course the cost associated with that complexity.

We don't like mandates a whole lot. Americans tend to be a little bit free-wheeling, and they're not too much into following all the dots and tittles and all the little nuances of laws and rules. Americans like to have some freedom, a little bit of elbow room, a little flexibility. So when we're talking about the mandate, we're saying, here, there's mandates in this bill. All those ''shalls'' come into things that restrict your freedom. One of the mandates is that employers must offer a qualified health care plan to full- and part-time employees.

So we're saying to companies, we don't care what you think is good for your employees, and we don't really care what your employees think is good for them; what we're going to do is tell you how it's got to be. And so we are going to write what your health care plan has to look like, and then, Mr. Employer, you have to offer what we're writing up for you to your employees.

□ 1715

That is an interesting approach. We think of it in terms of the idea of a top-down, Big Government solution because the government is going to tell you what you need. Whether you think you know what you need doesn't make any difference. It's going to be a top-down status mandate, and you will pay for 65 to 72 percent of the cost of the plan.

So we're going to tell you what kind of plan you're going to offer. By the way, you're going to pay for it, and if you don't pay for it, we're going to penalize you, and we're going to hit you with a tax of up to 8 percent of your payroll costs. So whoever you are, even fairly small businesses, you know, in terms of what the cutoff is in this, you're going to get hit with 8 percent of your payroll taxes. In fact, if you have 100 employees, if 99 of them want this qualified plan and one does not, the way the bill is written is that you're going to end up paying this 8 percent because everybody has to agree to what the government has mandated.

So there are some mandates in here which, from a small business point of view, are considered fairly onerous. It's another thing which makes the bill offensive and not popular.

Now, one of the concerns is, when the government takes something over, it tends to cost money. The President said it's not going to cost a dime. I suppose that's true. It's supposed to cost over $1 trillion, but there are a lot of hidden costs. You see, you bury the costs of some things that you don't want to show. Trying to keep it under $1 trillion was a tough thing to do; $1 trillion is a fair amount of money. Even for the U.S. Federal Government, $1 trillion is a lot of money.

We spent about $1.4 trillion last year. That was about what our level of debt was, $1.4 trillion. The highest debt that we'd had before that was under President Bush in 2008. During the Pelosi Congress here in 2008, we had just south of $500 billion in deficit spending that year. So, if deficit spending of 400 and—whatever it is—50 or 60 billion was a lot, $1.4 trillion in deficit spending was a considerable amount. So our deficit in '09 tripled from '08, and it was a $1 trillion-plus, $1.5 trillion.

Well, here is $1 trillion for this little plan. This is not small if you're worried about Federal spending. The estimate here is it's going to raise taxes $729 billion. If we got away with that few in tax increases, we might be doing well. It increases the long-term cost of medical care by $289 billion. Again, I think those are conservative estimates. It creates shortages, higher costs, more regulations, more patients, and a fixed supply of medical professionals.

This is part of the CMS Report. CMS is a group of staffers who are not connected with a political party. They take a look at legislation, and they try to come up with what the costs are and how it's going to work. Of course, there's a lot of argument about what they count and about what they don't count; but things like creating shortages and also considerable amounts of unemployment are expected to come from this because, if you mandate that businesses spend a lot of money, what happens is it means their employees are going to cost more. If their employees are going to cost more, there's an incentive for them to get rid of some employees and to run the employees they have for longer hours. That reduces their costs, which of course increases unemployment.

So this bill will affect unemployment, which is another reason people are not very pleased with it and are disappointed in the bill. There is an inefficiency and an expense here which is quite considerable.

There is another mandate. This is one on individuals. It says that individuals must buy acceptable health insurance coverage. Now, guess who defines what health insurance coverage is acceptable if you're an individual citizen of the United States?

Is it the individual citizen? Is it the 22-year-old who says, I can't afford health insurance right now, and I'm very healthy and I'm making the decision not to get health insurance? Is he the one who decides what acceptable health insurance coverage is?

Of course, the answer is ''no.'' The answer is that the Federal Government knows what you need better than you do, so the Federal Government is going to mandate that you have this coverage, and they're going to tell you what kind of coverage it is, and you've got to buy it.

Now, this raises kind of an interesting legal point, which is, if the government mandates that you have something or that you buy something, is that not really, essentially, a tax increase? When you mandate that somebody has to buy a particular product, is that something that the Federal Government should be doing in this particular area? Is it even constitutional? When it is a mandate, is it not just essentially a tax increase? Or pay an additional 2.5 of your income in taxes. So now you're going to have a choice. You can either buy the insurance that we know is best for you—Big Brother government—or you can pay a fine or face criminal penalties, including jail time and severe fines if you don't get in line with what we know is best for you.

Who is ''we''? Oh, we just saw a picture of the ''we,'' didn't we? Here is the ''we.'' We know what's best for you. All of this matrix of bureaucracy, this matrix run by the Federal Government, really knows what's good for you, and so we're going to tell you what it is that you have to buy. You've got to buy the insurance we tell you you've got to buy. Otherwise, you'll face criminal penalties, including jail time.

How do you think that goes over with a lot of freedom-loving Americans? Well, not very good.

I think some of the election results that we've seen in the last number of months reflect the fact that people are not that comfortable with Washington, D.C.—Big Government—playing God in everybody's lives. That's one of the concerns and why this is not particularly popular.

I notice that we have joining us this evening a doctor, somebody who has spent years in the health care profession and who has really been in the middle of it as to providing that doctor-patient relationship. He knows the subject far better than this poor, old engineer does, and I would like to yield some time to my good friend who has just joined me on this health care topic. I was just running through some of the reasons why people aren't that excited about this Big Government takeover of health care and why you're seeing a lot of people voting, saying, I'm not sure we're on the right track with this.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank you for yielding.

As Congressman AKIN has said, I've spent the last 31 years, until a year ago, practicing medicine in Johnson City, Tennessee, and really in a rural area in Appalachia. I've also practiced medicine in Memphis, in the inner-city, while I was in training and in school.

We have to back up, I think, and look at what the problem was, what problem are we trying to solve.

In this country, I just saw a poll recently that showed among likely voters that approximately 90, 91 percent of the folks had some form of health insurance. What we're getting confused with is there are people out there who don't have access to care. There is no question about that, and we need to address that problem.

What we've been hearing in this particular H.R. 3962, aka H.R. 3200 that we began to deal with, is that this is the only solution, which is this very complex health care bill, which I've read—I've read all 2,000 pages of it—and you have very adequately stated some of the problems. What are we trying to fix?

Well, we have 40-plus million people in America who do not have—not access to care, because a law was passed in 1986 called EMTALA, and that afforded every American, whether you're legal or not—you could be an illegal citizen in this country—or whether you could pay or not. If you go to a hospital with an emergency room, you have to be cared for. We have no choice. When I was on call in the emergency room—and believe me—I'm the one who had to get up at 3 a.m. in the morning and go see these patients and care for them. So the care was there. It's just not the most efficient way to provide the care. There is no question about that.

We have a system in this country now where costs are out of control, and I think that's what this bill doesn't do. It doesn't address the fear that most of

us have and that I know I had as a doctor and that I have as a consumer of health care, which is the ever-rising cost of the care.

We can do several things. Let me just point out, in the 2,600- or 2,700-page Senate bill, I can cover 20 million people on one page. This is just to show you how simple you can make it. Number one, if you have signed up the people currently who are eligible for the State Children's Health Insurance plan and they've just not signed up for a current plan that's already there in Medicaid, you would cover 10 to 12 million people.

There's one thing in this bill that I do like a lot, and that's to allow adult children, when they graduate from high school or college who don't have health insurance, to stay on their parents' plans, their parents' health care plans. You could cover 7 million young people. You could cover almost 20 million people in this country. I don't think either side, the Democrats or the Republicans, would mind doing that. You've covered two-thirds of what the Senate bill is going to do by doing that one thing, and you can do that on one page.

Mr. AKIN. Could I just reclaim my time for just a minute, Dr. ROE?

The way you're approaching this seems to be a little bit more sane in some ways in that you're saying, look, we're going to define our problem precisely, and we're going to tailor a solution to try to improve what we've got in order to try to make the system work.

Now, you're not proposing—I thought it was 2,000 pages. You're saying it's coming up close to 3,000 now. You're not proposing a 3,000-page or 2,000-page solution. You're talking about one simple thing, and you can take half of the people who don't have health insurance, and you can get them insurance.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. AKIN. You can do that on one page.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. On one page.

Mr. AKIN. Now, I think the American public prefers simple and to just fix what's broken instead of scrapping everything and starting over, but I yield to my good friend from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Another issue that we deal with all the time—and as a physician, I would deal with this—are patients who would develop, let's say, breast cancer and lose their jobs. Then they would lose their insurance coverage. Now they have chronic conditions, and they don't have insurance coverage. How do you help those patients? How do you help those folks?

Well, this is a very simple problem. Preexisting conditions are a problem but not in the large group market. In other words, if you've worked for a large corporation or let's say—like we get our insurance here through the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan, the so-called FEHBP. You've got 9 million people who get their insurance through that. If one person has a chronic condition like breast cancer or diabetes, it really doesn't affect our rates because you spread those risks over millions of people. If you would simply get rid of State lines and if you would allow small groups to become big groups, you then solve the preexisting condition problem.

The second thing you can do is to subsidize——

Mr. AKIN. I don't mean to interrupt you, and I don't want to be rude, but I just want you to develop that point a little bit more.

In other words, am I understanding, Doctor, that what you're saying is you could buy insurance across State lines? Is that the point you're making?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Reclaiming my time, absolutely.

Look, you can buy any other kind of insurance in the world but health insurance across a State line. Why in the world should it make any difference? If I'm living near the State line—and we're surrounded by multiple States in Tennessee—I should be able to buy that insurance across a State line.

For instance, let's take Realtors. Almost every Realtor's business is a small business. They have six, eight, ten. Twenty would be a lot in our area. Let them all group together across this Nation, and then you'll have 500,000 or 1 million Realtors who could spread their risks, and you wouldn't have any government involvement. You wouldn't have any subsidies involved. You wouldn't have any complications. You'd simply let the free market system work.

Mr. AKIN. Doctor, reclaiming my time again, what you're saying is you're combining a couple of ideas, but you're saying it fast. I want to make sure people can understand it.

The first thing you're saying is you can buy insurance across State lines. Particularly if you live in a place like, for instance, Kansas City, Missouri—and there's a Kansas City, Kansas, right across the river—you could be buying insurance out of two markets instead of one or even possibly from someplace like all the way up in Massachusetts. So that's one idea.

As to your other idea, though, it sounds like what you're saying is you're allowing the individuals, let's say, who work for some small employer to pool together to create large pools, which then gives you the statistical smoothing so that you could apply for insurance, one, because you have a whole lot of buyers. You're a significant player, so you can buy at a discount price. Second of all, if somebody does get ill, you can smooth that load over a big enough base that it doesn't affect it. Am I understanding you correctly?

I yield.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding. You're absolutely right, because what you allow it to do is you allow a small business to become a large business.

Like I said, the problem with preexisting conditions is, if you have a small shop of 5, 10, 20 employees, which many businesses have—and 70 percent of our employees in this country work for small businesses. If you have one very expensive condition that hits, it breaks them. They can't afford insurance. That's why it's not affordable.

Some other things we could easily do are preventative care, and you could do that where you have different incentives to keep yourself well.

□ 1730

As a physician, I can tell you all day long how to stay well, but it is up to you as a patient to carry that out. I can give you all the great ideas in the world, but if you don't carry them out, then it doesn't do any good.

Mr. AKIN. It is about that third helping of french fries, I understand.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. That is correct. So you want to have the incentives built into our health care system.

For instance, a health savings account. I have one, a health savings account. Let me explain this to our audience today, the people who are watching this.

Before, when you pay a premium in, if you don't use it, who keeps the money? The insurance company does. In my case right here, with a health savings account, you put in X dollars. In our office, it is $3,000. It can be $5,000 that your employer puts in that account for you. You pay everything first dollar, so I am highly motivated to take care of myself, because at the end of the year, if I don't spend that money, I get to keep that money, not the insurance company. And you can roll that money over and use it the following year and the following year.

In our group, we have 350 employees in our medical group at home, and for those who get insurance, over 80 percent of them choose a health savings account. They manage their own care, so they are motivated not to smoke and to exercise and to lose weight because they save their own money. You can use that money later in your life if you accumulate many thousands of dollars for long-term care or whatever you want. You are the insurance company.

Mr. AKIN. Doctor, again, I would like to cut in for a minute here. You are talking about a medical savings account. What you are saying makes a whole lot of sense.

In other words, what you do is you put your money aside, and you have some tax benefits from setting it aside, into not something for your retirement but something to help cover your medical needs. Then, as medical expenses come up during the year, you can pay for those out of this pre-tax money which is in your medical savings account.

If you stay healthy and you have a good lifestyle and you didn't have that third helping of french fries, then you may not spend as much money as you put in there and you would be allowed to keep it year in and year out, and it

could continue to earn interest to cover in case of a medical problem.

Is that right so far?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. That is correct. And if something were to happen catastrophically, let's say you have an accident or a heart attack and you spend more than that predetermined amount, you buy catastrophic coverage that covers every bit of it.

For instance, in my particular case, anything over $5,000 is paid for 100 percent. And you had the $5,000 to begin with, it was your money, so you got to keep it. I think that is a very simple thing that we are currently doing and we should be encouraging people to do, not discouraging.

Mr. AKIN. Now, my understanding is we put that into law, but there were a lot of limitations on it, and I don't think that is generally available for most people in the public. Is it, Doctor?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. It is not, and it should be.

Mr. AKIN. Is that a problem that the marketplace hasn't caught up to what the law says? Or, are there roadblocks that make it so that people can't do that?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I think probably we haven't educated our public as much as we should have. I was surprised in my own practice about how many chose to do that once they understood it.

When you are faced with paying $3,000, that is kind of scary to do that when you normally have a small copay or deductible. But once you understand how it works, that you get to keep the money, not the insurance company—and while we are on insurance companies, I have got a problem.

I know one of the things that I did in practice that really frustrated me to no end was to have insurance companies deny needed care for patients, and I think certainly they are culpable. I know I have spent as much time on the phone sometimes getting a case approved for a patient to get needed care as I did actually doing the procedure I was trying to get approved. That is very frustrating. So the insurance company is culpable out there, and we do need some reform.

Mr. AKIN. Doctor, we just talked about that. One of the first slides I brought up was starting, when you want to talk about health insurance, one thing that you want is you want to have that doctor-patient relationship kept—I don't know if you would call it sacred, but you want that to be a primary kind of consideration. And if an insurance company parks itself between the patient and the doctor, we don't like that idea very well.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. No, we don't.

Mr. AKIN. And with this bill that is being proposed, the insurance company can second-guess the doctor, and if there is a bad result, they can't be sued. That is one more strike why people don't like this bill. But that is a great point.

We have been joined by another colleague of mine, Congressman THOMPSON. G.T. is here, just a stalwart, free-enterprise guy, and somebody with a whole lot of common sense. I would like to yield some time, if you would like to comment.

We are trying to take an overview of what is happening now, after the election yesterday, and where we are in this whole thing of health care and are we still under this model of Big Brother is going to take it all over.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank my good friend from Missouri and my good friend from Tennessee for this Special Order tonight that you are doing.

Yesterday was a landmark day. I think it established a pretty confident trend of what the American people like and what they dislike. And what they dislike I think is properly captured and framed in that chart that you have on the tripod, the bureaucracy of a government-run, government takeover of health care.

We need to be approaching health care and we need to be approaching everything we do in this Chamber, I believe, from a principled leadership perspective, of leading with principles. And I have to tell you, and I suppose my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would agree with that. It is just their principles are completely 180 degrees from our principles. I have to imagine, what are the principles behind that health care nightmare that is outlined there? I liken it to a train going down a mountain with no brakes—it never ends well.

What they are trying to shove through is just to get anything, get something. I can imagine how the behind-closed-door discussions are going, which happened again today even after the people in Massachusetts spoke.

Mr. AKIN. All the complaints.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. It has to be something like this: ''We don't care what it is, let's just pass something, whatever it might be.'' The goal is just to get something through to be able to say they did something. Well, that is wrong. That is not the approach we do. The American people need and deserve better than that. They want principles.

The health care principles I believe in and the Republican Party and some of my Democratic colleagues, I think we can work together. There are four principles I have always held dear as a health care professional for almost 30 years, and that is—and my belief is that we have a health care system that is pretty good. In fact, I would rate it one of the best in the world, not that it couldn't be improved upon. And the principles that we dedicate ourselves to are decreasing costs, increasing access, improving quality, and preserving that relationship that Dr. ROE talked about, the decisionmaking relationship between the physician and the patient, not allowing a bureaucrat to insert themselves into that relationship. And this certainly, I think, is regressive, regressive in terms of all four of those principles.

My colleague from Tennessee talked about the impact on the relationship of decisionmaking between the patient and the physician, where the bureaucracy, a bureaucrat is inserted between that relationship. But when you look at all of it, when you look at cost, the cost of the Senate bill, which I believe—I don't know, but that is what will be shoved at the American people and will be shoved at this Chamber to work on. The Congressional Budget Office showed those costs going up significantly. I believe the individual costs were at least, on the average, $300 per year, $2,100 per family. I thought the idea behind that is to lower costs for everyone, yet we know what is out there.

My colleagues have talked about allowing the purchase of health insurance across State lines. That is greater competition. That is a good thing. That brings costs down.

Certainly the whole issue of tort reform; $29 billion a year that is spent in this Nation on tort reform premiums, $29 billion. And we talk about waste and fraud, waste within health care spending. I think that is the biggest waste there is. Those dollars could be going into directly caring for patients. You add on top of that the cost of the practice of defensive medicine, and I understand why that occurs.

A physician comes out of medical school with a quarter million dollars of loans, if they are a specialist, maybe half a million dollars in loans. And at the risk of even a frivolous lawsuit they can lose a practice, lose their family's home. They order extra tests that may not be necessary to treat the illness at hand but does substantiate they followed a standard of practice, a standard of care.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield, let me just mention a couple of things that my friend from Pennsylvania is talking about.

In 1975, all the malpractice companies left the State of Tennessee. We had nothing. So the physicians there brought together and formed what is called the State Volunteer Mutual Insurance Company. It was a mutual company that anything that wasn't paid out in premiums came back to us. Since the inception of that company in 1975, over half the premium dollars have gone to attorneys. Less than 40 cents on the dollar went to the injured parties, the injured patients, and about 10 cents to run the company.

We have a system that is broken terribly when you can't even compensate injured people. That is the system we have in America now, and that is wrong, because there are events that do occur that need to be compensated. We don't have a system that can even do that.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, gentlemen, what you have been outlining here today is, I think, what the American public is eager for. They are eager for people to define specifically what a problem is, and to outline a solution

that makes common sense, that isn't going to be that expensive. In fact, the solution should save money. They are going to increase the amount of freedom that consumers have and choices, and improve the quality of health care. That is a way to approach health care. That is to say, we are not going to totally destroy it all; we are going to fix the parts of it that are broken.

That is usually the way we approach most legislative questions. And yet, now, for to whatever it is, eight months, we have been running down this track trying to reproduce in America what has never worked in foreign countries very well.

I think you could say there are a lot of things we could fix in America. But, on the other hand, if you are the guy that lives in Dubai and you are worth a couple hundred million dollars and you get sick, guess where you want to be treated. You want to come to the good old USA.

So why do we want to scrap something that has many aspects? In fact, I would say if you take a look at the American health care system, if you look at what is being provided in care, we are doing pretty darned well. If you are taking a look at how are we paying for that, we have got some problems.

So our problems tend to be more in the pay for side than in the quality of the care that is coming out. And each of you gentlemen have demonstrated, I think very articulately, tonight the fact that there are some certain specific things that could be fixed, yet we seem to be just on this—you called it a train wreck—just trying to replace the whole thing with a Big Government solution.

And I think it is ironic, almost amusing, and a month or two ago would have been unbelievable, to say that this whole thing may well have been derailed by Massachusetts voting for a Republican for the U.S. Senate. If you said that 2 months ago, people would think you needed to be locked up in a little white straitjacket. They would say there is no chance that something like that could happen.

Yet people are starting to pay attention to what is being proposed here, and this, along with a whole series of other incidents and mismanagement, has created a political anomaly. I mean, there wasn't one Republican Congressman in the State of Massachusetts, and yet the State, looking at this kind of thing, along with the tremendous spending that this represents, said, Time out. We are not solving our problems.

I appreciate your time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I would say, when you look at this—I am just a country doctor from east Tennessee, but if you look at the health care problem in America, it is this: One is we have had escalating costs. There is no question of the costs. And we have got people who don't have health insurance coverage. Those are the two problems. How do you solve those problems?

Let me explain to you why having more government will never work and will end up costing more money. And my good friend from Pennsylvania, Congressman THOMPSON, has hit the nail right on the head.

When you take $500 billion—and I have dealt with Medicare patients for my entire medical practice. When you take $500 billion out of a plan that is already underfunded, that goes upside down in premiums by 2017—and beginning next year the baby boomers hit 3 million to 3.5 million new recipients every year. You take a half trillion dollars out and you add 30 to 35 million people, three things happen: One, you have decreased access; two, because you are not going to get in to see the doctor, number two, you are going to have decreased quality; and three, and seniors get this, their costs are going to go up to get the care that they need.

Mr. AKIN. Doctor, you are so eloquent and you said it so smoothly, but I just think we need to underline what you said.

What you are saying is you are going to take $500 billion out of Medicare. Now, is this a Republican that is going to raid Medicare?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. No, sir.

Mr. AKIN. We have always been accused of raiding Medicare, but we are not the ones doing this, right?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. That is correct. Unless you are in Florida, of course.

Mr. AKIN. So we are going to take $500 billion out of Medicare. And what do you think is going to happen? If you take $500 billion out of Medicare, it is going to be harder to provide services for people.

But you are not just doing that alone. You are adding more people and taking money out.

□ 1745

So now you're sort of compounding the problem. And so the result is you're going to get poorer quality care and you're going to have to pay more money on the side, I suppose. Is that right, Doctor?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. That's correct. What you're going to do is, you're going to create waits. There's no other way around it. And that's my biggest fear as a physician, is that at the bottom line, the end of the day, when you budget so much money for health care and you have more demand for services than you have money to pay for it, you create waits. It happens in England France, and Germany, unless you are wealthy and can buy your way around the system, which is what happens. But I'm talking about for the bulk of the American people.

Over 90 percent of the people who have insurance in this country like it. And they like what they have. They understand we pass all of this right here. When a patient comes to me, am I going to be able to provide better care for that patient? The answer is, No, I can't. And let's look at some numbers.

Mr. AKIN. One other point, Doctor. You said you're just a country doctor from Tennessee. But if I remember right, there were two States that did the experiment of essentially government-run health care. One was the great State of Massachusetts, which has now become my fond friend.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mine, too.

Mr. AKIN. And the second one is Tennessee. So you've had personal firsthand of the State government deciding they're going to take over health care. Is that correct?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. We had the 17-year experiment called TennCare. And to back up to the beginning of Medicare, in 1965 that great program that was passed started as a $3 billion program. The congressional estimates were at that time that by 1990, 25 years later, it would be a $15 billion program. The actual number, a $90 billion program. It's gone from $90 billion in 1990 to over a $400 billion program. And we're going to cut this much money out. As our population ages, there's going to be more spending involved. Now that's one plan.

In Tennessee, we started with a managed care plan in 1993 to control costs, because costs were going up and there wasn't enough access for our citizens. It was a $2.6 billion program in 1993. In 10 budget years it was an $8 billion program. It took up almost every new dollar that the State of Tennessee brought. And let me go on and fast forward to this Senate bill for a moment, because this is very important for States.

This bill calls for a massive expansion, the Senate bill, a massive expansion of Medicaid. In the State of Tennessee we're looking at three-quarters of a billion dollars of unfunded—unfunded—liability. That's what Nebraska got off the hook for. What you're asking us to do in Tennessee is we, this year, Mr. Speaker, this year we have 50 less highway patrolmen in the State of Tennessee than we had in 1978. And we have 2 million more people. That's the kind of shape that the States are getting in. And we're getting now another unfunded mandate through this health care bill that I don't know where the money is going to come from.

We have no capital projects for our colleges this year in the State of Tennessee. We're not building a new dormitory, a new library, or anything. And yet we're going to get crammed down this massive expansion of government with an unfunded mandate. That's why people are angry.

Mr. AKIN. Doctor, you just made another point. What I'm hearing you say is that the estimate that the CBO has put together of this little treasure here of a trillion dollars, that part of the deal is it's a little more than a trillion, because we're going to do something that's going to make the States pay a chunk of change, too. So we have what's called an unfunded mandate that's going to descend on the States.

The trouble is the States don't have the option we do of just busting the budget, because a lot of them have balanced budget amendments. And that's going to be tough.

I'd like to go back over to Congressman THOMPSON from Pennsylvania. Would you like to join us here?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Absolutely. I believe, actually, it was the Tennessee Governor, a Democrat, who coined the term that this Senate bill and the Medicaid, the shoving of the increased Medicaid rolls and shifting that over to the State was, ''the mother of all unfunded mandates.''

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. That's what he said.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Sounds like a very smart man.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. He is a very good Governor.

Mr. AKIN. That's a Democrat Governor.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. AKIN. He says it's the mother of all unfunded mandates. That says that trillion may be a pretty conservative number.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. When we look at the State of Pennsylvania, the conservative estimates are that the Senate bill provision with the huge expansion of the Medicaid rolls, which is truly just shifting it to the States without funding, $2.4 billion to the State of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania went 6 months—at least 6 months without a budget this past year, the State government, because they couldn't make it balance. They're required to, but they just couldn't get it done. The economics, the revenue, and the expenses just did not match up.

I think that there are so many problems with the proposals that our Democratic colleagues have been proposing. And I suspect what we will see as a bill comes out of the closed, dark room to the House floor, that it will be very flawed. But let me just say there are solutions. There are solutions that have been defined. There are solutions that have been introduced going back to July of this year, 7 months ago, and there are solutions that have received even some support but are largely Republic solutions.

The Putting Patients First Act, which addresses the issue of tort reform and takes that $329 billion-minimum of waste, and that would allow the cost of everybody's health care to come down. The Putting Patients First Act, which allows the bidding of health insurance across State lines, which allows the formation of association health plans to give small businesses the opportunity to join together to have a larger voice and more negotiation power. It also addresses key issues, and does it in a good market approach of addressing preexisting conditions.

They allow the States to create high-risk pools. Just because you're born with a preexisting condition or during the course of your lifetime you experience or develop a disease or disability, say breast cancer or prostate cancer, that should not mean that you shouldn't be able to afford to purchase—I'm not saying anybody give you—but be able to afford to purchase reasonably priced health insurance.

The Republican solution does that. And it doesn't do it with massive taxing. Does it with no taxing, does it with no cuts to Medicare, does it with no shifting of tremendous health care cost to the State. It is a win-win and brings down the cost of health care for everybody.

Mr. AKIN. So we've got some solutions. I was just thinking about the voters in all the different States that are frustrated. They may be listening to us even here on the floor of the Congress, and they're thinking, Do they guys get it or not? Why are they talking about these huge Big Government solutions and spending the money that we don't have. I'm not sure some of them aren't ready to declare independence again.

I was just thinking, if you're going to write a declaration of independence relative to health care, one of the things you say is, it's not going to add a whole lot of money to the big national debt. That's one thing you've got to pay attention to. It's not going to impose mandates on States or employers or individuals. And it's not going to use taxpayer dollars to fund abortions or illegal immigrants.

I think those are all things that have been debated and discussed and people are upset about. It's going to be negotiated, I think, in a free and open format instead of behind closed doors. We're going to reserve that doctor-patient relationship. And we're going to allow freedom, which has worked so well in America for a couple of hundred years, to reign. To actually have some freedom to let people make choices and trust them to make their own choices and then do some of these commonsense solutions that you're talking about to not try to reproduce the failed systems of the Soviet Union or the failed systems of European medicine or Canadian medicine, which are very inefficient and expensive, but rather build on the model of freedom and people's free choices and people making distinctions between what sort of health care they do or don't want and, particularly, allowing doctors to practice medicine without feeling threatened from lawyers or insurance companies or Big Brother looking over their shoulder.

If you go to med school and spend a quarter of a million bucks on education, I think I'd rather have your opinion as to what you ought to do to me. I don't mean to rant here, but it seems like we need some sort of statement or declaration or something about some basic principles that Americans believe in.

I yield to you, Doctor ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I think one of the problems that you've seen with this plan is the complexity of it. I think the bottom line, what you saw in Massachusetts yesterday is that the people there do appreciate their own personal freedom. They want their freedom to choose. Also, Massachusetts was being asked, since they've already been mandated to pay for their own policy, which I might add has added tremendous cost, and I will also tell you that half of the primary care doctors in that State are not accepting patients.

This is one of the things that isn't understood about a lot of the government-run plans: They don't pay the cost of the care. We haven't discussed that much here, but in our own State, Medicaid pays less than 60 percent of the cost to the providers; the hospitals and the doctors. Medicare pays somewhere between 80 and 90 percent of the costs. The rest of those costs are shifted to private health insurers, meaning that people out in private businesses are actually getting taxed again.

What Congressman THOMPSON was talking about, another thing that's left out of this particular plan that's really unfair is that you're not even putting in the so-called ''doctor fix.'' Let me explain that to the viewing public out there. In 1997, there was a bill passed here called ''The Sustainable Growth Rate: How Medicare Pays the Physicians.'' And what happened was, is there was supposed to be cuts every year. This year, there was supposed to be a 21 percent cut to physicians, which if that happens, nobody is going to able to see a Medicare patient. And that's not even here. It's over a $200 billion pricetag that's not even listed in this current trillion-dollar pricetag.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. So the statistic you talked about, Medicare payments, which it has been my experience in Pennsylvania, for every dollar of cost, reimbursement of 80 to 90 cents. So for every dollar of cost, the physicians are already losing significant moneys. That 21 percent cut that you talked about, that's on top of that.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. That's correct. That's on top of the 80 to 90 percent. So for patients and what they're concerned with now, I believe what's happened, and just to simplify in my own terms, is what happened in Massachusetts, where people saw they were already paying very high taxes, they were already paying for coverage, and then they were going to have to pay for States like Nebraska, who were opted out of this deal.

Congressmen, I was very proud to be sworn in to the U.S. Congress on the 6th of January, 2009. I woke up on the 23rd——

Mr. AKIN. You didn't know what you were in for, did you? It's been a whale of a ride, brother.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. It has been a whale of a ride. I woke up on the 23rd

of December and told my wife that I was actually embarrassed to be in this House because of the deals that were cut. And who ultimately paid for them are the patients and taxpayers. And that's wrong. It really embarrassed me when you saw this deal in Louisiana and the different deal in Florida.

Mr. AKIN. We've just got about a minute or two. We're going to be followed up by another good friend of mine. We may stay on this topic a little bit. I thought it might be appropriate tonight in the last minute or two to make a tribute to Massachusetts. Now who would have thought Congressman AKIN would be making a tribute to Massachusetts? But if you recall our history, Massachusetts used to be the cradle of freedom and innovation in terms of government. It was Massachusetts in 1620 that saw the Pilgrims come. They put together the idea of the first concept of a Republic. A group of free people, under God, selecting their own leadership to preserve their God-given rights. That's a powerful idea that came from Massachusetts. A hundred-fifty years later you had the Massachusetts provincial Congress saying, Resistance to tyranny is your Christian duty.

For the last 50 or 100 years it seems like Massachusetts has been sending us the King's people, always wanting more taxes, more government, more government spending, bigger government, and yesterday the people of Massachusetts reverted back to that great heritage of patriotism and freedom and said, We're finally tired of Big Government. It's time we start to look at solving our problems without thinking every solution means more taxes and more Washington, D.C., control.

I thank you, gentlemen, that your States have stood for freedom and your constituents have elected you to join us here to stand up for just plain, old basic American principles. I think we're going to get the job done. I think that what happened yesterday was about, from a political point of view, quite a stroke of lightning. I think it should get people's attention. I think the public has spoken. And it's time for us to move on with the ideas that you, Doctor ROE, have been making very clear here. It's not like these things are too complicated. And G.T., same thing. You're from Pennsylvania, representing the people with common sense. These things are not complicated. Define the problem, craft a limited solution that fixes it instead of trying to scrap everything and go to the Big-Government-fixes-all kind of model. I think it's really something that the people of Massachusetts kind of came back to their heritage and to their roots in standing up for the country, as they did so many years ago.

□ 1800

When I was a little kid, I lived in Concord and Lexington—actually in Concord, and I saw the place where the Minutemen had stood against the biggest military power in the world. There is a statue that says: ''By the rude bridge that arched the flood, their flag to April's breeze unfurled, here once the embattled farmers stood, and fired the shot heard round the world.'' They stood for freedom, and they stood for the basic principles that America has always stood on. And I am sure glad they joined us yesterday in making a statement and a statement that's going to affect this chart right here. Hopefully this chart goes in the dust bin before it ever becomes law. Last word, GT?

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Well, I just couldn't agree more. I think yesterday was a statement that the American people—what they want and what they expect from our leadership is that we do our best to provide safety, prosperity and liberty, the freedoms within this country. And that's the type of public policy that they've been getting since last January. That has worked against all three of those.

Mr. AKIN. Dr. ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Health care should not be a partisan issue. In 30-plus years, I never saw a Republican or Democrat heart attack. I never operated on a Republican or Democrat cancer, just a people problem. We need to get together in this body and not have a partisan solution. There needs to be a bipartisan solution that is simple and addresses problems that we have laid out here today so that patients, their families and doctors can make health care decisions.

Mr. AKIN. And that's certainly what you've been talking about tonight, both of you gentlemen. I understand that my good friend Congressman KING is going to be here in just a jiff. He is going to be continuing along the same lines, talking about freedom, talking about the principles that made this country and how those principles can be applied to solving these very practical problems with health care.

I will check to see how we are doing on time. Oh, we actually have 2 minutes. So I don't want to cheat anybody. Are there any last comments? Anything that we haven't covered that you want to catch, Dr. ROE or GT?

Here is one. We didn't talk about all of the cool features of this policy; but this wheelchair tax, it was kind of stuck in my craw. The idea that you are going to tax a wheelchair, the mental picture of that just doesn't seem to be what we want to do. So we're looking for places to dig for money to pay for this Big Government system. So what are we going to do? We're going to pose a 2.5 percent excise tax on medical devices, which includes wheelchairs, to try to raise some money.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, my background is rehabilitation services. I have seen where these types of medical devices—and it is not just wheelchairs. That is an understatement. It is insulin. It is crutches. It is canes. It is prosthetic limbs. I mean, there are just so many different things that this applies to. And this 2.5 percent excise tax, that is going to get passed right along to the consumers.

Most of the consumers who utilize these types of medical devices are older adults. They're individuals on very fixed incomes. Those who are surviving on maybe $800 to $1,200 a month of Social Security, and the very things that maximizes their independence, maximizes their quality of life, we're going to tax that? That's a quality-of-life tax, actually, because the people who use those medical devices, they are medically necessary. They're not luxuries. Those are devices that make their lives possible, that allow them to be able to live in the communities, to be able to live in their own homes, to not live in an institution. That's a quality-of-life tax.

Mr. AKIN. So if it moves, tax it. If it doesn't move, tax it anyway. It might be dead.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, gentlemen, for joining me.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

## IMPACT OF MASSACHUSETTS ELECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate being recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. I have been listening to the dialogue that has been poured before us from the three gentlemen here, my colleagues, speaking mostly about health care, the National Health Care Act, and what this could mean.

I would like to pick this up from the place where TODD AKIN left off, and that would be the importance of the State of Massachusetts. I do not believe that it can be overstated, the impact of the election returns last night. I listened to Carl Cameron on FOX News who is, I believe, a very well-informed and probably a deeply researched individual. He said that this was the most important congressional race in 50 years. Well, I can remember that far back, and I would completely agree with him. And I would suspect it may be the most important congressional race in the history of our country, Mr. Speaker.

The situation in Massachusetts where TODD AKIN laid out the poem that said, ''and fired the shot heard around the world,'' well, this in Massachusetts last night was a shot heard around the world. It was the SCOTT heard around the world. He will be here tomorrow, straight down that hallway,

swearing into the United States Senate.

So how did we get to this point, and what happened? And what is the significance of what took place in Massachusetts last night, Mr. Speaker? Those are the issues that I think are important to the American people here. I will make the point that we're a Nation that, let's say, we have people who are studying every day to be nationalized American citizens. We're a Nation that has skimmed the vigor off of every donor civilization that has sent immigrants to the United States.

The Mayflower landed at Plymouth Rock in 1620, 390 years ago. They disembarked from the Mayflower because they came over here for religious liberty, religious freedom. They established those freedoms and liberties right there in the Bay State. Now this Nation was founded on the same principles and the same liberty that came to us with the Pilgrims and were built upon as the years unfolded. And it's rooted back, a long ways back. A Western civilization itself, I would trace it back to the Greeks 3,000 years ago and the Age of Enlightenment, especially the English-speaking division of the Age of Enlightenment, which brought us free enterprise.

And if there is an immigrant in the United States who is studying to take the test to become a naturalized American citizen, there is a whole stack of flashcards that are there that are put out by the United States Citizenship Immigration Services. They are glossy flashcards. The government spent a lot of money to make these things real nice. You look on one side, and it will say, Who is the founder of our country? You flip it over to the other side, George Washington. Who saved the Union? Flip it over, Abraham Lincoln. Who signed the Emancipation Proclamation? Same man. Next question, What is the economic system of the United States of America?

You flip the card over, and if you are going to pass the test to become an American citizen, you have to answer what it says on the back of that card, free enterprise capitalism, Mr. Speaker. The economic system where we don't have the government setting prices. We have the market setting prices. We have supply and demand setting prices, and we let people invest equity, sweat equity and capital to buy, sell, trade, make, gain, invent. We protect the intellectual property through patents and trademarks, and we also encourage people to make money. We know that when you generate that wealth in the legitimate private sector that everyone prospers, that a rising tide does lift all boats.

And that's what people were thinking, I believe, in Massachusetts yesterday. I spent 3 days there. They were an outstanding 3 days. It was a fantastic experience. I went to polling places. I went to campaign headquarters, both sides of the case. I went to union halls, and I talked to as many people across the State of Massachusetts as I possibly could. The center line was this: the Federal Government spent too much money. It's gotten too big. It's gotten too intrusive. They're imposing too many mandates and regulations on the American people. They have their own universal health care in Massachusetts, and they aren't particularly happy with it.

One of the things they have a conscience about is not imposing that version on the entire United States of America. They understood that for them to cast a vote wasn't just, How did their ballot for SCOTT BROWN, how did it affect the destiny of Massachusetts? It wasn't a selfish vote. They understood they have a national responsibility, Mr. Speaker.

It was a national responsibility, and I understand this, I think, as well as most in the country because Iowa is first in the Nation caucus, and we take our jobs seriously, and we're all politics all the time. Generally, every 4 years we very, very often have at least one Presidential candidate from Massachusetts that we host. They go around through Iowa, sit down, have coffee with us and we talk to them. We look them eye to eye. I have done that more than once. We take our retail politics seriously.

But when we go to the first-in-the-Nation Presidential caucus and cast our ballot there, even though it has more impact than probably the single vote of anyone from any other State with regard to who is nominated as the President, Mr. Speaker, it is still only a recommendation to the rest of the country. Iowa gets to go first. We take it seriously. Somebody has to be first. I don't have confidence in anybody else to do a better job. But it's still only a recommendation.

What happened in Massachusetts last night was not a recommendation that affected the rest of the country like Iowa makes when they do the first-of-the-Nation Presidential caucus. What happened in Massachusetts last night was a decision for the rest of the country, a decision that will bind the destiny of America. They understood that, and they stepped up to that cause, and their conscience and their sense of responsibility kicked in.

So I am very proud of what the citizens of Massachusetts have done. They have mobilized the political effort that many of them hadn't seen ever in their lifetimes. I talked to a lady that said that she has worked in political campaigns for 50 years, 50 years; and she said that when the polls closed, and they counted the ballots, they cried their eyes out, and then they got up, and they went to work again. Well, this time I imagine there were tears among these groups. They probably did cry their eyes out, but they were tears of joy. And a great shout of joy went up all across America that finally, finally somebody heard.

I have asked for reinforcements. I have prayed for the cavalry to come, and at the last minute they came riding over the hill in the person of SCOTT BROWN. Now we have a chance to save, serve and protect our liberty; and this debate now begins on an entirely different field, on an entirely different terrain, and I believe an entirely different outcome. I am completely in awe at how the most improbable sometimes comes along to save us with something that appeared to be inevitable.

The gentleman from Tennessee has been willing to stick around, and I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee who happens to be a doctor, who knows what TennCare looks like and knows what America would look like if we adopted TennCare, CanadaCare, United KingdomCare, GermanCare, name your country. But this is America, and take care to protect America. The gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I think last night, watching what happened in Massachusetts, was really, in the many years I have watched politics, was really astounding. The people there I think—it was more than just health care. We have a country now that's not in trouble. We're America, and we know how to avoid trouble in this country. But we have a lot of our citizens who are hurting now. They need jobs, and they need employment. Certainly in our district and around our area where unemployment is over 10 percent, that's the talk in the barber shops and the restaurants: What's the economy doing? What business are we going to lose overseas next? What manufacturing job is going to be gone?

I think the people there looked at more than just health care. I think they looked at a stimulus package of almost $800 billion that I don't believe has worked. It certainly has provided some one-time jobs. But you know and I know as a former mayor that you don't take one-time money and turn that into a long-time job.

How you do that is you incentivize the people who are creating jobs in this country. That is small business. In this country, 70 percent of the businesses are small business that create the jobs. And how do you help them? You make the cost of capital, the cost of money, the cost of creating a job less. How do you do that? Well, you cut capital gains taxes. You can cut individual income tax rates. You can accelerate depreciation for plant equipment that they buy. So we have a country now that has put itself in debt that my great grandchildren will not be able to pay off.

□ 1815

We looked last year, and it is staggering to me how much a trillion dollars is. I get almost overwhelmed, and I made it through calculus in college, and I have a tough time getting my arms around how much money that really is.

We have a budget that went up 8 percent last year. We added 8 percent. In the State of Tennessee where I live, we had to live on less money than the year before. That is what we had to do in our State. That is what California is having to do. That is what every State in this Union is having to do.

I don't know if the people here in Washington get out, as I have, and talk to our Governors and our State legislators, but our States are in trouble. We need our economy to pick up. If our economy was doing well, I don't think that our health care issue would be as big of an issue as it is. As people lose their jobs, they lose their health benefits.

The people of Massachusetts got their arms around the bigger problem, and I think they looked at this entire country and the direction it is going and said, Whoa, wait a minute, we don't like the direction that the country is going. They put the brakes on this. They said let's stop and take a slow, measured look at what we are doing.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. He mentioned that he has taken calculus. I would submit that they put me through calculus, too, a couple of years, and they actually never told me at the beginning, middle, or end that there wasn't much purpose of going through all of those calculations. It was more about how to discipline the mind to think rationally, logically, and reasonably. That is also why they send people to law school. Our President went to law school and actually taught in law school. He taught constitutional law, which is a bit of a surprise to me that he can advocate some of the things that he does.

The basic logic that comes isn't rooted in law school and it isn't rooted necessarily in calculus. It isn't rooted in geometry or algebra. It might be two plus two equals four. But the rationale that was presented to us consistently and repeatedly by Presidential candidate, President-elect, and then President Obama, Mr. Speaker, was health care costs too much money. I have been browbeaten by the Europeans. They would say we spend 9.5 percent of our GDP. You spend 14.5 percent of your GDP. That is way to much money. Well, never mind, we make more money than they do. And never mind, we have better health care than they do. Never mind that we are willing to spend that. We don't like to spend it when we are looking at it in large, but when it comes time to save our lives or our health, we are glad to spend that kind of money.

We don't know what the threshold is, but our GDP, about 14½ percent spending, some say as high as 16 percent, we spend too much money; so, therefore, we should solve the problem by what? This is this two plus two. What the President proposed to us didn't spend less money. Anybody in third grade, if you say you have a problem with spending too much money, what do you do about that, you could hand them a 50-cent allowance, and you spend a quarter, not all 50 cents, and a kid can understand that at age 6 or 7, maybe even less than that.

But we are here listening to, being browbeaten and demagogued because we have a health care policy that spends too much money. It is 9.5 percent in the rest of the industrialized world and 14.5 percent here in the United States. So what does the President propose to do about solving spending too much money? Spend more. Spend at least a trillion more.

If you look at the real costs involved, look at Judd Gregg's numbers, the first real 10 years, it is $2.5 trillion more. If you look at the contingent liabilities that go along with this and all of the other components, it may be as high as $6 trillion more. So the problem of spending too much money is solved supposedly in a rational fashion and advocated by the President, the Speaker of the House, the majority leader of the United States Senate, and all of the people that line up to vote for their bills, solve the problem of spending too much money by spending a lot more money.

Now we have kind of forgotten about all of the browbeating that went on about we need more competition in health care insurance. The President made that argument over and over again. Well, he has the bully pulpit, but, you know, they have yet to invent the saw that will cut off the branch of truth. We can go out and stand on the branch of truth and we can say, All right, how many insurance companies do you need in America, Mr. President, to have the extra competition? Funny, a guy that doesn't much believe in the free market system thinks we ought to inject competition into the health insurance industry. So the President wants one more health insurance company in America and then that is going to fix the problems.

So I ask a simple question: How many companies are there in America? The answer comes back, 1,300; 1,300 health insurance companies, Mr. Speaker. And that is a little bit of a round number. So if you have all of these companies that are competing, 1,300 of them—I have never had that much competition, and I made my living on low bid in the construction business. When I had seven or eight or nine people bidding against me, I already knew somebody was going to make a mistake on the bid and lose money and take the chance for profit away from the rest of us.

So if there are 1,300 companies and they are competing, throwing one more in there doesn't really help that mix. But it wasn't the President's idea to provide more competition anyway; he just thought we would believe that. His idea was to get government in the business of providing that which the people in the private sector could do very well themselves.

And, by the way, these 1,300 companies offer a different variety of policies that individuals could shop and buy, approximately 100,000 different policy varieties, Mr. Speaker. So you can multiply 100,000 policies out there and you can look at 1,300 companies that are brokering them, and imagine how is it the Federal Government getting into the business could legitimately compete with those kinds of entities.

And if you want more competition, the way you provide that is open up the trade from State to State so people can buy health insurance in Tennessee instead of New Jersey. The gentleman from Tennessee knows what that is like. That would make sure that all 1,300 companies competed against each other, and these 100,000 policy varieties would probably get to be less because they wouldn't have to accommodate some of the silly mandates that come down from the States.

So a young man buying health insurance in New Jersey, a healthy 25-year-old might pay $6,000 a year for a typical policy. Or he could go to Kentucky where there are fewer mandates, and a similar but not identical policy might cost that same individual $1,000. Now, what kind of a smart, young person usually on a limited budget would write a check for $6,000 if they could write a check for $1,000. Wouldn't we then have more people insured if they had more options? That's the answer.

Furthermore, there are things we want to fix. We want to fix lawsuit abuse. The health insurance underwriters produced a number. The one that I trust the most—and I have seen numbers on the cost of lawsuit abuse in America on health care to go as low as 5.5 percent of the overall cost of health care services provided. I have seen it go as high as over 30 percent. The number that I trust is 8.5 percent. So 8.5 percent of the cost of health care in America is $203 billion a year, and this is included in the additional tests that have to be given because they are done for defensive medicine purposes. Also, the litigation and settlements that don't have a medical reason for them. We want people to be whole. If they have suffered from malpractice, the legitimate system is there, but the abuse has taken this way out of sight. So $203 billion a year going almost all of it to the trial lawyers, not to the patients but the trial lawyers.

And do you think there is a single Democrat in the House of Representatives or a single Democrat in the Senate who would stand up and say this is completely and totally utterly wrong to be funding trial lawyers on the backs of health care patients and acting like we are reforming health care and protecting the trial lawyers completely, not allowing insurance to be sold across State lines, and denying full deductibility for everybody's health insurance premiums?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. If the gentleman would yield, let me give a practical example of what you are saying there.

Let's say years ago if I were working in the emergency room and a patient came in with right-sided pain, I might be concerned about whether they had an appendicitis. I would get a blood count. It was at that time probably a $15, $20 test. It is probably a $50 test now. You do a physical examination, take their vital signs, their blood pressure, their pulse and temperature and do a physical exam, and you would say, I don't think there is a chance that you have an appendicitis, but let's let you go home and if you get worse, start to have more pain, come right back and we will reevaluate you.

That is not going to happen anymore because part of the legal system now, you know if you do that and you don't get a CT scan, a very expensive test on that patient and you go out and you happen to have an appendicitis, the one in 500 times that might happen, you will be held liable. So all 499 people are going to come out of the emergency room glowing in the dark, just about, because of all the X-rays that they have had to protect the doctor from a potential lawsuit of the one in 500. That is the problem that you get into with the tests that are not needed basically to protect the physician. And why wouldn't the doctor order those tests? You don't want to put up everything you have earned in your entire life for the risk of that one in a thousand, that jackpot that somebody might have.

The thing you also brought up is people are genuinely injured in the system. We don't have any way to adequately compensate the injured parties without the attorneys getting their hands on a significant amount of the settlements.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I had a conversation with an orthopedic surgeon a couple of months ago. He said to me, I have a small practice. He said 95 percent of the MRIs that he orders are completely unnecessary except he has to cover everything because someone might try to hit the jackpot. So he has to order those tests. Everybody in the business orders all of those tests.

If you cut out that 95 percent, his number is that it costs patient's insurance companies, taxpayers, a million dollars a year just to fund the unnecessary tests in one that he calls a small practice. That gives you an implication. You can multiply that $1 million across the whole country, and what you come up with is $203 billion in additional costs. We can't get them all out of there. There is a bill that we have introduced that finds about $54 billion over 10 years. I think it ought to be tougher than that. I think we ought to tighten this thing down more.

The argument again that has been made out of the White House and out of the majority party and from the Speaker's office itself, too, is that Republicans don't have any solutions. Well, they must have sat up some night in one of those formerly smoke-filled rooms to come up with an idea like that. It is completely and utterly false, Mr. Speaker. Republicans have introduced at least 42 separate bills in this 111th Congress that reform health care. And I can tell you exactly how many of them were incorporated into this document that was promised to be a bipartisan document, and that is a complete double aught goose egg. None. No free market solutions, no patient choice solutions, no medical malpractice lawsuit abuse reform, no selling insurance across State lines, no full deductibility, no real transparency, none of the components that give people options and choices have been considered.

And why? Because if you put free market solutions in and you give people the liberty and the freedom to make their own decisions on health care, first, they are going to take a financial responsibility and a personal responsibility. If you help out on the lawsuit abuse, more people are going to say, I don't need that test either, Doctor, and so let's save the money and not do that. But the bottom line is Republicans have always injected free market solutions in place; for example, health savings accounts.

Health saving accounts are just starting to grow the way they need to. That is 2003 legislation, wiped out by this proposal that comes from Speaker PELOSI, the President, and HARRY REID. No more health savings accounts if you read the legislation and figure out how it is going to come out. Imagine this, Mr. Speaker. If a young couple had engaged in health savings accounts when it was first set up by this Congress in 2003 and they invested $5,150 as the maximum amount into their health savings account, and if they spent $2,000 a year out of that health savings account in legitimate expenses and accrued the balance of that account at 4 percent per annum and compounded it, they would reach retirement age, the two of them in reasonably good health with $950,000 in their health savings account.

And what is the interest that CHARLIE RANGEL has on that: Tax it. They want to tax it. I want to give an incentive to buy a Medicare replacement policy and let them keep the change. That Medicare replacement policy would cost about $72,000 per person today. That is one of the Republican solutions, but it doesn't fit very well with socialized medicine, you know. That is what happens.

This is an effort to try to mix. They didn't try to mix, but the reason it doesn't mix is because it is oil and water. It is freedom and liberty. It is market solutions and individual responsibility and doctor-patient relationships on this side, and over on this side it is socialized medicine, one size fits all. Big Brother at the top draconianly mashes this down on everybody else in America, and you have to accept the policy that they give you and you have to then get in line.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. If the gentleman would yield, let's just talk about, for a minute, we have this very complex, over 2,000-page bill which I have read. The Senate bill is over 2,500 pages, which I will admit I have not read. I have seen the synopsis of it. We have 118 new agencies in this very complex schematic that you have down there in front of you. We should, on both sides of the aisle, be able to agree on a few things. One is that we agree that the cost of care is rising too fast and we have the uninsured out there that we need to cover. Those are the two basic premises that spurred this entire debate. How can you best solve those problems? It is not that complicated. You can do several things.

One, as you point out, let's just look at five things that we can do on 25 pages, not a complicated 2,000 pages. You can let people buy insurance just like you do your auto insurance or your life insurance. We see advertisements every night on television with a little gecko running around, those cute ads they have. Let people buy health insurance across State lines.

Let young people who don't have health insurance stay on their parents' plan, if they don't have a job that provides it, until they are 26 or 27 years old. Pick your number. You can cover 7 million people by doing that at zero cost to the Federal Government.

You pointed out very eloquently liability reform. You save billions of dollars doing that.

You simply sign up the people right now who are eligible for government programs without creating another new one. You cover 19 million people by doing that. You are not creating another agency and 118 new bureaucracies.

Expand the health savings account. I will give you personal experience. I have had one for 2 years. I put $5,000 a year in. Instead of the insurance company keeping my $10,000, I have spent about $2,000. My wife and I are both healthy, fortunately. We have $8,000 in our health savings account that we can use how we choose, not the insurance company.

□ 1830

I think for someone who owned an individual policy, you can treat them like a big corporation. Let them deduct their premiums just like General Motors gets to do, like the big unions do, and so forth.

And then I think the last thing you have to do is you have to put some individual responsibility for each of us, so that everybody, no matter what care they get, needs to pay something for the care. It shouldn't be totally free. We saw that in Tennessee, when our costs just skyrocketed because of the very generous plan we had there where there were no costs to the patients and it was overutilized.

So those are five or six things that every one of us in this room, in this auditorium, ought to be able to agree on and take care of. And it wouldn't be hard to do. It is an easy solution. We

should be able to pass that in no time at all. And the President ought to listen to that. He really should. These are simple, real-world solutions.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. They are simple, real-world solutions. They are free market solutions. They are commonsense solutions. And there is this other part about human nature. It is helpful when a country has its leaders that believe in the principles that built this as a great Nation, and also understand the human nature part.

There has to be incentives in place. And a nanny state can never be enough of a nanny to take care of people's failings. I think it was Phil Gramm that said this first, that I heard it anyway, and that is you take the safety net out there, that safety net that taught a man to fish, and then you give him the fish instead, and you turn the safety net into a hammock.

So here is the safety net down here, and as Congress keeps cranking that safety net up higher and higher and higher, and it becomes more and more of a cushy hammock. And you know, there is a reason why the most successful civilizations in the world generally originated someplace in a temperate climate instead of down by the equator. Because there wasn't an incentive. You didn't have to prepare for winter.

Where I live, you by golly got to be ready for winter, which means in that window of time that we have from around the first of April until about the first of December you got to get all the things done you are going to get done outside. That means all the food has got to be put up. That means all the staples have to be put in place to get your work done. We got to get our construction work done then, because in the wintertime it gets cold and it gets dark soon. That means you have industrious people.

Now, I am not drawing a comparison between the Mason-Dixon line. I am drawing a comparison between the equator. And I want to make that point clear for my colleagues here. But the industriousness of people, that was necessary. Squirrels put away for the winter, grasshoppers freeze to death. And if you give people the hammock instead of the safety net, they are not going to take care of themselves, and more than likely they are going to have to require us to do that because we are not allowing them to be tested.

There is a value to adversity. When I think of the things that I have gone through, and I don't wish them upon anybody, the challenges that are there, but every one of them put a little more steel in me, a little more mettle in me, and caused me to be better organized, work harder, be more industrious, prepare more. And if you take away that reward for planning for your future, you will have people that don't plan for their future.

If you pay young women to have babies if there is not a man in the house, they will have babies. If you pay them as long as they don't go to work, they won't go to work. These are simple things that anybody can understand that seem to have completely escaped the President of the United States and the majority party and the troika of leadership we have in this country called Obama, PELOSI, and REID.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. If the gentleman would yield for just a second, there is a great book out by Milton Friedman, Free to Choose. And he makes a statement in that book, if you want more of something, you subsidize it. If you want less, you tax it. And it is a very simple principle you can apply to health care or anything else. If you have government programs that are subsidized by the taxpayers, you will create more people who use those programs. We have seen it over and over and over again.

I will give you a brief example before I yield to my colleague from Georgia. In this country we talk about, and I heard many times about how—and we do have failings in our health care system. It is not perfect. But when President Clinton had a heart attack, he was taken to an emergency room to the hospital, where he had a heart cath and discovered that he had blockages in his arteries and needed a bypass operation for it to save his heart. He got a bypass operation. It was delayed a couple, 3 days I am sure because of a blood thinner they gave him. I don't know that, but I am pretty sure that is what happened or they would have done it immediately.

Let's say you are in small town Johnson City, Tennessee, and you don't have any insurance or anything at all, and you have a heart attack and you come to the emergency room, what is going to happen to you is you are going to get a heart cath and you are going to get a bypass operation, and then we will figure out how to pay for it.

In Canada if you have that heart attack, what they will tell you is there is a list that you get on that you can get a catheterization, where they put the dye in your heart and see if you have a blockage. You will get on a list. And when your name comes up, you will get the cath. And then you will get put on the list to see if you get a bypass operation. That is the difference and the delay in the care. And I have seen it happen. I know people that that has happened to in Canada.

They have wonderful physicians in Canada, I want to point out also. I know many of them, have worked with some that have moved to our community. Well trained, excellent doctors. So when you get the care, I think, in Canada, it is good care. I really believe that. When it is available, I think it is excellent care because of the experience I have had with Canadian-trained physicians. Some of my colleagues I worked with every day were well-trained physicians.

That is the rationing of care that we speak of that we don't want to have happen in our country. And we have enough of that as it is. People will tell you that insurance companies ration care. And they do. And I think certainly they are to be held culpable also.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. And I just relate a very quick story that was presented to us by Dr. David Janda, who has written a book. He is out of Michigan. He has practiced in Canada. When he first went up there to work in the emergency room, and he is an orthopedic surgeon now, he had a patient come in, a young man who had torn up his knee playing softball, torn meniscus, ACL, I think, one of the ligaments. And he looked at him and he said you need surgery. I can schedule you in the morning. And he is in a Canadian emergency room. Must have been his first day at work. He found out that he couldn't schedule this young man for surgery the next morning. He couldn't even schedule him for a review to get the surgery approved under the Canadian health care plan.

So he had to back up and put him on crutches. And 6 months later this young man was allowed to be examined by the doctor who approves the request for surgery, and 6 months later they actually did the surgery. Almost 1 year to the day, the surgery took place in Canada that would have taken place the very next morning in the United States. Meanwhile, this young man can't go to work, his leg atrophies, he is running around on crutches. His life has been altered because different things happen in your life in that fashion. He didn't get back in the groove. What does that cost when you let people come out? That is an example.

And I know that we have experts here tonight. And so watching that clock tick, I am very interested to hear what the gentleman from Georgia has to say, whether it be about the Hawkeyes, the Yellow Jackets, or his field of expertise.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I think that I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding. And I am not going to say one word about the Hawkeyes and the Yellow Jackets. Maybe we will come back to that another year. But congratulations, by the way, to the Hawkeyes. They did a great job.

Mr. Speaker, it is an opportunity to come before our colleagues tonight and to join with Representative KING from Iowa and Representative ROE, Dr. ROE from Tennessee, and later on you will hear from MICHELLE BACHMANN, Representative BACHMANN from Minnesota, talking about the health care bill and health care reform in general.

I think we would be remiss if we didn't talk about the election yesterday in the Bay State, Massachusetts. Many of my colleagues have already spoken about that. And there is a lot of political pundits on every channel, cable, broadcast, network, whatever, trying to analyze and say, well, what happened? How did this occur? And, you know, we all have our own opinion,

but quite honestly, I think it is a lot about health care.

It was kind of instructive that when people were asked, coming out of a voting booth, what they thought about the health care reform bill in the Bay State that the same percentage that were opposed to it is the percentage that Senator-elect SCOTT BROWN received in the election. It was the same margin. So clearly, health care was a significant issue in that race in my opinion.

I think the people in Massachusetts clearly had about a year-and-a-half, 2 years to look at the commonwealth care that was enacted. And they don't like it, Mr. Speaker. They don't like it because it, instead of lowering the cost of health care, it has driven it up. Although more people are insured and have coverage in the Bay State, they are, as my colleagues have talked about in regard to other systems, there is a long queue, there is a long wait. It is very difficult to get a physician to see you, particularly if you are one of those who has a subsidized policy.

And basically, the state is going broke. And they have had to make a number of changes. They have had to drop dental care as part of the coverage. They have had to drop many thousands of legal immigrants who were not citizens, but had coverage. They no longer have coverage. And I know my colleague especially, Mr. Speaker, Dr. ROE from Tennessee has probably already talked about TennCare and their experiment 10, 12, 15 years ago, and the miserable failure of that.

So yes indeed, health care had a lot to do with the outcome yesterday in Massachusetts. But it was not just health care. I think that people are so tired, Mr. Speaker, of this Federal Government ignoring them and dissing them, as the expression goes. We had the August recess that lasted 5 weeks, and all of these town hall meetings all across the country, and we come back, and you would think that the majority party and the administration would have listened to those people. And instead, what they did is they simply changed the number on the House bill. They took off H.R. 3200, because the people had railed against it so loudly over that 5-week period of time, instead they just changed the number on the bill.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I gladly yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. You can call a polecat a skunk, but it is still a polecat or a skunk, whatever you name it. I yield back.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Absolutely, the gentleman is right. And so people are sick and tired of being disrespected. They were very disappointed of course in the economic stimulus package, $787 billion that was supposed to keep the unemployment rate at 8 percent, no higher than 8 percent. It is 10.2 percent now. 16 million Americans out of work, many of them in the Bay State.

I think it is a message. It is a message to the administration, to President Obama, and the Democratic majority, Speaker PELOSI, Leader HARRY REID in the Senate. Look, you still have an opportunity, my colleagues, you still have an opportunity to come together in a bipartisan way and do things in an incremental fashion that truly will lower the cost of health insurance for everybody and make it better and rein in, yes, the abuses of the health insurance industry as well.

And what is this big rush, anyway? The Democratic majority, Mr. Speaker, insisted on getting it done in 2009. They didn't want to face this during an election year. Well, look, the American people are saying to us, and especially to the majority and to the President, We don't care about the next election. Get it right. Don't rush to judgment. What is the big hurry? Why not get it done in 2011 if it takes that long? But get it done right.

The people of Massachusetts went to the polls, they knew that their bill was an abject failure, and that is basically what they were saying. If the administration and this majority ignores it, they do it at their own peril.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from Iowa, because I know there are others that want to speak tonight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And reclaiming before I yield, I want to pose a question here for consideration. Canadian health care plan, the average length of time to wait for a knee replacement is 340 days, a hip replacement 196 days. Where I come from, we don't stand in line. I went to Moscow a while back, and I watched people hunched over in their shoulders with their big coats and hats walking around looking for a line to stand in. And then when they got to the end of the line, then they went and looked for another line to stand in. I think a lot of times they didn't even know why they were even standing in line.

And it occurred to me, and it may not be universally true, but it occurred to me that free people don't stand in line. And if you are standing in line at Kentucky Fried Chicken, that means that somebody ought to have a free market opportunity to set something up next door. And people will go over there and get their service. But that is what the free market principle does. People don't stand in line when it is a free market principle. I would submit also that people die in line.

I yield to the gentlelady from Minnesota.

□ 1845

Mr. KING of Iowa. The gentlelady from Minnesota.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

I also have so much esteem for my colleague from Tennessee, Dr. ROE, and also my colleague from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY. They are just wonderful examples, and they enlighten all of us who aren't medical professionals. But they've been there, done that. They have skin in the game, and they know what's at stake. They know what's at stake for those who have put so much into becoming physicians, who have put their life on the line to be healers, but also the people they serve. They see the real cost in human health, in terms of misery that is down the road if we embrace this system.

I come at it a little bit differently. My background is that I am a former Federal tax lawyer, and I see how egregious tax costs can destroy businesses, destroy families, individuals, farms and creativity. And also as a business owner. My husband and I have started two businesses. We're not a big deal; we've employed 50 people, but we do know what it is to take and start a business from scratch using our own equity, our own capital. We have to be disciplined and make a lot of good decisions. We have to get it right every time so that we can make a profit.

My husband told me that he spoke to a number of other small businessmen that have said to him they will have to cut jobs with their small businesses if this health care bill goes through. There are a lot of small business employers that would love to provide health insurance, but they can't because currently health insurance is so expensive.

I think one thing that cannot escape this discussion that we're having tonight among colleagues, whether we're health care professionals or tax lawyers or small business owners, is this; President Obama's Chief Economic Advisor, Christina Romer, said herself that if President Obama's plan would go into effect, that America would see 5.5 million jobs lost if we adopt his plan. Not only would it cost us trillions of dollars that we simply don't have, but it would cost us 5.5 million American jobs. It isn't that those jobs wouldn't be done, but they wouldn't be done in America. It's another 5.5 million jobs that would go offshore.

I yield to the gentleman from Tyler, Texas, LOU GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. So what you're saying is the President's health care bill really is a jobs bill, but instead of creating them, it eliminates them.

Mrs. BACHMANN. It eliminates them, and I think one can understand why. We saw a chart or a graph that was recently produced several weeks ago. It plotted all of the private-sector experience in the Presidents from the last 100 years. It showed that in President Obama's Cabinet, in his administration he has less private-sector experience in real job creation than any other administration: 7 percent experience. No wonder every answer that comes out of this administration is more spending, higher taxes, more government. But the last seven economic recessions, every blooming one of them

we have come out of the recession—from government? No. From small business creation.

We would love, in our small business, to create more jobs, but I will tell you this, from the other small business job creators that I know in Minnesota: Right now they are scared to death. They don't want to add more jobs because they know if they add more jobs, they're stuck with more costs that they may not be able to take. They don't want to hurt the existing people they have now that they hired. They don't want to have to close their doors and fold up. A great business in our State, Home Value stores, just announced last week that they were closing their doors after over 35 years in business. Why? Because of this job-killing, bone-crushing debt that's coming out of Washington, D.C. Let's reject that.

The American people last night rejected President Obama's decision because if there is one headline that would encapsulate all of 2009 it would have to be this: ''The Federal Government takeover of private industry.'' That's what last year was all about. The American people said no way; we believe in America, we believe in job creation, we believe in prosperity. And that's what last night's poll numbers reflected.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I would propose that it actually goes another step yet, and that is, we talked about the government takeover of the private sector, and we talked about between 30 percent and 33 percent of the private-sector profits nationalized by mostly this President's administration. We've seen the nationalization take place, the government takeover, but the most personal and private property we have is our own bodies. This is a government nationalization, a government takeover of our individual persons and bodies, managing our health care and seeking to tell us what we can eat and what we can't, what we can drink and what we can't, managing our own personal bodies. What could be a more egregious violation of liberty and freedom than that?

I would like to pose a question for a response here and maybe go down through some things in my mind and see if there is dissent among the esteemed Members of Congress that are here on the floor.

First I would ask you, if they impose a centrally controlled system of government-run health care, will it result in a loss of personal and economic liberties? And is it an indisputable violation of the principle of limited government established by the Constitution? Would you agree with that?

Mrs. BACHMANN. Absolutely. Yes, I would. I would agree with that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I will ask another question. If they impose a government-run health care system, would such system result in increased costs in taxes to individuals, to families, to businesses, as well as to all taxpayers at the Federal, State and local levels?

Mrs. BACHMANN. It would. And that's what I am so worried about as a tax lawyer, that this will mean diminished opportunities for Americans because we will see increased taxes in defiance of President Obama's promise to the American people.

Mr. KING of Iowa. What kind of harm would that do to the American economy and the businesses and jobs and productivity and quality of life?

Mrs. BACHMANN. It would be irreparable harm. It would be very difficult to come back from.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I will yield.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. What the gentlelady from Minnesota has said is absolutely true. Just in our area, at Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee, the largest employer in the county, 14,000 people—these are jobs that don't go overseas, they're not exported, these people are doing great work—new innovations, new treatments that may go away with this system—they're afraid to hire anybody. In my local town, our medical center, 9,000 employees in their system. The adjoining city has a medical system of 6,000. That's 15,000 people that work in health care in two cities with a little over 100,000 combined population bringing quality care to the people of Appalachia.

What I am worried about is if that's going to go away. Those jobs will dry up—and those are great jobs that are not exported anywhere, they are jobs for Americans with health insurance, with retirement plans, great benefits, and we may be tanking that also.

I want to just reminisce for a moment when I graduated from medical school and think back as the gentlelady from Minnesota, Congresswoman BACHMANN, was talking about. When I graduated from medical school there were five high blood pressure medications, three of them made you sicker than the high blood pressure did. Now we have over 50 wonderful medications to provide for people. Antibiotics, a plethora of antibiotics; we had one or two at the time I graduated. Ultrasounds, MRIs, PET scans, survival rates of cancer. The research is just astonishing that's going on in America. We are the leader in the world; the world looks to us for medical innovation. With this right here I'm afraid it will stymie that innovation.

I think back—and we were talking about this a moment ago—one of my good friends and a colleague, a medical colleague whose wife is English, his sister-in-law lived in England. She died of chronic lymphocytic leukemia. That's a disease that Americans just don't die of any longer. We live with that disease. It's treatable. She was treated with a blood transfusion. We could have done that 50 years ago. That's all the treatment. And she got that treatment because she was too old to be treated. We don't do that in this country. And I'm afraid we're heading down that path.

I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, the value of life changes.

And another point, a point that I think JOHN SHADEGG made very well, is that this policy here—whatever number they attach to it or whatever they might try to do—will have mandates in it. And what it will do is it will require certain health insurance policies to have those mandates covered in there, and it mandates that people buy them or employers provide them. And his case is that that's a tax. I would ask the man who is the judge if he could explain why it's a tax when the government makes someone buy a policy and then takes it out of their taxes if they don't and puts them in debtors prison if they hold back. If you have to buy something, why does that make it a tax?

Mr. GOHMERT. If it's mandated by the government, then certainly it's a tax, because that is all that the government is entitled to do. Under our Constitution, you can't force somebody to buy a product.

And I appreciate your directing that question to me because obviously all the prior questions were directed at my friends from Louisiana and Minnesota because you qualified it by saying, This question is for the esteemed Members. So I stayed quiet throughout your answers, but now you have included me as the unesteemed Member.

Mr. KING of Iowa. They're polar opposites, Mr. GOHMERT; they're Tennessee and Minnesota.

Mr. GOHMERT. Yes, exactly, Tennessee. Tennessee and Minnesota.

But that is what has gotten people upset across the country and is what we saw in Massachusetts. They've seen what's going on around here.

There was a promise that C–SPAN would be covering all the negotiations because we're talking about people's lives, the length of their lives, and their loved ones, how long are they going to be able to be living in this world, whether they will get the medication they need, or are they going to be told you're too old? So as the President so ably said before he was elected, those negotiations need to be out there. And all we've seen is the nasty, sordid deals that were cut after being behind closed doors so that you have insurance companies signing onto the President's bill. And then you go through and say, ah, here are the pages where they got their deal cut. Ah, here is the deal that the plaintiffs lawyers got. Ah, here's the deal the pharmaceutical industry got. And they're conflicting. And it is such a mass of mess the way they've cut these deals and they've forged them together. And the ones that are going to suffer are the people in this country when there is no reason to.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Should they be negotiated publicly and free of political favoritism, Mr. GOHMERT?

Mr. GOHMERT. Exactly.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If I could just respond on the tax portion. Government can directly mandate that you must pay a percentage or a fee, which is a direct tax. But if government requires you to do something or purchase a health insurance policy in conformity with what government says must be the items in that policy, that's just as much a tax as if government says you must pay a percent or an exact amount. The final result is the same because the taxpayers' pockets are picked for what government mandates it must be picked for. It is a tax, pure and simple. That's the point.

Mr. GOHMERT. And along those lines—I appreciate the gentleman yielding—we've heard the President say, well, you know, States require you to buy insurance for your car, so this is nothing new.

Mrs. BACHMANN. It's not the same.

Mr. GOHMERT. It is very new. Of course we've heard the argument that actually, yes, States do require you to buy insurance if you're going to drive a car. You don't have to own a car or drive a car to live in a State, not in any State.

But another thing that's lost in the equation too is there is no mandate by any State in this country to buy insurance to protect your own car and your own person. You are required to buy insurance to protect the other person whom you may harm while you're driving. And all of that is based on the privilege of driving, it is not based on just living.

We are supposed to have, under our Constitution, as was mentioned in the Declaration of Independence, this right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Whether you're an unborn child or whether you're an old geezer like some of us, you actually have a right to life. And here the Federal Government is saying we're going to snuff yours out a little early because we just don't find that you're all that productive. Where is that line drawn once they're allowed to say now you buy a product or you don't get to live here?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I have this other thought. It occurs to me, and I believe in H.R. 3200 there was an amendment offered that would have required Members of Congress to live under the same law. That offer for that exemption was voted down by Democrats. So if you had a bad policy, wouldn't you want to exempt yourselves from that?

I would ask the gentleman from Tennessee what he thinks of that.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I think you're absolutely right. I mean, it's the ''do unto others, except don't do it to me.''

Mr. KING of Iowa. Would you support language that would require that Members of Congress stand in the same shoes as the citizens of America?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. There is not one of us standing here now that wouldn't agree with that 100 percent.

And Congressman GOHMERT makes a good point about the mandate. Let's give some practical experience about what's happening to the mandate. Mandate means you have to purchase something, and in Massachusetts it's health insurance. It also says that you cannot be denied because of a preexisting condition. So the Harvard Pilgrim health care plan, beginning in March of 2008 until this year, 2009, 1 year, they found this, that almost half the people who got their health insurance through the Harvard Pilgrim plan kept it for an average of 5 months.

□ 1900

You couldn't turn them down, so they waited until they got sick, and when they got well, they dropped it. If you were in that 5-month period of time, that plan spent over $2,000 a month on those folks. For the other folks, like me, who just bought it for the year, they averaged then about $300 a month. So people scammed the system. They paid the tax until they got sick because it was cheaper than buying the health insurance. Then they bought the health insurance and kept it until they got well.

It's the same thing as using Congressman GOHMERT's example of a car wreck. Well, you have your car wreck, and then you buy the best car insurance policy you can, and when your car is fixed, you drop it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. It is so important also to note that, with all the talk about our friends across the aisle who are concerned about the working poor in America, if you look at the bill that was passed out of this House, it makes it very clear: if you can't afford the great policy that is mandated and if you're just above the poverty line where the government is going to pay for it, you'll have an additional 2½ percent income tax on your income. That is outrageous. Those are the people who, if they could afford to buy the insurance, they would buy the insurance. Now you're going to pop them with another 2½ percent tax. That's not caring about the working poor, about the people who are helping make the engine in this country go.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, it's quite likely that this fellow right here, the health choices administration, czarissioner, would probably rule that those high-deductible, high-copayment, low-premium policies wouldn't fit his idea of what health insurance is in America. So the low-income people who can only buy in, according to the way this thing was laid out in negotiations in the Senate, would have about four different tiers of policies.

It's interesting: those who have the lower premiums pay the least amount. Those who have the highest premiums pay the highest amount. The people who can pay the highest premiums are the ones who get the best kind of health insurance out of that, and those who can afford the least have to have the highest copayment, but they can't do the high deductible because that doesn't fit the socialist model. That's part of what's going on.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If I could add to that, the one thing that doesn't get talked about very much here is the iron ceiling on wages that was contained in this bill.

If you have a double-income couple with no kids and if their combined income is $64,000 a year or more, at that point they lose all Federal subsidy. So what they have to do is go out, and if their employers pay the 8 percent fine to the government and don't provide health insurance, they have to go with after-tax dollars and purchase health plans, which, in Minnesota, would cost about $14,000 a year. So you'd have a couple making $64,000 a year who has to go and buy a plan out-of-pocket; but if the couple made $63,000 a year, Uncle Sam would pay their way. That's the iron ceiling on wages. There is no incentive to make a dollar more, because you would be so heavily penalized by going out of the subsidy, and that kills the American Dream.

Why would we have a couple of people here in this Chamber make a decision for over 300 million people? Let's free up decision-making for 300 million people to make the cheapest and best choices for themselves.

I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota and the other participants here tonight from across the board, from Tennessee and Texas.

I will just summarize what's going on here.

I think that a government-run health care system takes away our liberty. It nationalizes our bodies. It will result in increased costs and taxes. The taxes come in the form of mandates as well as whether we think we're paying taxes or premiums. It should not add to the crushing national debt or impose mandates. No tax dollars should go for abortions or for illegal aliens. It should be negotiated publicly, out in the daylight. It should apply to all Members of Congress. It should provide equal protection under the law. It should be free market-based, and it should protect the vital doctor-patient relationship.

That's the summary of what we want to do here, and it's what we have the opportunity to do because the cavalry came riding over the hill just in the nick of time in the form of, today, Senator-elect Scott Brown and, tomorrow, Massachusetts Senator Scott Brown.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I yield back the balance of my time.

## CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TERRORISTS WHO THREATEN TO DISRUPT THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111–88)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHAUER) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the Federal Register for publication the enclosed notice stating that the emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process is to continue in effect beyond January 23, 2010.

The crisis with respect to the grave acts of violence committed by foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that led to the declaration of a national emergency on January 23, 1995, has not been resolved. Terrorist groups continue to engage in activities that have the purpose or effect of threatening the Middle East peace process and that are hostile to United States interests in the region. Such actions constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process and to maintain in force the economic sanctions against them to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 20, 2010.*

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

## 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. PAYNE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, January 27.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, January 27.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, January 27.

Mr. GOODLATTE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, January 26 and 27.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

## BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on January 20, 2010 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 3788. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located in 3900 Darrow Road in Stow, Ohio, as the ''Corporal Joseph A. Tomci Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3767. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 170 North Main Street in Smithfield, Utah, as the ''W. Hazen Hillyard Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3667. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16555 Springs Street in White Springs, Florida, as the ''Clyde L. Hillhouse Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3539. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 427 Harrison Avenue in Harrison, New Jersey, as the ''Patricia D. McGinty-Juhl Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3319. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 440 South Gulling Street in Portola, California, as the ''Army Specialist Jeremiah Paul McCleery Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3072. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9810 Halls Ferry Road in St. Louis, Missouri, as the ''Coach Jodie Bailey Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2877. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 76 Brookside Avenue in Chester, New York, as the ''1st Lieutenant Louis Allen Post Office''.

H.R. 1817. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 116 North West Street in Somerville, Tennessee, as the ''John S. Wilder Post Office Building''.

H.R. 1377. To amend title 38, United States Code, to expand veteran eligibility for reimbursement by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for emergency treatment furnished in a non-Department facility, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 21, 2010, 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:

5606. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-271, ''Fiscal Year 2010 Income Tax Secured Revenue Bond and General Obligation Bond Issuance Temporary Approval Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5607. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-270, ''Retirement Incentive Temporary Amendment Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5608. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-269, ''African American Civil War Memorial Freedom Foundation, Inc. African-American Civil War Museum Approval Temporary Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5609. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-267, ''Disclosure of Information to the Council Amendment Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5610. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-268, ''Fiscal Year 2010 Limited Grant-Making Authority Clarification Temporary Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5611. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-263, ''Public Land Surplus Standards Amendment Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5612. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-266, ''Prescription Drug Dispensing Practices Reform Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5613. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-265, ''Whistleblower Protection Amendment Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5614. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-264, ''Fire Alarm Notice and Tenant Fire Safety Amendment Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5615. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 121 to Mile Marker 122, Above Head of Passes, in the vicinity of the I-310 Bridge, Luling, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-019] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5616. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety

Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 175 to Mile Marker 176, Above Head of Passes, Donaldsonville, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-020] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5617. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 229.4 to Mile Marker 230, Above Head of Passes, Baton Rouge, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-021] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5618. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 215 to Mile Marker 217, Above Head of Passes, Longwood, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-033] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5619. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 160 to Mile Marker 162, Above Head of Passes, Convent, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-034] (RIN: 1625-AA00), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5620. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 94 to Mile Marker 95.5, Above Head of Passes, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-035] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5621. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 89 to Mile Marker 91, Above Head of Passes, Algiers, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-037] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5622. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 87 to Mile Marker 88, Above Head of Passes, Chalmette, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-008] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5623. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 94 to Mile Marker 97, Above Head of Passes, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-009] (RIN: 1623-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5624. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 87 to Mile Marker 88, Above Head of Passes, Chalmette, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-010] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5625. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, the L & N Bridge at mile marker 2.9 to the Industrial Locks at mile marker 0.0, and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway from Mile Marker 11.2 to Mile Marker 8.2, East of Harvey Lock, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-012] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5626. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 95 to Mile Marker 97, Above Head of Passes, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-013] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5627. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Maker 138.5 to Mile Marker 139.5, Above Head of Passes, Reserve, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-014] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5628. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 303.0 to the Entrance of the Southwest Pass Safety Fairway, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-015] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5629. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Harvey Canal, Mile Marker 4.0 to Mile Marker 5.0, Above Head of Passes, Harvey, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-016] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5630. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 94.3 to Mile Marker 95.3, Above Head of Passes, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-017] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5631. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 228.8 to Mile Marker 229.8, Above Head of Passes, Baton Rouge, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-018] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5632. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, L & N Bridge to the Industrial Locks, and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway From Mile Marker 11.2 to Mile Marker 8.2, East of the Harvey Lock, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-007] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5633. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intacoastal Waterway, Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, 500 yards North and South of the Florida Avenue Bridge, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-100] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5634. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Harvey Canal, Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mile Marker 1.7 to Mile Marker 1.9, in the vicinity of Houma Industries, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-104] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5635. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, Mile Marker 2.3 to Mile Marker 2.9, in the vicinity of the L&N Railroad Bridge, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-105] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5636. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Intracoastal Waterway, Mile Marker 11.9 to Mile Marker 12.1, West of the Harvey Locks, in the vicinity of the Wagner Bridge, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-001] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5637. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 156.0 to Mile Marker 157.0, extending the entire width of the river, St. James, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-002] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5638. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 94.0 to Mile Marker 96.0, Above Head of Passes, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-003] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5639. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Maker 6 to Mile Marker 7, Above Head of Passes, Pilottown, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-004] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5640. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 94.5 to Mile Marker 95.5, Above Head of Passes, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-005] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5641. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 88 to Mile Marker 90, Above Head of Passes, Chalmette, LA [COTP New Orleans-06-006] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5642. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf of Mexico, Posit 29°26.8N 093°25.8W

[COTP Port Arthur-06-025] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5643. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf of Mexico, Posit 29°26.8N 093°25.8W [COTP Port Arthur-06-026] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5644. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ocean Beach Pier, Ocean Beach, CA [COTP San Diego 07-452] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5645. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Oceanside Pier, Oceanside, CA [COTP San Diego 07-552] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5646. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Red River, 500 yards North and South of the Long-Allen Bridge, Shreveport-Bossier City, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-094] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5647. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Quachita River, Mile Marker 168 to Mile Marker 169, in the vicinity of the Forsythe Recreational Boat Launch, Monroe, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-095] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5648. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, 500 yards North and South of the Florida Avenue Bridge, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-096] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5649. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, 500 yards North and South of the Florida Avenue Bridge, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-097] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5650. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, 500 yards North and South of the Florida Avenue Bridge, New Orleans, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-098] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5651. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 229.5 to Mile Marker 230.5, Baton Rouge, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-099] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

*[Omitted from the Record on January 19, 2010]*

H.R. 2989. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than February 26, 2010.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself and Mr. HOEKSTRA):

H.R. 4471. A bill to clarify that revocation of an alien's visa or other documentation is not subject to judicial review; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 4472. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to take action with respect to the Chicago waterway system to prevent the migration of bighead and silver carps into Lake Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 4473. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish an extended special enrollment period for individuals to enroll in part B of Medicare; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MINNICK (for himself and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.R. 4474. A bill to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BACA, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. COLE, Mr. SHULER, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 4475. A bill to amend sections 14006 and 14007 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 to reserve funds under the programs established under such sections for payments to the Bureau of Indian Education of the Department of the Interior for Indian children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 4476. A bill to suspend the current compensation packages for the senior executives of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and establish compensation for such positions in accordance with rates of pay for senior employees in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 4477. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to establish a medical surveillance system to identify members of the Armed Forces exposed to chemical hazards resulting from the disposal of waste in Iraq and Afghanistan, to prohibit the disposal of waste by the Armed Forces in a manner that would produce dangerous levels of toxins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 4478. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to direct the President to take actions to address the needs of children and families who are victims of a major disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 4479. A bill to enforce discretionary spending limits to rein in spending, reduce the deficit, and regain control of the Federal budget process; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 4480. A bill to amend the Community Services Block Grant Act to authorize appropriations for national or regional instructional programs for low-income youth; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 4481. A bill to reduce the Federal budget deficit in a responsible manner; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 4482. A bill to apply recaptured taxpayer investments toward reducing the national debt; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Appropriations, 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. ROSKAM:

H.R. 4483. A bill to prohibit compensation for any officer or employee of the Federal National Mortgage Association or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, during any conservatorship or receivership of such enterprise, in an amount exceeding the compensation provided to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARDOZA:

H. Con. Res. 229. Concurrent resolution supporting the designation of the facility under development by the Stanislaus County Ag Center Foundation, in Stanislaus County, California, as the National Ag Science Center; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Res. 1019. A resolution recognizing the fifth anniversary of the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement between the Government of the Republic of the Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army and calling for urgent and aggressive actions to establish peace in all regions of Sudan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MARKEY of Colorado (for herself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado):

H. Res. 1020. A resolution honoring the 95th anniversary of the signing of the Rocky Mountain National Park Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Mrs.

CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. NORTON, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SIRES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. WATT):

H. Res. 1021. A resolution expressing condolences to and solidarity with the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake of January 12, 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MASSA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. CHU, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WATT, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Ms. WATERS):

H. Res. 1022. A resolution honoring the life and sacrifice of Medgar Evers and congratulating the United States Navy for naming a supply ship after Medgar Evers; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANCE:

H. Res. 1023. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to remove the authority of the Committee on Rules to waive clause 5 of rule XVI or clause 9 of rule XXII; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H. Res. 1024. A resolution expressing support for designation of January as Poverty in America Awareness Month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 211: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 213: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 235: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 273: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 391: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 460: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 537: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 558: Mr. TONKO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 678: Mr. HOLT and Mr. BARROW.
H.R. 690: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 772: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 847: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1079: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1132: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 1351: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1378: Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 1392: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 1469: Mr. SHULER, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1557: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1708: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1806: Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 1816: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 1826: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1855: Mr. SCHAUER.
H.R. 1964: Mr. CLAY and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 2043: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2067: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2084: Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 2135: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2149: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2243: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey.
H.R. 2254: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 2296: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 2305: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 2324: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2443: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 2446: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 2455: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. MASSA.
H.R. 2497: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 2546: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 2555: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2565: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 2730: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 2981: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.
H.R. 3019: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 3092: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 3101: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3144: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 3264: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 3359: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
H.R. 3381: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3412: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 3458: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 3480: Ms. BALDWIN and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3486: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3491: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3564: Mr. COSTA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3577: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 3578: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 3615: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 3652: Mrs. BONO MACK.
H.R. 3695: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 3734: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3757: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 3758: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
H.R. 3764: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 3790: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.
H.R. 3885: Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 3888: Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 3936: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 3995: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 4003: Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 4014: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. CAMPBELL.
H.R. 4044: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 4065: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 4070: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4099: Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 4128: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 4129: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 4140: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4186: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 4188: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 4191: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 4192: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 4196: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. WU, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 4198: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 4199: Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 4227: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 4233: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 4239: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 4255: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 4260: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 4269: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. HALL of New York.
H.R. 4278: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 4295: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 4296: Mr. KAGEN.
H.R. 4302: Ms. RICHARDSON and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4329: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 4330: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 4332: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 4370: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4386: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 4396: Mr. BOREN and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 4400: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PERRIELLO, and Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 4403: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 4415: Mr. WOLF, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4462: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 4463: Mr. OLSON and Mr. BOEHNER.
H.R. 4464: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. FOXX, Mr. PITTS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LATTA, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Ms. GRANGER, and Ms. FALLIN.
H.J. Res. 1: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.J. Res. 61: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H. Con. Res. 137: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Con. Res. 169: Mr. TIAHRT.
H. Con. Res. 170: Mr. ARCURI.
H. Res. 22: Mr. SNYDER.
H. Res. 363: Mr. ELLISON.
H. Res. 704: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BOREN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HOLT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. FLEMING, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H. Res. 847: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H. Res. 873: Mr. GOHMERT.

H. Res. 888: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H. Res. 925: Mr. MURPHY of New York and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Res. 947: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Res. 960: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. SCALISE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HENSARLING, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. PITTS.

H. Res. 967: Mr. FARR.

H. Res. 975: Mr. MASSA.

H. Res. 990: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WU, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Res. 997: Mr. FILNER.

H. Res. 1003: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HARE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. OBEY, Mr. WATT, Ms. TITUS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. HALVORSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FARR, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. KILROY, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BERRY, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H. Res. 1006: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H. Res. 1009: Ms. HARMAN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Res. 1010: Mr. SABLAN.

H. Res. 1011: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BOCCIERI, Ms. CHU, Mrs. LUMMIS, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HODES, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. WEINER.

H. Res. 1013: Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 1018: Mr. WAXMAN.

## DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4191: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

United States
*of* America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

*Vol. 156* WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2010 *No. 6*

# *Senate*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TOM UDALL, a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, thank You for the gift of a new year. We have received great benefits from Your hands and lift to You our grateful praise.

Lord, lead our lawmakers on the road You have chosen. Guide them with Your counsel and teach them with Your precepts. Give them the spirit they ought to have that they may do what they ought to do. Lord, this is the day You have made. We will rejoice and be glad in You, for Your joy is our strength. We pray in Your great name. Amen.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable TOM UDALL 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.

## APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The legislative clerk read as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
*Washington, DC, January 20, 2010.*

*To the Senate:*

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM UDALL, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
*President pro tempore.*

Mr. UDALL thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

## RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

## SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following leader remarks, the Senate will proceed to a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each. The time will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

Following morning business, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Beverly Baldwin Martin of Georgia to be a U.S. circuit judge for the Eleventh Circuit. Debate on the nomination is limited to 1 hour, equally divided and controlled between Senators LEAHY and SESSIONS or their designees. Upon the use or yielding back of the time, the Senate will proceed to vote on confirmation of that nomination.

The Senate will recess from 12:30 until 2:15 p.m. to allow for our weekly caucus meetings.

We expect to consider H.J. Res. 45, a joint resolution increasing the statutory limit on the public debt, under a previous agreement later today.

## MEASURES PLACED ON CALENDAR—H.R. 3961 and H.R. 4154

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is my understanding there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The clerk will read the title of the bills for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3961) to amend Title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reform the Medicare SGR payment system for physicians and to reinstitute and update the Pay-As-You-Go requirement of budget neutrality on new tax and mandatory spending legislation, enforced by the threat of annual, automatic sequestration.

A bill (H.R. 4154) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the new carryover basis rules in order to prevent tax increases and the imposition of compliance burdens on many more estates than would benefit from repeal, to retain the estate tax with a $3,500,000 exemption, to reinstitute and update the Pay-As-You-Go requirement of budget neutrality on new tax and mandatory spending legislation, enforced by the threat of annual, automatic sequestration, and for other purposes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I object to further proceedings with respect to these two bills.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bills will be placed on the calendar.

## MAKING LEGISLATIVE PROGRESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, visiting with Nevadans, as I have done during these past several weeks, it is impossible not to be motivated to get back to the business of legislating. It is impossible to ignore their grief over growing foreclosures or the uncertainty of unemployment or the frustration of fighting insurance companies for their families' health.

It is just as evident that the people of Nevada and the Nation need us to work toward sensible solutions rather than drown once again in the partisan bickering that consumed much of last year.

Some elections go your way; some elections go the other way. It is the nature of democratic politics in a very diverse Nation. But regardless of an outcome of an election, as I have said many times, the American people demand that we work together as partners, not partisans, to improve their lives. That is as true after Republican victories as it is after Democratic victories.

In the first half of the 111th Congress, even with the minority's minimal help,



Printed on recycled paper.

we made significant progress. While last year's final few months were dominated by a debate over health insurance reform that will save lives, save money, and save Medicare, that historic step was only one of many accomplishments that we are proud to have passed last year.

We began this Congress determined to strengthen and stabilize the economy for working families. That is why we immediately cut taxes for the middle class and small businesses. That is why we immediately started the Lilly Ledbetter legislation to equalize pay for women in America. That is why we started the process of creating good-paying jobs here at home and investing in our future.

Just last week, the White House Council of Economic Advisers found that as many as 2 million Americans have the stimulus to thank for their jobs, as does the growing gross domestic product. But there is more to do, that is for sure.

We protected consumers by cracking down on abusive credit card companies, and we have been trying to do that for a long time. Last year, we were able to get it done, finally—to get under control the abuses credit card companies have been doing to the American people for so long. We cracked down on mortgage fraud scams, the scams that take place when times are tough. We changed the law. We rooted out corporate fraud. But there is more to do.

We started to thaw our frozen credit markets so Americans can get the loans they need to buy a car, send a child to college, or start a new business. But there is more to do.

We are helping responsible homeowners keep their homes, and helped more homeowners to keep the equity in their homes. We helped more families to buy their first home. A lot of people can claim the idea for the first-time home buyer tax credit. The idea came, as far as I know, from JOHNNY ISAKSON of Georgia. It was a tremendously important program that is still going on. We extended that. But even though we have done that, there is more to do.

We helped millions of children stay healthy by expanding CHIP. We extended it by about 14 million children who can go to the doctor when they are sick or to the hospital when they are hurt. We made it easier by far for these kids to get the help and care they need.

We made it harder for tobacco companies to prey on these children. We learned, and we have known for some time, that the tobacco habit starts, most of the time, when you are a teenager. With this legislation we had been trying to pass for decades, we were finally able to get it done—to focus on tobacco companies and why there has to be control placed on them. Even though we have done that, there is more to do.

We extended unemployment insurance for millions and extended COBRA subsidies so those struggling to find work can feed their families, fuel our economy, and afford decent medical care. But there is more to do.

We supported the travel and tourism industries, which will create tens of thousands of jobs and cut our deficit by hundreds of millions of dollars. Even after having done that, there is more to do.

We helped hundreds of thousands of drivers afford more fuel-efficient cars and trucks. It was such a good idea—cash for clunkers—that now I heard on the news that Japan is going to do it. That will be a boon for American car manufacturers because Japan said those Japanese people who decide to use the Cash for Clunkers Program can buy American cars. Even though we have done that, there is more to do.

With the national service bill named for Senator Kennedy, we made it easier for more Americans to serve their country like our heroes of generations past. With one of the most important conservation bills in many decades, we protected public lands for generations to come. But there is more to do.

We have given our troops, veterans, and their families the support they deserve, including better battlefield equipment, better care for our wounded warriors, and a well-earned pay raise. We also cut waste and fraud in the Pentagon's purchase of military weapons. But there is more to do.

This Congress also made history by pursuing justice and ensuring equality for every single American. With a hate crimes bill that bears Emmett Till's name, we stood up for those who were victims of violence because of their race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation. With the fair pay bill in Lilly Ledbetter's name, we stood up for those who are targets of discrimination in the workplace because of their gender or background.

We passed overdue appropriations bills, new appropriations bills, and an honest, responsible budget that makes sound investments in every part of our country. The Senate confirmed President Obama's outstanding nominee for the Supreme Court, Sonia Sotomayor.

It is a long list of accomplishments, but I assure the Senate that we are just getting started. We have a lot more to do.

In the coming year, we will ensure all Americans can access affordable health care, and we will deny insurance companies the ability to deny health care to the sick, and we will slash our deficit in the process.

We will help more Americans keep their homes and their jobs, and we will continue to help our economy not only recover but prosper once again.

We will continue to create new jobs, including good-paying clean energy jobs that can never be outsourced. You can see throughout the country that happening. A week ago Monday, 2 days ago, I was in a place about 35 miles outside of Las Vegas at the Harry Allen plant that is going to be the most clean natural gas facility for producing electricity in America. About 700 men and women were working on that construction project. At that construction project, there were people walking and running and doing the jobs they needed to do, with trucks moving back and forth.

The reason we were there is because the Western Area Power Administration, WAPA, under the stimulus bill we passed, had the ability to do loans that were very low-interest loans. We were there to announce a public-private partnership between WAPA and others, which will bring electricity from the northern part of the State to the southern part of Nevada for the first time in Nevada's history.

We became a State in 1864. Why is that important? It will allow Nevada to be energy independent in 2½ to 3 years. Just as important, we also will be able to produce far more electricity than Nevada needs because now, with this power line that will create hundreds and hundreds of jobs, we will also have a lot of energy projects for that full 250-mile area. They will be able to do solar, wind, geothermal and bring that onto the power line. That is only the first phase. After that, it has been agreed by WAPA that they can do stage 2, which will bring electricity from the Northwest into Nevada and, of course, California and the whole Southwest. That is a good project and an example of good-paying clean energy jobs that can never be outsourced.

We will tackle our daunting energy and climate challenges, and by doing that we will strengthen our national security, our environment, and our economy.

We need to look no further than Boone Pickens, who talks about this every day of his life. We will have a more secure Nation, and we will lessen our dependence on foreign oil. We will use the resources we have, among which are wind, Sun, geothermal, and now we are the largest holder of natural gas of any country in the world. That is what Boone Pickens is talking about—using our own energy, not continuing importing oil.

As we do all these things, we will continue to leave a seat at the table for our Republican colleagues. Whether their caucus comprises 40 or 41 members, each composes this body of 100. Our individual caucuses—one that will have 59 and one that will have 41—should all be united within the walls of this Chamber and not defined by the aisle that divides the desks.

Today is the first anniversary of the first time our President addressed our Nation as our President. One year ago today, standing on steps just a short distance from here, he reflected that our Nation had chosen ''unity of purpose over conflict and discord.'' He asked us to put aside the differences and dogmas that paralyze our politics.

We can answer that call this year—not just because President Obama requested it but because the American people justly demand it.

By and large, those in the minority have shown, so far, far too little interest in working with us. More important, they have shown far too little interest in working on the interests of their constituents.

Mr. President, I called my office early this morning and asked my faithful assistant, Janice Shelton, to arrange a call for me to talk to the new, soon-to-be Senator from Massachusetts, SCOTT BROWN. I look forward to visiting with him. I look forward to welcoming him to the Senate and asking him that he work with us. It is certainly a conversation I look forward to.

I hope in this new year we will resolve to leave partisan political motivation behind. I hope we will share and renew the motivation to get to work, to legislate for the good of this country.

## RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

## SCOTT BROWN VICTORY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, first, I welcome everyone back after what I hope was a restful time away from Washington. It is good to be here. I can assure everyone that Republicans are energized and eager to pick up where we left off. There is a lot to do, and we are ready.

The news of the day, of course, is that we will soon be welcoming a new Senator into our ranks. It has been a long time—a very long time—since the people of Massachusetts sent a Republican to the Senate. So I congratulate Senator-elect SCOTT BROWN on his decisive victory last night.

I had a chance to speak with him last night. I think it was truly a remarkable turnout and decision on the part of the people of that State.

There is a reason the Nation was focused on this race. The American people have made it abundantly clear they are more interested in shrinking unemployment than expanding government. They are tired of bailouts. They are tired of government spending more than ever at a time when most people are spending less. They do not want the government taking over health care. They made that abundantly clear last night in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

This is why Americans are electing good Republican candidates who they hope will reverse a year-long Democratic trend of spending too much, borrowing too much, and taxing too much. The voters have spoken. They want a course correction. We should listen to them.

Today, we will have a chance to show we have gotten the message when we take up legislation that would raise the national debt limit. The reason we are being asked to raise the limit on the national credit card is clear. It is because the majority has spent the past year spending money we do not have on stimulus bills that do not stimulate the economy, on budgets that double the debt in 5 years and triples it in 10. We need to move in a new direction—a dramatically new direction. That is the message of Virginia. That is the message of New Jersey. That is the message of Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

## RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

## MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business for 1 hour, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees and with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

## HEALTH CARE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, Massachusetts voters yesterday sent a clear message that the Democratic majority in Congress is not in touch with the American people and that we ought to restart the health care debate.

Senator-elect SCOTT BROWN's independent voice will provide a much needed check and balance to a Congress that has become dominated by more taxes, more spending, and more cash takeovers. Nothing demonstrates that need more than the so-called health care reform bill, a 2,700-page attempt to remodel 17 percent of the American economy that was concocted in secret, presented to the Senate over the weekend before Christmas during the worst snowstorm in years, voted on in the middle of the night, and passed 5 days later, on Christmas Eve, without one single Republican vote.

Now that the people have spoken in Massachusetts, we should abandon these arrogant notions of trying to turn our entire health care system upside down all at once and, instead, set a clear goal of reducing health care costs and then work together, step by step, to re-earn the trust of the American people—an approach Republican Senators urged exactly 173 different times on the floor of the Senate during last year.

If you will examine the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you will find that Republican Senators have been proposing a step-by-step approach to confronting our Nation's challenges 173 different times during 2009. On health care, we first suggested setting a clear goal: reducing costs. Then we proposed the first six steps toward achieving that goal: one, allowing small businesses to pool their resources to purchase health plans; two, reducing junk lawsuits against doctors; three, allowing the purchase of insurance across State lines; four, expanding health savings accounts; five, promoting wellness and prevention; and, six, taking steps to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse.

We offered these 6 proposals in complete legislative text totaling 182 pages. The Democratic majority rejected all six and ridiculed the approach, in part, because our approach was not comprehensive.

A good place to restart the health care debate would be to abandon plans to send a huge bill to States—that is, every State except Nebraska—to pay for Medicaid expansion. The 60 Senators who voted for this so-called health care reform legislation ought to be sentenced to go home and serve as Governor for two terms to try to pay for it because what these Senators would find is that States are broke, and there will either be higher State taxes or higher college tuition or both to pay for what the Democratic Governor of Tennessee has called ''the mother of all unfunded mandates.''

That mandate arrogantly expands Medicaid and, to help pay for it, would send a 3-year, $25 billion bill to Governors who, in turn, will send the bill to State taxpayers and then to college students. That is akin to your big-spending Uncle Sam hiring someone to paint your house and then sending the bill to you, even though you told Uncle Sam you already spent all your available money sending your kid to college. Of course, Uncle Sam does not have to balance its budget and you do.

I speak today not just as a Senator but as a former Governor worried about our States and as a former president of a great public university worried about our college students, many of whom are seeking an education to get a job.

Washington policies are turning our Federal constitutional system upside down. They are transforming autonomous State governments into bankrupt wards of the central government. In doing so, they are making it harder for States to support public higher education; therefore, damaging its quality and damaging the opportunity for Americans to afford it.

Governor Schwarzenegger of California said:

> With a $19 billion deficit, the last thing we need is another $3 billion bill for Medicaid.

At the University of California, students are paying a 32-percent tuition increase. Why? Because, according to the New York Times, ''the University of California now receives only half as much support from the State per student as it did in 1990.''

Why is that? Because when Governors make up their budgets, it usually comes down to a choice between exploding Medicaid costs and higher education, and Medicaid, hopelessly entangled with expensive Washington policies and mandates, usually wins.

This is not a new problem. It was a problem when I was Governor 30 years ago. It became a bigger problem between 2000 and 2006, when Medicaid spending for State governments rose 63 percent, while spending for higher education went up only 17 percent.

The Association of American Universities and President Obama's Budget Director both have warned us that the drop in State support is hurting the quality of American public higher education, and the problem gets worse.

Some estimates predict the State share of Medicaid spending will go from $138 billion in 2007 to $181 billion in 2011. Yet instead of fixing the problem of exploding Medicaid costs and its impact on higher education, the health care bill would make it worse.

Over the Christmas holidays in my State, the most talked about part of the health care bill was the so-called cornhusker kickback, which makes taxpayers and students all over America pay for Nebraska's Medicaid so Nebraskans will not have to raise their taxes and tuition.

I can guarantee you any Senator who is sentenced to go home and serve as Governor—except perhaps in Nebraska—would not vote for this health care bill.

The second recent big blow to States and to higher education has been the stimulus package, which was hailed as bailing States out but instead will soon push them over the financial cliff.

This is how the Democratic Lieutenant Governor of New York explained it in a Wall Street Journal article on January 8. He said:

. . . states, instead of cutting spending in transportation, education, and health care, have been forced to keep most of their expenditures at previous levels and use Federal funds only as supplements. The net result of this: The federal stimulus has led states to increase overall spending in these core areas, which in effect has only raised the height of the cliff from which state spending will fall if stimulus funds evaporate.

On top of all this is the dramatic deterioration of the autonomous role of the States in our Federal system. Thanks, in part, to the stimulus, federally collected tax dollars have risen to 40 percent of State budgets. So instead of serving as autonomous laboratories of democracy in a Federal system, States are becoming little more than heavily regulated and increasingly insolvent administrative divisions of the central government in Washington.

Some are suggesting a new stimulus to bail out the States. Why should we even consider that when the last one is helping to push States off the financial cliff? Why should we pass a new health care bill that makes it worse for States; that is, every State except Nebraska.

Wouldn't it be better to restart the health care debate and take a series of steps to reduce health care costs without the Medicaid mandate?

Instead of expanding Medicaid and sending the States the bill, why not reform Medicaid, which has become an embarrassing administrative nightmare, where $30 billion a year goes to waste, fraud, and abuse, according to the Government Accountability Office.

Instead of dumping 15 million to 18 million more low-income Americans into a Medicaid Program, in which 50 percent of doctors—50 percent of doctors—will not take new patients, shouldn't we try a better idea?

Lieutenant Governor Ravitch suggests that one place to start is relieve States of the responsibility for those patients who draw services from both Medicare and Medicaid.

That would save States about $70 billion a year and would place all the responsibility on Washington for reforming the program so taxpayers could afford it.

Thirty years ago, when I was Governor, I met with President Reagan and proposed a grand swap: that the Federal Government would take over all of Medicaid in exchange for giving the States all the responsibility for elementary and secondary education. President Reagan liked the idea. I still think fixing the responsibility for both education and Medicaid in a single government would make it work better and force its reform.

The No. 1 topic on the minds of most Americans today is jobs. Running up the cost of health care, raising State taxes, damaging the quality of universities and community colleges, and restricting access to them is a good way to kill jobs, not create jobs.

There still is time to restart the health care debate, to work together on a step-by-step plan to reduce health care costs, while avoiding expensive mandates on States that increase State taxes and increase college tuitions. The surest way to cause this to happen is to tell those 60 Senators who voted for this health care bill that if it becomes law, they will be sentenced to go home and serve as Governor for two terms to try to pay for it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three newspaper articles.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 7, 2010]

WASHINGTON AND THE FISCAL CRISIS OF THE STATES—THE STRINGS ON FEDERAL STIMULUS MONEY ARE MAKING IT HARDER FOR STATES TO CUT SPENDING AND BALANCE THEIR BUDGETS

(By Richard Ravitch)

As one whose interest in public service stems largely from the conviction that government can make a positive difference in people's lives, I have found the past year a paradox. From the financial crisis to healthcare reform, the federal government has taken on challenges that urgently need to be addressed. Yet despite these actions—and sometimes because of them—the states, which provide most of the services that touch citizens' lives, are in their deepest crisis since the Great Depression. The state crisis has become acute enough to belong on the federal agenda.

New York State faces a budget deficit that could climb to $8 billion or $9 billion in fiscal year 2010–11 and the state could face another deficit in 2011–12 of about $14 billion to $15 billion. The causes of the larger deficits down the road include a drop off in federal stimulus funds, an increase in Medicaid costs, and the planned expiration of a state income tax surcharge, as well as the state's underlying structural deficit.

New York is in a tough spot, but few other states are immune from large and growing deficits. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the states have faced and will face combined budget shortfalls estimated at $350 billion in fiscal years 2010 and 2011. Past experience suggests that these deficits will continue even if a national economic recovery takes hold. Moreover, we do not know how robust the recovery will be or what shape it will take. We know only that it will not spare the states the necessity of making acutely painful fiscal choices. New York and other states face draconian cuts in public services, higher taxes, or, more likely, a combination of both.

The federal stimulus has provided significant budget relief to the states, but this relief is temporary and makes it harder for states to cut expenditures. In major areas such as transportation, education, and health care, stimulus funds come with strings attached. These strings prevent states from substituting federal money for state funds, require states to spend minimum amounts of their own funds, and prevent states from tightening eligibility standards for benefits.

Because of these requirements, states, instead of cutting spending in transportation, education, and health care, have been forced to keep most of their expenditures at previous levels and use federal funds only as supplements. The net result is this: The federal stimulus has led states to increase overall spending in these core areas, which in effect has only raised the height of the cliff from which state spending will fall if stimulus funds evaporate.

Until recently, some people predicted that the stimulus funds would not evaporate—that instead the federal government would rescue the states once more with another stimulus bill. But the prospect of this kind of help looks doubtful as an increasing number of lawmakers in Washington worry about the federal deficit and seem intent on taking serious steps to rein it in.

If those steps include neglecting the fiscal situation facing the states, the country could be headed for fiscal problems that are larger than the ones we face now. We are in a time of extraordinary economic change and Washington is struggling with the sometimes-conflicting demands of the federal deficit and the unemployment rate. But the states' growing deficits present their own urgent national problem that the federal government must place in the balance.

Federal policy makers do not have the option of assuming that the state fiscal crisis is temporary or will cure itself without further involvement by Washington. This crisis reflects the growing long-term pressures on the states from the health-care needs of an aging population and the maintenance needs of an aging infrastructure. Moreover, the $3 trillion municipal bond markets have begun to notice the states' deficits: Moody's recently downgraded the bond ratings of Arizona and Illinois because of the deficits those states face. The rating agency says it is waiting to see whether New York will reduce its budget gaps and has warned the state against trying to do so solely through one-time actions.

It seems almost inevitable now that the states' fiscal problems will have further effects on capital markets, possibly as soon as next spring and summer. If more cracks appear in the capital markets that handle municipal bonds, the U.S. Treasury and the

Federal Reserve will be faced with an unattractive set of options: They can allow those markets to deteriorate or use federal tax dollars to shore them up and thereby increase the federal deficit.

It is safe to say that one way or another events will force federal policy makers to spend money in response to state deficits. Federal officials shouldn't wait for an emergency to begin to address two questions: Which services should the federal government provide and which should the states provide? And how should the costs of these services be split among federal, state, and local tax bases?

For example, Medicare, not Medicaid, is the primary payor of health-care costs for the elderly and disabled. About 17% of Medicare beneficiaries are low-income and, thus, also receive varying levels of state Medicaid benefits. These ''dual eligible'' beneficiaries account for some 40% of state Medicaid spending.

For these beneficiaries, the current system is a nightmare: They disproportionately suffer from chronic diseases but must navigate two separate bureaucracies and sets of rules in order to receive care. For the states, this system is a costly burden. From the perspective of a rational health policy, the system is an anachronism. It developed when Medicare did not provide income-based aid and did not have income-based information about those it served. Medicare now provides such aid and has the information and capacity to provide these benefits more effectively, with more potential for cost containment, than the current system.

A federal takeover of services to dual eligibles would cost about $70 billion per year. For many states, a share of this amount would be the difference between chronic fiscal crisis and a chance at structural budget balance. After the Troubled Asset Relief Program and health-care reform—with the cost of the latter estimated by the Congressional Budget Office at almost $900 billion from now through 2019 and $1.8 trillion in the 10 years from 2014 through 2023—the bill for such a takeover does not seem huge or disproportionate to the relief it would provide to state budgets.

Those of us responsible for the states' budgets have the unpleasant duty of imposing greater burdens on our citizens before we can reach legitimate balance between revenues and expenditures. It is not unreasonable for us to hope that federal policy makers will treat our state deficit problems with the same seriousness with which they are now preparing to address the national deficit.

---

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 5, 2010]

THE PUSHBACK—STATE AGS SAY BEN NELSON'S MEDICAID DEAL IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

''It's not a special deal,'' Ben Nelson told the New York Times of the special deal that converted him into the 60th Senator for ObamaCare. ''It's a fair deal. Some people said I was getting money for Nebraska. That's wrong. I was just getting rid of an underfunded federal mandate. There's nothing sleazy about it. I cracked the door open for other states.''

The other states think somewhat less of Mr. Nelson's benevolence. Under the ''Cornhusker Kickback,'' the federal government will pay all of Nebraska's new Medicaid costs forever, while taxpayers in the other 49 states will see their budgets explode as this safety-net program for the poor is expanded to one out of every five Americans.

''In addition to violating the most basic and universally held notions of what is fair and just,'' the AGs wrote last week to the Democratic leadership, the Article I spending clause is limited to ''general Welfare.'' If Congress claims to be legitimately serving that interest by expanding the joint state-federal Medicaid program, then why is it relieving just one state of a mandate that otherwise applies to all states? In other words, serving the nongeneral welfare of Nebraska—for no other reason than political expediency—violates a basic Supreme Court check on the ''display of arbitrary power'' that was established in 1937's Helvering v. Davis.

Obviously Congress treats different states differently all the time, via earmarks and the like, but in this case there is simply no plausible argument for some kind of ''general'' benefit. The only state that gains from special treatment for Nebraska is Nebraska—and this actively harms all other states, which will have fewer tax dollars for their own priorities while effectively subsidizing the Cornhusker state.

The 12 Attorneys General are all Republicans, but as it happens their complaints are echoed by the liberal states of New York and California. In a December letter Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger lamented that ObamaCare would impose the ''crushing new burden'' of as much as $4 billion per year in new Medicaid spending in a state that is already deeply in the red. And in a Christmas Day op-ed in the Buffalo News, New York Governor David A. Paterson protested the almost $1 billion in new costs as well as the ''unfairness of the Senate bill'' when ''New York already sends significantly more money to Washington than it gets back.''

The reality is that national taxpayers have subsidized New York and California's social services for years because Medicaid's funding formula rewards higher state spending. That spending helps explain why these two states, plus New Jersey, are in such budget fixes today. But we welcome Mr. Paterson's discovery that redistributing income via progressive taxation is harmful.

''The final bill must provide equitable federal funding to all states,'' Mr. Paterson insisted, and in that sense Mr. Nelson may be right about his opening the political door. As Democrats merge the House and Senate bills, they may extend the 100% Nebraska deal to all states to shut them up, assuming they can rig the budget math. Of course, that gambit would harm either medical providers, given that state Medicaid reimbursement rates are well below even Medicare's, or Medicaid patients, as more doctors and hospitals simply drop those patients.

We recognize that mere Constitutional arguments won't deter the political juggernaut that is ObamaCare. But no one should be surprised when Americans wonder if this unprecedented federal intrusion into their lives violates our nation's founding principles.

---

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 2, 2010]

THE STATES AND THE STIMULUS—HOW A SUPPOSED BOON HAS BECOME A FISCAL BURDEN

Remember how $200 billion in federal stimulus cash was supposed to save the states from fiscal calamity? Well, hold on to your paychecks, because a big story of 2010 will be how all that free money has set the states up for an even bigger mess this year and into the future.

The combined deficits of the states for 2010 and 2011 could hit $260 billion, according to a survey by the liberal Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. Ten states have a deficit, relative to the size of their expenditures, as bleak as that of near-bankrupt California. The Golden State starts the year another $6 billion in arrears despite a large income and sales tax hike last year. New York is literally down to its last dollar. Revenues are down, to be sure, but in several ways the stimulus has also made things worse.

First, in most state capitals the stimulus enticed state lawmakers to spend on new programs rather than adjusting to lean times. They added health and welfare benefits and child care programs. Now they have to pay for those additions with their own state's money.

For example, the stimulus offered $80 billion for Medicaid to cover health-care costs for unemployed workers and single workers without kids. But in 2011 most of that extra federal Medicaid money vanishes. Then states will have one million more people on Medicaid with no money to pay for it.

A few governors, such as Mitch Daniels of Indiana and Rick Perry of Texas, had the foresight to turn down their share of the $7 billion for unemployment insurance, realizing that once the federal funds run out, benefits would be unpayable. ''One of the smartest decisions we made,'' says Mr. Daniels. Many governors now probably wish they had done the same.

Second, stimulus dollars came with strings attached that are now causing enormous budget headaches. Many environmental grants have matching requirements, so to get a federal dollar, states and cities had to spend a dollar even when they were facing huge deficits. The new construction projects built with federal funds also have federal Davis-Bacon wage requirements that raise state building costs to pay inflated union salaries.

Worst of all, at the behest of the public employee unions, Congress imposed ''maintenance of effort'' spending requirements on states. These federal laws prohibit state legislatures from cutting spending on 15 programs, from road building to welfare, if the state took even a dollar of stimulus cash for these purposes.

One provision prohibits states from cutting Medicaid benefits or eligibility below levels in effect on July 1, 2008. That date, not coincidentally, was the peak of the last economic cycle when states were awash in revenue. State spending soared at a nearly 8% annual rate from 2004–2008, far faster than inflation and population growth, and liberals want to keep funding at that level.

A study by the Evergreen Freedom Foundation in Seattle found that ''because Washington state lawmakers accepted $820 million in education stimulus dollars, only 9 percent of the state's $6.8 billion K–12 budget is eligible for reductions in fiscal year 2010 or 2011.'' More than 85% of Washington state's Medicaid budget is exempt from cuts and nearly 75% of college funding is off the table. It's bad enough that Congress can't balance its own budget, but now it is making it nearly impossible for states to balance theirs.

These spending requirements come when state revenues are on a downward spiral. State revenues declined by more than 10% in 2009, and tax collections are expected to be flat at best in 2010. In Indiana, nominal revenues in 2011 may be lower than in 2006. Arizona's revenues are expected to be lower this year than they were in 2004. Some states don't expect to regain their 2007 revenue peak until 2012.

So when states should be reducing outlays to match a new normal of lower revenue collections, federal stimulus rules mean many states will have little choice but to raise taxes to meet their constitutional balanced budget requirements. Thank you, Nancy Pelosi.

This is the opposite of what the White House and Congress claimed when they said the stimulus funds would prevent economically harmful state tax increases. In 2009, 10 states raised income or sales taxes, and another 15 introduced new fees on everything from beer to cellphone ringers to hunting and fishing. The states pocketed the federal money and raised taxes anyway.

Now, in an election year, Congress wants to pass another $100 billion aid package for

ailing states to sustain the mess the first stimulus helped to create. Governors would be smarter to unite and tell Congress to keep the money and mandates, and let the states adjust to the new reality of lower revenues. Meanwhile, Mr. Perry and other governors who warned that the stimulus would have precisely this effect can consider themselves vindicated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

## SENATOR DORGAN

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from North Dakota for allowing me to speak out of order. I might add—and I will say this several times—what a privilege it has been for me to have served with the Senator from North Dakota, a man who embodies the best in a prairie populist and one with whom I have had a great honor and privilege working for a long time.

As the hour grows near, I will have more to say about my appreciation and the honor of working with the Senator from North Dakota.

## SENATOR-ELECT SCOTT BROWN

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to congratulate my friend, SCOTT BROWN, on his historic victory last night.

SCOTT BROWN is a man who has served his country in the Army National Guard and Reserve. He is a person who has served his State in the State legislature. He is a wonderful father and a wonderful public servant. I congratulate him on his landmark victory.

I believe it was in Concord where the ''shot was heard round the world.'' Last night a shot was fired round this Nation. A shot was fired saying no more business as usual in Washington, DC. Stop this unsavory, sausage-making process called health care reform, where special favors are dispensed to special people for special reasons in order to purchase votes.

The American people do not want this health care reform because they do not believe it attacks the fundamental problem with health care in America; that is, there is nothing wrong with the quality, it is the cost that needs to be brought under control.

But there is also anger—I know from the townhall meetings in my own State—about the process: the Louisiana purchase, $300 million for Louisiana; the Florida Medicare Advantage grandfather clause for the Senator from Florida; the $5 billion cornhusker kickback; Vermont, Massachusetts, Hawaii, Michigan, Connecticut—twice in Connecticut—Montana, South Dakota, North Dakota, Wyoming—the list goes on and on of special deals that were carved for special reasons. The latest, of course, is the incredible action concerning unions being exempt from taxes nonunion members will now have to pay in greater numbers. How do you justify favoring one group of Americans; that is, union members, for any reason other than you owe them political favors and they have political influence?

So the negotiating went from the backrooms here to the backrooms in the White House—the same President who said C–SPAN and a completely transparent process would prevail here so the American people would know who is on the side of the pharmaceutical companies. And the pharmaceutical companies probably got the best sweetheart deal of anybody in this whole process.

So I believe the majority of the American people have said and according to polling data 48 percent of Massachusetts voters have said health care was the single issue driving their vote. Thirty-nine percent said they voted for Brown specifically because of his vocal opposition to the measure. I congratulate SCOTT BROWN. I congratulate our new colleague not only for standing up for what is right but also for articulating the frustration of the American people about this process we have been through.

So here we are, and now the rumors are that they will jam this proposal through the House of Representatives and then bypass what has always been the normal legislative process. They should not do that. The American people have spoken. The people of Massachusetts have spoken for the rest of America: Stop this process, sit down in open and transparent negotiations, and let's begin from the beginning.

We can agree on certain principles and certain measures that need to be taken, such as malpractice reform, going across State lines so people can have the insurance of their choice, and many other things, including, perhaps, a refundable tax credit for those who need health insurance and risk pools for those who have preexisting conditions. There are many things we could agree on if, for the first time in this administration and in this Senate, we sit down across the table from one another in honest and open negotiations and discussions.

We know health care costs in America are out of control. We know they need to be fixed. We want to be part of that process. So I urge the President of the United States, I urge my colleagues—now 59 of them—to say: Stop, start from the beginning, sit down, and work for America. Let's do what has been done in the past, time after time after time, where we sit down and negotiate in good-faith efforts. So far, that has not happened despite the promises the President made during his campaign.

I urge my colleagues together to say we have to stop this process, we have to stop this unsavory sausage making, Chicago style, that has been going on, and we have to sit down in open and honest negotiations with the American people and fix the health care problem. We can do that together, and that is what the American people want us to do.

Again, I thank my colleague from North Dakota, and I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

## THE ECONOMY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, there has been a lot happening in this country with respect to politics and the economy over these past months, and I know there is great angst and concern across this country. There are questions: When will America get the bounce back in its step? These are troublesome times, for sure, for a lot of reasons, but I am convinced we will find ways to put America back on track. I am convinced of that.

You know, you go back a couple hundred years in American history, and this country has been through some very tough times but always—always—rebounds. There has always been a sense of optimism that the future will be better than the past, that kids will have it better than their parents. I am convinced of that.

I think the American people have plenty to be steamed about, and they need to find ways to let off that steam. They have a right to be steamed, and let me describe a bit of it.

One year ago, this President took office and he inherited an economic wreck. That is just a fact. The question at that moment was, will this economy completely collapse? That wreck was caused by a lot of things, but deciding to go to war and not paying for a penny of it year after year—everybody knows better than that. You can't do that. Hiring regulators who were boasting that they weren't willing to regulate, saying to the big shots on Wall Street, the speculators, the big investment bankers, and others: Do whatever you want. We won't watch. The sky is the limit. We don't care. Now we see the carnage that results from that: derivatives—instruments that derive value from something else—CDOs, mortgage-backed securities, synthetic derivatives. Do you know what a synthetic derivative is? That is something that doesn't have any value of any kind. It is just a wager. You might as well put a craps table in the middle of an investment bank lobby and say to them: You don't have to go to Las Vegas, you can gamble here. And by the way, you can gamble with other people's money, not your own. But even investment banks and FDIC-insured banks have been gambling on their own proprietary accounts on derivatives. We ought to know better than that. So what happens is the regulators give a green light to that kind of rancid behavior, and it steers this country into an unbelievable bubble of speculation. Then the center pole of the tent collapses, the economy nearly collapses,

and a whole lot of the American people are paying for it. The fact is, these folks fleeced America. It is the great bank robbery in American history.

When I talk about big investment banks and some others, the community banks out there weren't involved in this. Go to most of your hometown banks and take a look at how they are doing. They are doing just fine because they weren't involved in these sorts of shenanigans. It was the biggest financial firms in this country that steered this country into the ditch, and it started, yes, with mortgage brokers and mortgage banks and investment banks and hedge funds and derivatives traders. All of them steered this country into the ditch. By the way, now they are driving the getaway car, going to the bank to deposit their big bonuses. They got big bonuses even while their firms lost a lot of money. Now, all of a sudden, many of the firms that would have collapsed were it not for the help of the American people are now earning record profits and set to pay the biggest bonuses in history in the next few weeks. That is unbelievable, and in my judgment, it shouldn't be allowed.

In my judgment, we have to do something about this, and one of the pieces of the agenda in front of us is to reform this system of finance and try to wring out the unbelievable orgy of speculation in this system that puts the American economy and the American people at risk. So one of the pieces of this agenda at this point is so-called financial reform legislation.

As I said, I am convinced that while this ship of state has a lot of leaks, we can fix it and set it right and set it back on course, but it is not going to be done by revisionist history of the past by some, by those who put their hands over their eyes and plug their ears and decide, you know, we are not interested in learning the lessons of the past.

This President inherited a wreck. He may not have done every single thing right in the last year, but I will tell you this: He took action to try to put a foundation under this economy to prevent its collapse, and I think he deserves some credit for that. Had he done nothing after walking in the White House door, the Federal budget deficit was going to be $1.3 trillion. That is what this President was left with from the previous administrations.

So, as I said, we have a lot of work to do, and it is going to require the cooperation of people in this Chamber. There has not been much cooperation recently. This Chamber has been pretty divided. You know, I have I guess dozens of times quoted Mark Twain when he was asked once by someone if he would engage in a debate. And he immediately said: Yes, if I can take the negative side. And they said: Well, we have not even told you the subject. He said: That doesn't matter. The subject doesn't matter. The negative side will take no preparation for me. And so it is here in this Chamber—the negative side saying no to every single initiative, even those initiatives that I believe saved this economy from collapse. But we need to do better than that. We need to work together and find ways, in a bipartisan manner, to cooperate for this country's benefit.

So what are the issues? Well, I just mentioned financial reform. We have to fix this system of ours. The fact is, the same firms that steered this country into the ditch, the same people, the same interests are doing exactly what they did before: trading on their own proprietary accounts and taking on massive amounts of risk. We have to decide whether we should separate investment banking from FDIC-insured banking. We have to decide if you are too big to fail, you are just flatout too big. We have to decide those things in a financial reform bill that comes to the floor of the Senate.

The American people are concerned about a lot of things—first and foremost, jobs. There is no social program in this country that is as important as a job that pays well, in my judgment. A good job that pays well makes everything else possible for families. So we need to focus like a laser on trying to create jobs once again in this country and put people back on payrolls. If we want to do something for the economic health of both families and America, it is good jobs that pay well, with some security and some benefits. There is no better tonic than that.

It is also the case that we need to focus like a laser on this issue of deficits and debt because the fact is, we were left with an economy that is not sustainable with respect to the current deficits. It just isn't. You can't fight wars without paying for them. You just can't do that. You can't enact programs without paying for them. And when you fall into a very deep recession and your revenues dry up and you have $400 billion a year less in revenue—because of unemployment and many other stabilizing programs that try to help people who have been laid off and who are in trouble, you have $400 billion more in outlays—and you run into giant Federal budget deficits, we have to fix that. We have to do that because this course is not sustainable.

There is one other issue I want to talk about for a moment. I hope that early on in this year, we will do something else that is important to the economic strength of America, and that is to pass an energy bill that moves in the direction of giving us the freedom from foreign oil. Let me describe why this is important in the context of trying to also fix what is wrong in this economy. We are a nation that uses a substantial amount of oil. We stick little straws in this planet every day and suck out oil. We suck out about 85 million barrels of oil a day from this planet called Earth. Of the 85 million or 84 million barrels of oil a day, one-fourth of it is used in this little place on the planet called the United States of America. We need one-fourth of all the oil that is produced every day just to keep America going, and a substantial amount of that oil is produced in areas of the world that don't like us very much, areas of the world that are very troubled. So we have great vulnerability with respect to our nation's energy security.

The fact is, energy powers this country's economy. We don't think about it. We get up every single day and we flick on a switch, we plug something into a wall socket, we turn a key in an ignition. In dozens of ways, beginning when we first step out of bed and turn on the light, we use energy, and we use a lot of it. So the question is, What can give this country some energy security? Being 70 percent dependent on foreign oil? Certainly not. By the way, in addition to getting nearly 70 percent of our oil from other countries, nearly 70 percent of the oil is used in our transportation fleet.

So what do we do about all that? The fact is, we passed the Energy bill out of the Energy Committee, about 6, 7 months ago here in the Senate, and that Energy bill, in my judgment, has a lot to commend it. I believe that early on in this Congress, the President and the Senate ought to decide we are going to take up this bill. It is bipartisan. We should pass this legislation and give America another step in the direction of being less dependent on foreign oil.

It is also about jobs. You create a lot of jobs by new production and conservation systems and so on.

Let me describe what is in this legislation. The legislation deals with increasing production of energy here at home. It also increases conservation and efficiency and maximizing the production of renewable energy. It also creates the first ever national renewable electricity standard, which means that a certain percentage of our electricity to come from renewable energy. All that is in this legislation and it has already been passed by the Senate Energy Committee on a bipartisan vote. Let me start for a moment with some good news.

Mr. President, could I be notified at the end of 15 minutes, please, of my presentation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Let me start with some good news because we almost never hear good news these days in America. All the news in America is about what went wrong, the old saying about bad news is that it travels halfway around the world before good news gets its shoes on. Almost nobody has any interest in saying let's broadcast good news all day.

The good news last year, with respect to oil, was that for the first year in a long time, America actually increased its production of oil. We have been on this declining path. No more. Last year

we increased the production of oil. Part of that comes from a formation in my part of the country called the Bakken shale. It is unbelievably complicated what we have done, but our country has learned to go explore and get oil from formations that 5, 8, 10 years ago you could not get oil from. There is up to 4.3 billion gallons of oil in the Bakken shale formation, 4.3 billion barrels of recoverable oil, that can now be unlocked using today's technology. They drill down 2 miles with a drilling rig, do a big curve, and go out 2 miles. With one rig they go down 2 miles, then go out 2 miles and then they hydrofracture it and the oil drops. They are getting up to 2,000 barrel-a-day wells. That is just one part of the substantial additional production available in this country, and it is producing now in a very significant way in Montana and North Dakota in the Bakken shale.

Also, in the Energy bill that was passed by the Senate Energy Committee, I introduced an amendment that was agreed upon on a bipartisan vote that opens the eastern Gulf of Mexico. We believe that there is at least 3.8 billion gallons of recoverable oil and at least 21 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in the eastern Gulf of Mexico including the Destin Dome. There is a lot to be achieved by additional production and we should do that. There is no question we should do that. The legislation that has been passed on a bipartisan vote, with my amendment to open the additional production, would allow that to happen.

That is one piece of the Senate Energy Committee's legislation. But there is much more. We understand our most abundant resource is coal, but we need to have a lower carbon future as we continue to use fossil fuels for energy. So the research and the science that is exciting, to be able to continue to use coal and capture and sequester or capture and provide beneficial use of $CO_2$, is something we are working on very hard. We advance it in this legislation.

If you are going to maximize production of energy where the wind blows and the Sun shines, through solar energy and wind energy, you need to develop an interstate highway of transmission. We don't have that. We have an interstate highway system to drive on, but we don't have an interstate highway system to move electricity on and to produce energy where the wind blows and the Sun shines and then move it to the load centers. That does not exist at the moment.

In the last 10 years, we have built about 11,000 miles of natural gas pipeline to move natural gas around the country. During the same period, we only built 668 miles of high-voltage transmission lines between the States. We have to fix that. If you are going to maximize the production of energy where the wind is blowing and the Sun is shining, and we should, then you need to have an interstate highway of transmission to move that energy to the load centers. This transmission section is in the Senate Energy Committee's bill.

We have included a national renewable electricity standard, for the first time in history, in this legislation. That will drive the production of renewable energy because 15 percent of the energy that is sold must come from renewable energy sources. I think the votes exist on the floor of the Senate to get to a 20-percent RES. All of that, I think, is very important.

The other thing we do is we move toward an electric drive vehicle system with investments in battery technology and all of the related issues that would involve electric drive vehicles. That is going to be part of our future.

Beyond the electric drive future, I think, is hydrogen and fuel cell technology. There is so much to be excited about. We do need to get the legislation that has already passed the Senate Energy Committee to the floor of the Senate. Let me describe it briefly by saying this. There are some who say the issue is climate change, and we have to bring a climate change bill to the floor of the Senate.

Here is my view. To address climate change and have a lower carbon future means that you have to put in place policies that actually reduce carbon. How do you do that? By doing the very things I have described in this legislation that is now out of the Senate Energy Committee and ready to come to the floor. It is addressed to the specific policies that will reduce carbon, that will actually allow us to make progress in addressing climate change issues.

I know there is a lot of discussion, and also a lot of controversy surrounding the issue of cap and trade. My own view on cap and trade is that I don't have the foggiest interest in providing a $1 trillion carbon trading market for traders and speculators on Wall Street to decide on Monday and Tuesday what our energy is going to cost on Thursday and Friday. I am not interested in doing that, given the history of what has happened on Wall Street and the economic wreck they caused in recent years.

Having said that, we still need a lower carbon future. I agree with that. The way to do that is to pass smart energy policy. We have a bipartisan bill that addresses all these issues: additional production, additional conservation, more efficiency, maximizing renewables, the first ever renewable electricity standard. All these issues will strengthen our country, and I hope very much one of the priorities in the coming months will be to pass the energy legislation that was passed by the Senate Energy Committee and advance our country's interest.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has used 15 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, before I address some of the issues before us, let me say a word about my friend and colleague from North Dakota who, during this recess, announced he is going to retire at the end of this year. Senator DORGAN and I have served together both in the House and the Senate. He has been such a powerful force and powerful voice in the Senate Democratic caucus on so many important issues that we share values on. I am not going to bid him farewell because I know this year will be a busy year for him, representing his State and being engaged. His talk, just this moment on the floor, about issues of concern are clear evidence he is going to be fighting for his causes and his people in this upcoming year. But I do have to express my regret that my colleague is leaving us and thank him for his many years of fine service to the people of his State, in the House and the Senate, and I look forward to making this a great sendoff year and again thank him for his contribution.

Mr. DORGAN. If the Senator will yield, I have always refrained from using the word ''retire'' because I can't sit around very much. So I don't intend to quit working. But I am not seeking reelection, the Senator is correct about that. This is a great institution, and it is a great privilege to serve here. I look forward to a lot of work this year with my colleague from Illinois and I hope, together, we will frame the policies that will help put America back on track to a better future.

## LESSON FROM MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, what did we learn yesterday in Massachusetts? I guess many things about the feeling of the American people. When you take a look at the polls, it is interesting. It is not as if it is a very partisan feeling among most Americans. They are not happy with either political party, when it comes right down to it, and if given a third-party choice, a lot of folks tend to move in that direction. It reflects a number of feelings. The first is, we have a weak economy and a lot of people unemployed and there is a lot of uncertainty. I think that has created anxiety, if not anger. I think also it is an issue about whether this Congress and this administration can respond to the issues that count, that matter in people's lives, and do it in a timely fashion. There is a frustration that many of the issues we take up seem to take forever, and most of them take forever right here in this room because the Senate was designed to slow things down and sometimes bring them to a halt. That is even adding to the frustration and maybe the anger across America.

When you ask people in polls about the situation in Washington, they say two things that are not necessarily consistent. They say: No. 1, I am concerned about the debt of this Nation. How much more debt can we pile up on

future generations and how much more can we mortgage our future to foreign lenders such as China that will buy up our debt and buy a bigger piece of control of our economy? A legitimate point. But the second thing they will say is: Listen, I hope the President and Congress will do something to help create jobs to get this country moving forward—which, of course, would involve the expenditure of Federal funds. They do not always give consistent answers, but it is easy to look behind the results in Massachusetts and in other States and see that the American people are upset and concerned about the current situation. What will we take from this?

There will be a realignment in the Senate, in terms of going forward. There will be 59 Democratic Senators and 41 Republican Senators after the new Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN, is sworn into this body. But still we will face the issues people want us to deal with.

When I went home to Illinois, I didn't shy away from health care. I took it on the road and went to South Suburban Chamber of Commerce in Cook County. That is right near the city of Chicago. Yesterday, I went to the Chicago Chamber of Commerce and invited in small businesses to talk about health care. What I heard from them I heard in letters and e-mails and messages from all over the State; that is, people are genuinely concerned. They may feel at least some satisfaction with their current health insurance, but they are worried about the future. When small businesses stand, as they did yesterday, and say: Our premiums went up 17 percent, 20 percent each year and it is unsustainable, that is a reality. If we play to a draw here and do nothing, it is understandable people will be even more frustrated and angry.

I understand the shortcomings of our effort to reform health care. I am humble enough to realize that even our best work may not be perfect and may need to be changed in the future. But it is not enough to just stop the debate and ignore the problem. I would engage and invite my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, if they truly want to govern, if they truly want to work with us, please step forward. Show us you are willing to sit down and work together; we are and we have tried and we will continue to. We should. It is not just a matter of health care. It also goes to the question of creating jobs.

We have an opportunity now to breathe life back into this economy, to get more people back to work. Like one of my friends, a Congressman from Illinois, PHIL HARE, said recently: I get personally ill when I hear the term ''jobless recovery.''

I share his angst and nausea, if that is what it is, over that term. There will be no jobless recovery. Until people get back to work, we are still in recovery and have not reached our goal yet, which is to end the recession with a strong economy and people back to work.

How will we reach that goal? We need to do something this year, and we need to do it quickly so we do not miss a construction season, so we can create new opportunities for jobs in building bridges and highways and airports and water projects all across America—investment in our infrastructure that pays off over the long run and creates jobs immediately. That is something we need to do. It will take money to do it.

Fortunately, there is a source. President Bush had his Troubled Asset Relief Program and took hundreds of billions of dollars and loaned them to financial institutions and companies to get through the worst of the recession. Many of those companies are paying us back, some with interest. We wish to take the money that is being paid back there and invest it back into this economy to get it moving forward.

This sounds to me like something that Democrats and Republicans should agree on. I think we both share the goal of getting out of this recession and begin moving forward, but we need a cooperative, bipartisan effort for that to be achieved. I hope we can find it. I hope we can reach common ground there.

I believe most of the Senators from most of the States represented here have heard from their Governors. My State is struggling. Others are as well. There will be layoffs of key personnel—firefighters, policemen, and teachers, for example. We should find a way to help those States get through this tough patch they have run into because of a recession and downturn in revenues. We don't want to see our children suffer because teachers are laid off and there are more kids in the classroom. We certainly do not want to endanger our communities by laying off firefighters or policemen, if that means our safety is compromised in our homes and neighborhoods. So there ought to be some common ground we can find, both sides of the aisle.

At the same time, there is a meaningful discussion underway with Senators CONRAD and GREGG, Democrat and Republican, on long-term deficit reduction. In the midst of a recession it is hard, I think terribly hard, to argue we will not be adding to the national debt as we try to bring ourselves out of the recession. But we clearly need to have a plan—a direction and a long-term goal—of reducing our deficit. We can reach that goal, and I think we should. We need to do this on a bipartisan basis.

I hope in the days ahead, when the President gives the State of the Union Address, he will speak to this and he will try to help us in reaching that common goal.

So whatever the result in Massachusetts, it will, of course, make the news today, will diminish in importance as other stories replace it. But at the end of the day, we still have responsibilities. We still need to deal with the rising cost of health care. We need to deal with the fact that 50 million Americans do not have health insurance. We need to confront the health insurance companies that are turning down people when they need help the most with their health insurance plan. We certainly need to address the job situation, making sure our government is funding and inspiring new job growth across our country. We need to deal with a long-term deficit with a plan that starts to bring us out of our national debt or at least reduce our national debt.

That, to me, represents at least three immediate and attainable goals that should be done on a bipartisan basis. Whether we have 60 votes or 59 votes, those issues still challenge us. So the lesson from Massachusetts is the American people are expecting responsible results in Washington. We have to deliver them. We can deliver them. But to do it, we need a bipartisan approach. We need both Republicans and Democrats to work together toward these goals.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURRIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, is the Senate still in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back and that we move to the nomination of Beverly Martin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

### NOMINATION OF BEVERLY BALDWIN MARTIN TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to report the following nomination.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Beverly Baldwin Martin, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 60 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled between the Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY, and the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak under

the time allotted to Senator SESSIONS and that I be followed by my colleague Senator ISAKSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I rise today to speak on behalf of a good friend, a very fine jurist, Judge Beverly Martin, who has been nominated by President Obama to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals.

I have had the good fortune of knowing Judge Martin, who is a native of Macon, GA, for many years and could think of no one with more integrity, professional competence, and appropriate judicial bearing to sit on the Nation's second highest bench.

Judge Martin is a fourth-generation lawyer. Her great-grandfather, grandfather, and her father were all lawyers in Macon, GA. They started the law firm of Martin & Snow in Macon, which is where Judge Martin also began the practice of law after graduating from the University of Georgia School of Law in 1981.

I talked to my good friend Cubbege Snow, Jr., who was one of the senior partners at the firm at that point in time. I said: Cubbege, tell me about Beverly. What did you do with her when she came fresh out of law school to be the fourth generation Martin in that law firm?

He said: SAXBY, she started just like everybody else; we put her collecting accounts, which is the one thing lawyers have to do when they start out is that sort of menial type work.

I remember one day walking by her office and she is obviously on the phone with somebody trying to collect an open account, and she finally screamed at whoever it was on the other end and said, ''If you do not pay this bill, I am going to lose my job.''

So Beverly Martin started at the bottom of the ladder in the practice of law. She has worked herself up to the point now of being one of the finest district court judges we have in our State.

My good friend Jerry Harrell, who is also a member of that firm, says the thing he remembered best about now Judge Martin when she was practicing law is that she is very bright, but she approached everything from a true commonsense standpoint and that she was a very level-headed individual.

Judge Martin was drawn from private practice to Atlanta to go to work in the attorney general's office by then Attorney General Mike Bowers. She was there for a 10-year period. And in 1997 she was appointed U.S. Attorney for the Middle District of Georgia after serving for a couple of years as an assistant U.S. attorney.

During her tenure as U.S. Attorney for the Middle District of Georgia in Macon, Judge Martin was known as a tough prosecutor. She handled cases herself in a way that was not only very professional but in a very meaningful way.

At the same time, she was very compassionate outside of the courtroom. In fact, she started a program in Macon, Valdosta, Columbus, and Athens that is called the Weed & Seed Program. It is now a nationwide program that is run through U.S. Attorney offices. Judge Martin was a strong proponent and received national recognition for the work she did with the Weed & Seed Program in our State. She also held day camps for inner-city kids during the summertime. She served on various boards, including the board of Macon State College and Majority Women of Achievement, which board she serves on with my wife Julianne.

Her lengthy tenure as a prosecutor has given her a uniquely informed perspective. When handling criminal cases, as many of my colleagues know, a prosecutor must be tough but fair in carrying out their responsibilities. This experience has served her well as she has served on the District Court. It makes her exceptionally well qualified to serve on the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals.

While on the district court, Judge Martin was faced with several difficult criminal matters. In 2002, she refused to intervene and halt the scheduled execution of a man convicted of killing a Columbus, GA, police officer.

More recently, in 2008, she rejected arguments that Georgia's method of capital punishment was unconstitutional, determining that it more than conformed with the recent Supreme Court guidance on the issue.

In his choice of Judge Martin, the President not only picked a fine Georgian to sit on the nation's second highest bench, but he has also picked a top-notch legal mind.

More revealing about Judge Martin as a jurist than my remarks are the anonymous lawyer comments that have been written about her during her 9 years on the bench. Words such as ''smart,'' ''bright,'' ''respectful,'' and ''fair'' appear frequently. One lawyer wrote, ''Her legal ability is matched by her courtroom demeanor, which is the best around.''

Another said, ''She always calls it as she sees it. She has no leaning.''

Mike Bowers, attorney general and her mentor of 15 years, said she is the most evenhanded judge he has ever appeared before.

In fact, Mike, who is now in private practice, told me that he tried the very first jury trial case before Judge Martin. In Federal trials, the lawyers are all required to stand at a lecturn where they ask their questions to the witnesses, and it is not appropriate to get too close to the jury. But all of us used to try to do that because you could sometimes be more effective. He said: One day I was trying this case before Judge Martin, the very first case she had tried, and I obviously got a little too close to the jury. Being the evenhanded judge she is, she looked at her 15-year mentor and she said, very professionally: Mr. Bowers, please back away a respectful distance from the jury. He said: I remember it very well.

That is the evenhandedness with which Judge Martin has always conducted herself on the bench. I have no doubt Judge Martin will serve the people of Georgia, Alabama, and Florida very well on the Eleventh Circuit. She is, to put it plainly, a fair and wise judge. The President couldn't have chosen a more qualified individual for the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals. I am proud to lend my support to her and look forward to her swift confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague Senator CHAMBLISS to endorse the confirmation and hopefully unanimous confirmation of Judge Beverly Martin to the Eleventh U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. I thank President Obama for sending this nomination forward and for the consultation his people had with Senator CHAMBLISS and myself. I thank Senator LEAHY, chairman, and Ranking Member SESSIONS from Alabama of the Judiciary Committee for the diligence with which they approached this confirmation and the speed with which we have now brought it to the floor.

I am proud that the vote on Judge Martin today will be the first vote of the 2010 session of the Senate. As Senator CHAMBLISS said, Judge Martin comes from a long, distinguished family of lawyers from middle Georgia. She comes to the bench with a balanced temperament and the evenhanded process that comes from growing up in middle Georgia and having respect for one's fellow man.

I don't know Judge Martin and did not know Judge Martin until she was nominated. I am not an attorney so I didn't have a lot to fall back on when I made my first judgment. I decided what I would do is what I always did in my 33 years of business. I figured you could always find out what was at the heart of someone by calling those who competed with them, other members of the same profession. So I called lawyers, judges, prosecutors around Georgia, friends I had, and said: Tell me what you know about Judge Beverly Martin. Without exception, every response was positive.

It was interesting. One district attorney said: I like her because she has the tenacity of a prosecutor. She was a prosecutor for the northern district of Georgia. I talked to a dear friend of mine who is on the Georgia Supreme Court who said she has the temperament for a judge. I talked to another practicing attorney, who had tried cases before her and had competed with her when she was a practicing attorney herself, who said: JOHNNY, she is tough. She is fair. But she has a passion for the law, a passion for doing what is right.

I don't think you can come up with a finer endorsement than those three quotes.

I also join Senator CHAMBLISS in acknowledging and studying one's record. Some of her decisions I think have been outstanding. As a former prosecutor, she understands the dangers our law enforcement officers go through. She understands the value they serve. I think her ruling not to stay the execution of a murderer of a Columbus, GA policeman was absolutely the right decision. Her defense of the Georgia death penalty law as being constitutional was not only appropriate but right. Throughout all of her decisions, one thing is for sure: Whether you agreed or not, she gave it the thought and time necessary to make what she felt was the right decision.

In 2000, the Senate confirmed Judge Martin to the northern district court in Georgia. It did so unanimously. It is my hope that on this day the Senate once again will unanimously approve the confirmation of Judge Beverly Martin to the U.S. Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals.

I yield the floor, suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged to each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the nomination of Judge Beverly Baldwin Martin who President Obama nominated to the Eleventh Circuit on June 19. I remain at a loss as to why it has taken this long for her nomination to come before the full Senate for a vote. Judge Martin's nomination is one of the few that has had strong bipartisan support. Both of her home State Senators, Senator CHAMBLISS and Senator ISAKSON, have expressed their support for the President's nominee from the beginning. I have also expressed my support for Judge Martin and I believe she will be easily confirmed when the vote occurs.

As I have said many times, Republicans have been and are ready and willing to proceed to a roll call vote on her nomination for months but, for whatever reason, our Democratic colleagues, the leadership, would not take yes for an answer. Instead, they chose to force votes on controversial nominees such as David Hamilton and Andre Davis. Given those nominees' records, it was no secret they would engender opposition and that it would take some time for their records to be examined and to be prepared for debate.

I do not know the reasons for not calling up Judge Martin's nomination sooner. I hope it wasn't to purposely delay this noncontroversial nomination in order to create an illusion that a lot of judges are being obstructed. Certainly we have been accused of obstructing nominations in the last few months and we have heard these allegations repeated on the Senate floor and in the press, often supported by inaccurate and misleading information. Some of my Democratic colleagues have said they want to confirm judicial nominees at the same pace the Democratic-controlled Senate confirmed President Bush's nominees. I think my colleagues should be careful what they wish for, because President Obama's nominees have fared far better than President Bush's. For those who were not here then, and for those who don't—or won't—remember, I wish to take a moment to describe exactly what happened during that time.

President Bush began his Presidency by extending an olive branch and renominating two prior Clinton nominees to seats on the Circuit Courts of Appeal—one step removed from the Supreme Court. He renominated Democratic nominees. How was he repaid for that? The Democrats took the olive branch and broke it and gave it back to him. It began soon after President Bush was elected when a group of well-known professors—liberal activist professors—Laurence Tribe, Marsha Greenberger, and Cass Sunstein, met with the Democratic leadership and proposed changing the ground rules of the confirmation process in a meeting, apparently—certainly not open to the public. They proposed that Senators should consider a nominee's ideology—this had not been historically done—and for the first time in the history of the country, they proposed that the burden be shifted to the nominee to somehow prove they were worthy of the appointment instead of having the Senate respect the presumptive power of the President to make nominations and then object if that nomination was a concern to them. So it was clear to me then that as a result of that meeting, a majority of the Democrat Members of this body agreed to what they proposed. After the Democrats took control in the 107th Congress, then-Majority Leader Daschle promised to ''use whatever means necessary'' to defeat President Bush's judicial nominees.

Before the 2001 August recess, the Democrats granted hearings for only two circuit court nominees, and one was Roger Gregory, a former Clinton nominee who was renominated. They even refused to hold a hearing for now-Chief Justice John Roberts. His nomination at the time was to the District of Columbia circuit which had been scheduled for a hearing before the change in the Senate majority. Then, in an unprecedented and, I think, partisan move, our Democratic colleagues indiscriminately returned every single one of President Bush's 40 pending judicial nominations. There was no consideration of an individual nominee's record. There was no consideration of bipartisan support for the nominee. It was a simple obstruction, it appeared to me. Thirty of these nominees were later confirmed by voice vote or by a substantial majority.

This was followed by another unprecedented event: the systematic filibuster of highly qualified nominees, many of whom were later confirmed by voice vote or a substantial majority. The Democrats filibustered 30 attempts to hold up-or-down votes on at least 17 judicial nominees, highly qualified nominees—some rated unanimously well qualified by the American Bar Association. Senator REID summed up what they were doing during the filibuster of Priscilla Owen—a fabulous nominee; a justice on the Texas Supreme Court; a great lady—he opposed her nomination and he said in his quote: ''There is not a number of hours in the universe that would be sufficient'' to debate her nomination.

So, today, we hear outrage that President Obama's nominees have been waiting for weeks or months for a confirmation vote. President Bush's nominees to the circuit courts waited an average of 350 days—almost a year, on average; I was here—from nomination to confirmation. That was just the average. The majority of President Bush's first nominees to the circuit courts waited years for confirmation votes and some never even received a hearing in committee, despite being highly qualified, outstanding nominees. Priscilla Owen, Justice Owen of the Texas Supreme Court, waited 4 years for a confirmation vote. John Roberts, Jeffrey Sutton, and Deborah Cook all waited 2 years. Dennis Shedd and Michael McConnell waited for more than a year and a half. Terrence Boyle, who was nominated by President Bush for the Fourth Circuit, languished close to 8 years and never received a vote, even though he passed out of the Judiciary Committee with a majority, and the Democrats had the majority. Miguel Estrada, rated unanimously well qualified by the American Bar Association, was filibustered through seven cloture votes and never confirmed. Charles Pickering, Carolyn Kuhl, Williams Myers, Henry Saad, William Haynes—all I think outstanding nominees—all were filibustered and never confirmed. So I ask my Democratic colleagues: Did we have any outrage from that side then?

Let's look at the current pace of nominations. Unlike President Bush, President Obama did not extend an olive branch by renominating any of the outstanding pending nominees President Bush had submitted who were being held up. In fact, he ignored a request by all of the Republican Members of this body to do that. Instead, he chose Judge David Hamilton as his first nominee. He could hardly be characterized as a consensus nominee. Thirty-nine Senators—all Republicans—voted against him after a full debate.

The treatment of President Obama's and President Bush's nominees for the Fourth Circuit will illustrate what I am saying. During the 110th Congress, despite the 33-percent vacancy rate on that court, four of President Bush's

well-qualified, consensus nominees to that court, the Fourth Circuit, were needlessly delayed and ultimately blocked. President Bush nominated Steve Matthews in September of 2007. Despite his stellar qualifications, he was forced to wait 485 days to even get a hearing and the hearing never came. His nomination was returned in January of 2009. Chief Judge Robert Conrad of the district court had the support of his home State Senators and received an ABA rating of unanimously well qualified. Despite overwhelming support and exceptional qualifications, including having played point guard for Clemson in the ACC, he waited 585 days for a hearing that never came. His nomination was returned. Judge Glen Conrad had been chosen by Janet Reno, President Clinton's Attorney General, to investigate one of the allegations against President Clinton. Out of all of the prosecutors in America, she chose Judge Conrad. It is an outrage that he was not confirmed. He was a stellar nominee and should have been confirmed. The bar respected him and so did the Democratic administration.

Finally, Rod Rosenstein, whom the ABA rated unanimously well-qualified and who served in the Department of Justice in both Democrat and Republican administrations, waited 414 days for a hearing that never came. His nomination was returned on January 2, 2009.

President Obama's Fourth Circuit nominees have fared far better. Take Judge Andre Davis. He received a hearing a mere 27 days after his nomination, a committee vote just 36 days later, and was confirmed in early November of last year. Justice Barbara Milano Keenan was nominated on September 14, 2009. She received a hearing just 22 days later and was voted out of committee 23 days after that. Both Judge Albert Diaz and Judge James Wynn were nominated on November 4, 2009. The committee quickly held their hearing on December 16, 2009—despite the fact that the Senate was consumed with the healthcare debate—and their nominations are listed on the committee's agenda for this week.

The raw numbers also demonstrate that this is not the simple ''apples to apples'' comparison that some have tried to make it out to be.

President Obama has nominated little more than half the judicial nominees that President Bush had nominated at this point in his Presidency. Despite holding a time consuming Supreme Court confirmation hearing, the Judiciary Committee has still managed to hold hearings for all of President Obama's nominees, except for the few that were nominated just before the recess last month and were not ripe for hearings before the break. Compare that to this point under President Bush when 31 of his judicial nominees had yet to receive hearings.

And, not only has the Senate confirmed nearly the same percentage of President Obama's judicial nominees as were confirmed at this point under President Bush, but we are moving faster. Indeed, President Obama's circuit court nominees have received confirmation votes mere months after being nominated—far quicker than President Bush's circuit court nominees, who waited an average of 350 days. Many waited years and many never even received an up-or-down vote. The simple fact is that President Obama has nominated fewer and we have confirmed more.

All of this is not to lay the groundwork for some sort of payback, but to set the record straight. Republicans have not held a private retreat to plot how to block judicial nominees. We have not taken orders from outside groups to block nominees based on their ideology. We have not blocked nominees because we do not want them to sit on a specific case. We have not once attempted to filibuster nominees in the Judiciary Committee. That is how Democrats treated President Bush's nominees. Those are the facts.

We have not and will not do any of those things. Instead, we will continue to thoroughly analyze the records of President Obama's nominees, and hold fair and rigorous hearings to ensure that each nominee possesses the impartiality, the commitment to the rule of law, the integrity, the legal expertise, and the judicial restraint necessary to sit on our Nation's judiciary.

As ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, I look forward to continuing to work with the chairman to process nominations in the bipartisan manner that we have established over the past year.

I yield the floor.

I see our outstanding chairman, Senator LEAHY, is here. I know he wants to get back to the committee. I appreciate his leadership. He is a person I enjoy working with. We spat a little over these nominations, but he allows us to have full and fair hearings when we have them, and I think I can't ask for more than that.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as we return for the second session of the 111th Congress, the Senate at last considers the long-stalled nomination of Judge Beverly Martin of Georgia to the Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit. Even though Judge Martin is a well-respected district court judge with the strong support of both of her home State Republican Senators, Senator CHAMBLISS and Senator ISAKSON, her nomination has been stuck on the Senate Executive Calendar for over 4 months since it was promptly reported by the Judiciary Committee without a single dissenting vote.

The delays for consideration of the nomination of Judge Martin, along with delays for seven other judicial nominations currently on the Senate's Executive Calendar, are the result of a Republican strategy to stall, delay, and obstruct that began last year. I urge the Senate Republican leadership to reconsider their strategy and instead join with us and with President Obama to fill the more than 100 vacancies that have now accumulated on our Federal courts around the country.

The obstructionist tactics that we saw last year from Republicans led to the lowest number of judicial confirmations in more than 50 years. Only 12 of President Obama's judicial nominations to Federal circuit and district courts were confirmed all last year. The 12 Federal circuit and district court nominees confirmed last year was less than half of what we achieved during President Bush's first tumultuous year. In the second half of 2001, a Democratic Senate majority proceeded to confirm 28 judges. In the 17 months that I chaired the Senate Judiciary Committee during President Bush's first term, the Senate confirmed 100 of his judicial nominees.

Republicans have refused to agree to the consideration of qualified, noncontroversial nominees for weeks and months. Last December, only 3 of the available 13 judicial nominations on the Senate Executive Calendar were considered. By contrast, in December 2001, the first year of President Bush's administration, Senate Democrats proceeded to confirm 10 of his judicial nominees. At the end of the Senate's 2001 session, only four judicial nominations were left on the Senate Executive Calendar, all of which were confirmed soon after the Senate returned in 2002. At the end of President Clinton's first year, just one judicial nominee was left on the Senate Executive Calendar. At the end of President George H.W. Bush's first year, a Democratic Senate majority left just two judicial nominations pending on the Senate Executive Calendar.At the end of the first year of President Reagan's first term—a year in which the Senate confirmed 41 of his Federal circuit and district court nominees—not a single judicial nomination was left on the Senate Executive Calendar. This past December, Senate Republicans left 10 judicial nominees without Senate action and insisted on returning 2 of them to the President so that they would have to be renominated.

None of the eight judicial nominations currently pending on the Executive Calendar are controversial. Six were reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee without a single dissenting vote. We have wasted weeks and months having to seek time agreements in order to consider nominations that were reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously and then confirmed unanimously by the Senate once they were finally allowed to be considered.

Judicial vacancies have now skyrocketed to over 100, undoing years of hard work. The lack of Senate action last year is attributable to Senate Republicans and no one else. President Obama has reached across the aisle to

consult with Republican Senators. The nomination before the Senate today is another example of that. He has made quality nominations. While President Obama has moved beyond the judicial nominations battles of the past and reached out to work with Republicans and make mainstream nominations, Senate Republicans continue their tactics of delay.

When President Bush worked with Senators across the aisle, I praised him and expedited consideration of his nominees. When President Obama reaches across the aisle, the Senate Republican leadership delays and obstructs his qualified nominees. The Republican leadership has returned to their practices in the 1990s, which resulted in more than doubling circuit court vacancies, and led to the pocket filibuster of more than 60 of President Clinton's nominees. The crisis they created eventually led even to public criticism of their actions by Chief Justice Rehnquist during those years.

Instead of praising President Obama for consulting with Republican Senators, the Senate Republican leadership has doubled back on what they demanded when a Republican President was in the White House. No more do they talk about each nominee being entitled to an up-or-down vote. That position is abandoned and forgotten. Instead, they now seek to filibuster and delay judicial and even executive nominations. They have also abandoned their initial position at the start of this Congress that they would filibuster judicial nominees on which home State Senators were not consulted. It turned out such consultation and home State Republican Senator support did not matter when they unsuccessfully filibustered President Obama's first judicial nominee, Judge David Hamilton. He was filibustered despite the support of Senator LUGAR, his home State Senator and the longest serving Republican in the Senate.

Despite the fact that President Obama began sending judicial nominees to the Senate 2 months earlier than President Bush, last year's total was the fewest judicial nominees confirmed in his first year of a Presidency since 1953, a year in which President Eisenhower only made nine nominations all of which were confirmed. The number of confirmations was even below the 17 the Senate Republican majority allowed confirmation in the 1996 session.

This is wrong. The American people deserve better. The cost will be felt by ordinary Americans seeking justice in our overburdened Federal courts.

During President Bush's last year in office, we had reduced judicial vacancies to as low as 34, even though it was a Presidential election year. When President Bush left office, we had reduced vacancies in 9 of the 13 Federal circuits. As matters stand today, judicial vacancies have spiked and are being left unfilled. We started 2010 with the highest number of vacancies on article III courts since 1994, when the vacancies created by the last comprehensive judgeship bill were still being filled. While it has been nearly 20 years since we enacted a Federal judgeship bill, judicial vacancies are nearing record levels, with 102 current vacancies and another 21 already announced. If we had proceeded on the judgeship bill recommended by the Judicial Conference to address the growing burden on our Federal judiciary, as we did in 1984 and 1990, in order to provide the resources the courts need, current vacancies would stand over 160 today. That is the true measure of how far behind we have fallen. Justice should not be delayed or denied to any American because of overburdened courts and the lack of Federal judges.

We have seen this unprecedented obstruction by Senate Republicans on issue after issue—over 100 filibusters last year alone, which has affected 70 percent of all Senate action. Instead of time agreements and the will of the majority, the Senate is faced with a requirement to find 60 Senators to overcome a filibuster on issue after issue. Those who just a short time ago said that a majority vote is all that should be needed to confirm a nomination, and that filibusters of nominations are unconstitutional, have reversed themselves and now employ any delaying tactic they can.

These obstruction tactics took dangerous lows last year when Senate Republicans voted to leave our troops without funding at a time when we are fighting two wars. Had the Senate Republican filibuster of the Defense Department appropriations bill been successful, they would have cut off funding for our troops in the field. Senate Republicans also filibustered the veterans bill.

Judge Martin's nomination is the longest pending of the judicial nominees currently on the Executive Calendar. Judge Martin is a well-respected Federal district court judge. Her nomination received a unanimous rating of ''well qualified'' from the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary and has the support of both Republican home State Senators, Senator CHAMBLISS and Senator ISAKSON. Judge Martin has spent 25 years in public service as a Federal judge, as U.S. attorney for the Middle District of Georgia, as an Assistant U.S. attorney in that office, and as an assistant attorney general in the Office of the Attorney General of Georgia. Judge Martin's nomination should have been an easy one to have confirmed months ago. Republicans should have thanked President Obama for consulting with the home State Republican Senators and moved forward. I wish we could have reached a time agreement sooner. It should not have taken 4 months.

I urge Senate Republicans to reconsider their strategy and allow prompt consideration of the other judicial nominees awaiting Senate consideration: Judge Joseph Greenaway of New Jersey, nominated to the Third Circuit; Justice Barbara Keenan of Virginia, nominated to the Fourth Circuit; Jane Stranch of Tennessee, nominated to the Sixth Circuit; Judge Thomas Vanaskie of Pennsylvania, nominated to the Third Circuit; Judge Denny Chin of New York, nominated to the Second Circuit; Rosanna Malouf Peterson, nominated to the Eastern District of Washington; and William Conley, nominated to the Western District of Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I will reserve the remainder of my time and yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Delaware, an extraordinarily valuable member of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. KAUFMAN. I thank the Senator. It is a pleasure to serve with him on the Judiciary Committee and see the work he is doing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### IN PRAISE OF LISA BROWN

Mr. KAUFMAN. I rise once again to recognize one of America's great Federal employees.

One year ago today, Barack Obama took the oath of office as President of the United States. As with every change in administration, the White House welcomed many new staff members, appointed by the President to help him carry out his policy goals.

I have spoken many times about career Federal employees who serve regardless of which political party controls the executive branch. Today, I want to use my time to highlight the important work performed by those Federal employees who serve in appointee positions. Although their jobs depend on the outcome of elections and political circumstances, they are no less accountable to the people and no less dedicated in their service.

This holds true for the appointees from both parties, who, given the opportunity, eagerly leave jobs in the private and nonprofit sectors to serve in government. Many of our Nation's elected leaders once served in this capacity, including some of my Senate colleagues.

On this first anniversary of President Obama's inauguration, many are reflecting on the past 12 months and trying to gauge his administration's success. One thing I am certain about is that he could not carry out his ambitious agenda without the help of the talented White House staff.

The great Federal employee I am honoring today has the challenging job of making sure the White House staff are working together and that all of the information the President needs reaches his desk.

Lisa Brown serves as White House staff secretary. It is a position many

Americans are unfamiliar with, but it is one of the most important in the West Wing. The staff secretary is responsible for keeping the lines of communication between the President and his senior staff open and organized. Nearly every memo destined for the President's desk must first pass through the hands of the staff secretary, who filters the most pressing items and ensures that the President's decisions are conveyed to the appropriate staff member. Think about how complex that is.

Lisa is a native of Connecticut, and she graduated magna cum laude from Princeton with a degree in political economy. She also holds a law degree with honors from the University of Chicago.

After clerking for the late Judge John Godbold, on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit in Alabama, Lisa was a partner at the Washington law firm Shea & Gardner. While working in the private sector, she also engaged in pro bono work in the area of civil rights and disabilities law. During that time, Lisa gained valuable expertise in these fields, which she would later put to use in her government service.

In 1996, Lisa began working as an attorney adviser in the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel. After a year in that role, she was appointed deputy counsel to Vice President Gore, and in 1999 she was appointed as his counsel. At the same time, Lisa served on the executive board of the President's Committee for Employment of People with Disabilities. She also worked on legislative issues with the Vice President's Domestic Policy Office.

After the Clinton administration ended, Lisa moved to the nonprofit sector, where she became executive director of the American Constitution Society for Law and Policy. When President Obama was elected, he asked her to return to government service as a key part of his White House team.

Despite her busy schedule in one of America's most stressful work environments, Lisa still finds time to raise a 6-year-old son with her husband Kevin. Juggling family responsibilities and a demanding workload is a challenge she shares with many other West Wing staffers.

Lisa and other political appointees are a living reminder of the elective nature of our government. When the people decide to give control of the executive branch to the party in opposition, that party is always ready to call on a cadre of talented and dedicated citizens ready to shape policy.

Many of them bring to their jobs the unique perspective of having worked for a previous administration, and they frequently leave higher paying jobs to return to government service. When they do so, they are not only signing on to serve the President. They also commit to long and stressful hours working on behalf of the American people to whom the President and his West Wing staff are answerable.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will join me in honoring the service of Lisa Brown and all those working and who have worked in the West Wing under Presidents Obama, Bush, Clinton, and their predecessors.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I see the distinguished assistant Republican leader on the floor. I ask unanimous consent that all time remaining on either side be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been requested on the nominee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask for the yeas and nays on the nominee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Beverly Baldwin Martin, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit?

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 1 Ex.]

YEAS—97

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Akaka | Collins | Inouye |
| Alexander | Conrad | Isakson |
| Barrasso | Corker | Johanns |
| Baucus | Cornyn | Johnson |
| Bayh | Crapo | Kaufman |
| Begich | DeMint | Kerry |
| Bennet | Dodd | Kirk |
| Bennett | Dorgan | Klobuchar |
| Bingaman | Durbin | Kohl |
| Boxer | Ensign | Kyl |
| Brown | Enzi | Landrieu |
| Brownback | Feingold | Lautenberg |
| Bunning | Feinstein | Leahy |
| Burr | Franken | LeMieux |
| Burris | Gillibrand | Levin |
| Byrd | Graham | Lieberman |
| Cantwell | Grassley | Lincoln |
| Cardin | Gregg | Lugar |
| Carper | Hagan | McCain |
| Casey | Harkin | McCaskill |
| Chambliss | Hatch | McConnell |
| Coburn | Hutchison | Menendez |
| Cochran | Inhofe | Merkley |
| Mikulski | Sanders | Udall (NM) |
| Murkowski | Schumer | Vitter |
| Murray | Sessions | Voinovich |
| Nelson (NE) | Shaheen | Warner |
| Nelson (FL) | Shelby | Webb |
| Pryor | Snowe | Whitehouse |
| Reed | Specter | Wicker |
| Reid | Stabenow | Wyden |
| Risch | Tester | |
| Rockefeller | Thune | |

NOT VOTING—3

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bond | Roberts | Udall (CO) |

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

## RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:29 p.m., recessed until 2:16 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 3 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I further ask that I may be permitted to speak for as much time as I consume.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PRESIDENT OBAMA'S FIRST YEAR IN OFFICE

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, it was exactly 1 year ago that Barack Obama was sworn in as President of the United States. He began by promising to launch a new era of responsibility, bipartisanship, and transparency at home and to improve America's standing abroad. That message appealed to

the American people. The President came into office with high approval ratings, widespread support, and plenty of bipartisan good will in this Chamber. Taking stock now a year later, it is apparent the President has not delivered the change he promised. The President's approach to spending, debt, and big government has surprised and frustrated the American people. It is not what they bargained for. Much of the legislation introduced by the majority has passed on party-line votes and without the transparency he promised.

On this 1-year anniversary, I want to talk specifically about the conflict between President Obama's campaign promises and the policies he has promoted during his first year in office.

Despite his pledge to embrace fiscal responsibility, President Obama's domestic agenda has reflected a belief that big government and massive spending are the keys to promoting economic growth. From car company bailouts, to cash for clunkers, to a wasteful $1.2 trillion stimulus bill that failed to keep unemployment from topping 8 percent, as the administration claimed it would, Federal spending has soared. So has the national debt. President Obama said earlier this year that we cannot keep on borrowing from China, and that is true. So why does the President continue to advocate spending money that we do not have and will have to borrow? What ever happened to his campaign promise of a net spending reduction? Government spending grew by $705 billion in fiscal year 2009, an increase of 24 percent from 2008, and appropriations legislation enacted this year will increase spending by 8 percent more in 2010.

America's 2009 Federal deficit, which is the gap between total outlays and total revenue, made history—and not in a good way. It exceeded $1.4 trillion, which is the highest amount in history and more than three times as large as the biggest annual deficit during the previous administration.

The recordbreaking budget President Obama submitted to Congress doubles the deficit in 5 years and triples it in 10. It also creates more debt than the combined debt of every President from George Washington all the way through George Bush. There is no way to blame President Bush for this situation.

The total debt has reached an almost unimaginable sum—almost $12 trillion. This week, the Senate will take up an increase in the debt ceiling, which is the total amount of legal U.S. debt. That increase will come on the heels of a $290 billion increase in the debt ceiling that was passed late last year and another increase that was passed early in 2009 to accommodate the stimulus bill. Interest payments on this debt are expected to reach $800 billion—just interest alone—$800 billion per year by 2019. Clearly, we have not entered a new era of fiscal responsibility but, rather, quite the opposite.

Of course, the most expensive piece of legislation passed last year was the health care bill. The $2 trillion-plus bill, the most consequential domestic legislation in a generation, was hardly a work of fiscal responsibility or bipartisanship. It passed both bodies of Congress on a partisan vote. The legislation will create a massive new entitlement at a time when America cannot afford its existing entitlement programs.

The bill is filled with deals for special interests that President Obama said would be banned from doing business with his administration. Last week, for example, the White House reached a deal with labor union leaders to exempt, until 2018, union health care plans from a tax that will hit many other Americans.

The bill also violates several key pledges President Obama made about health care reform—first, the pledge that it would be deficit neutral. Richard Foster, who is the Chief Actuary for the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, estimates that under the reform legislation, national health spending will rise by $222 billion over the next 10 years, and the Congressional Budget Office tells us that the Senate bill double-counts the savings from certain Medicare reforms. It uses certain funds to extend the solvency of Medicare by 9 years while simultaneously using those exact same funds to offset the cost of the bill. According to the Congressional Budget Office:

> To describe the full amount . . . as both improving the Government's ability to pay future Medicare benefits and financing new spending outside of Medicare would essentially double-count a large share of those savings and thus overstate the improvement of the government's fiscal position.

In short, this bill is not deficit neutral.

The President also pledged that middle-income families would not see their taxes raised. This is the second broken pledge. As Republicans have explained repeatedly, this bill is packed with taxes that will hit many middle-income Americans, including seniors and the chronically ill. In fact, the Senate version contains a total of 12 new taxes.

The third broken pledge relates to costs. President Obama said his health care bill would reduce costs. It does not. Costs for many families will actually increase thanks to a litany of new Federal requirements and mandates.

This whole process has also shown that the President's professed commitment to transparency was nothing more than a campaign slogan. He promised at least seven times that the health care negotiations would be aired on C–SPAN, as he put it, ''so the American people can see what the choices are.'' But that didn't happen. As Speaker PELOSI reminded us, the President promised a lot of things on the campaign trail. Those who were not invited to the Democrats' secret negotiations did not know the details of the respective health care bills until just before each of them came out for a vote, and we are talking about bills that are more than 2,000 pages long and contain hundreds of hidden provisions.

Even before the health care legislation is concluded, the President is proposing yet another spending bill, a second stimulus package. The stimulus bill—they call it a jobs bill now—that recently passed the House of Representatives would cost taxpayers $260 billion more in deficit spending. I do not believe the way to create jobs is to expand the size and expenditures of the Federal Government. I believe we must encourage growth in the private sector, not by taking money out but by putting money back in. It is understandable and unfortunate that job creators may be nervous about economic conditions. The economy is still shaky and new taxes loom on the horizon.

After seeing the dismal employment report in December, a month in which the economy lost another 85,000 jobs, Diana Furchtgott-Roth, a former chief economist of the U.S. Labor Department, advised the administration to ''press the reset button on economic policy.'' More specifically, she urged the President not to raise taxes, scale back Federal spending, focus on deficit reduction, and reject the new environmental regulations that will drive U.S. jobs overseas.

I hope in the coming year President Obama will consider more sensible domestic policies so that we can rein in the out-of-control spending that has characterized his first year. This would truly be change we can believe in.

I would also like to discuss the tension between rhetoric and reality in the President's foreign and national security policies.

Throughout the campaign, President Obama pledged he would improve America's reputation abroad and repair supposedly damaged alliances. In September 2007, Candidate Obama said:

> America's standing has suffered. Our diplomacy has been compromised by a refusal to talk to people we don't like. Our alliances have been compromised by bluster. Our credibility has been compromised.

So what has been the President's strategy for boosting America's standing? He has gone on an apology tour of sorts, a fundamental consequence of which, in the words of Charles Krauthammer, has been ''to effectively undermine any claim America might have to world leadership.''

The President has devoted much energy to improving relations with our adversaries. Not only have these efforts failed to yield positive results, but they have also led the administration to mistreat several key U.S. partners.

The administration's approach to Iran has been regrettable, to say the least. President Obama came into office hoping to negotiate a ''grand bargain'' over the Iranian nuclear program. He embraced a policy of engagement with the radical Iranian theocracy.

So far, this policy has done nothing to stop Iran from developing nuclear weapons and brutalizing its own people. But it did prevent the Obama administration from offering robust support to the pro-democracy demonstrators who flooded the streets last summer to protest a stolen election. Rather than embrace the protestors, who were standing up for liberty and human rights, President Obama initially said that he did not want ''to be seen as meddling in Iranian elections. Those protestors, by the way, are still out in the streets, waging a courageous struggle for democracy.

Despite all these U.S. efforts to engage the Iranian government, the negotiations over Iran's nuclear program have gone nowhere, and the Iranian president recently declared that Iran ''will continue resisting'' international demands until the United States abolishes its own nuclear arsenal.

We must remember that Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, a government that murders peaceful student democracy activists. The events of the past year have shown that the Iranian regime is not a good-faith negotiator. Now is the time to maximize leverage over Iran through targeted sanctions. Meanwhile, we must not take any options off the table if we hope to prevent an Iranian nuclear weapon.

The President's Iran strategy was based on the idea that U.S. engagement would produce real concessions. That did not work with Tehran, and it has not worked with Moscow either. Despite U.S. diplomatic efforts, the Russian government continues to withhold support for strong U.N. sanctions against Iran, it continues to bully its democratic neighbors, such as Georgia and Poland, and it continues to practice authoritarian domestic policies. America's allies in Eastern Europe and Near Asia are getting nervous. President Obama's cancellation of a planned missile-defense system in Poland and the Czech Republic, and the manner in which it was executed, gave the impression that the U.S. had caved to Russian pressure.

There are few regions in the world as volatile as the Middle East. Unfortunately, the Obama administration has alienated our closest Middle Eastern ally, Israel, by stubbornly pushing it to adopt a comprehensive ''settlement freeze.''

As Elliott Abrams, a former deputy national-security adviser, has written in National Review, the administration has managed to damage the U.S.-Israel alliance, weaken Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas, and produce ''a massive policy failure.'' We all want a just and lasting solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. But demanding unilateral concessions from the Israeli government is no way to achieve it.

As for Latin America, it was highly regrettable that the U.S. imposed sanctions on Honduras, since the removal of former Honduran president Manuel Zelaya was a constitutionally justified act of democracy. Despite initially siding with Zelaya, a close ally of Venezuelan leader Hugo Chavez, the Obama administration appears ready to recognize the validity of the recent Honduran elections. The administration should now lift suspension of aid, cease any further contact with Mr. Zelaya, and denounce his extra-constitutional behavior.

With regard to Venezuela, the President's policy of engaging Hugo Chavez proved a failure. Writing in The Weekly Standard, Jaime Daremblum, Costa Rica's former ambassador to the United States, says, ''If Obama believed his personal charm and assurances of goodwill would be sufficient to sway Chavez and the Castro brothers, he was mistaken.''

Indeed, Chavez has responded to friendly U.S. overtures by continuing to suffocate Venezuelan democracy, continuing to cooperate with Iran and Russia, and continuing to harass neighboring democracies, such as Colombia, where Chavez has funded vicious narco-terrorists. In an editorial last spring, the Washington Post noted, ''This may be the first time the United States has watched the systematic destruction of a Latin American democracy in silence.''

Meanwhile, pending free-trade agreements with U.S. allies in Colombia, Panama, and South Korea still have not been approved by this Congress. That represents yet another foreign-policy failure for this administration. I sincerely hope the President urges Democratic leaders to take action on these agreements sometime this year, preferably soon. Implementing these three trade deals would provide a boost to the U.S. economy and would also strengthen the U.S. position in two important regions.

I also hope the President resists the temptation to support protectionist measures that will hurt our economy and damage our foreign relations. In his first year, the President signed a stimulus package containing a protectionist ''Buy American'' provision, agreed to discontinue a U.S.-Mexican trucking program, and imposed a tariff on Chinese tires. These policies were economically foolish, and they damaged America's credibility as a promoter of trade liberalization.

Finally, a word about the administration's antiterror policies, and its decision to increase the number of U.S. troops in Afghanistan. I am pleased that President Obama has maintained many of the policies that were formulated by President Bush, including the use of military commissions to try suspected terrorists. However, I am disappointed that the President has decided not to use a military commission to try Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind of the 9/11 attacks, and several of his co- conspirators.

Giving these terrorists a civilian trial in New York City will pose significant national security risks; among other things, it will compromise U.S. intelligence-gathering methods. The administration has chosen to prosecute several other terrorists before a military commission. So why not Khalid Sheik Mohammed? Why should the highest-ranking al-Qaida leader captured since 9/11 be given a civilian trial while other al-Qaida members are given military commission trials?

The war against al-Qaida is just that, a war. It is not a law enforcement matter. By announcing that Khalid Sheik Mohammed and other senior al-Qaida members will receive a civilian trial, the Obama administration has signaled that terrorists belong in the U.S. criminal-justice system. They do not. These men are enemy combatants waging war on the United States.

The terrorists who are scheduled to receive civilian trials in New York City have been held at the Guantanamo Bay detention facility. When the President took office, he promised that Guantanamo would be closed within a year. It is now a year later, and Gitmo is still open, as it should be.

There is a good reason that President Obama has not yet been able to fulfill his pledge: Closing Gitmo is a bad idea. The process of removing those detainees who are still being held at Gitmo will create a series of logistical problems and security threats.

Last month, six Gitmo detainees were sent back to their home country of Yemen. Just a few days later, a Nigerian man with links to a Yemen-based terrorist organization attempted to blow up Northwest Airlines flight 253. The flight 253 bombing attempt highlights the deadly threat posed by al-Qaida's Yemen affiliate, known as ''al- in the Arabian Peninsula.'' The administration has wisely halted the transfer of Gitmo detainees to Yemen. But it seems intent to try the flight 253 bomber as a criminal defendant, rather than an enemy combatant. That is deeply misguided, for the reasons I have just listed, as well as the unnecessary difficulties it raises for our intelligence gathering.

The most important front in the war on terrorism remains the battle for Afghanistan. Several weeks ago, the President announced that he would be deploying an additional 30,000 U.S. troops to finish the mission. I strongly support that decision, yet I also worry that the President has set an artificial timeline for withdrawing American forces. The President declared that a withdrawal would begin no later than July of next year. I hope that he is willing to embrace a flexible timeline. Military decisions in Afghanistan should be determined by conditions on the ground, not by the political climate in Washington.

The U.S. commitment to Afghanistan has been costly, and it will continue to be costly. That brings me to the connection between U.S. policies at home and U.S. strategy abroad. While domestic policy is not written to influence

foreign policy, it affects what we can spend on defense and security.

President Obama recently acknowledged the relationship between U.S. economic strength and U.S. global leadership, when he said, ''Our prosperity provides a foundation for our power. It pays for our military. It underwrites our diplomacy.''

Well, that is absolutely true. Our leadership is contingent on our prosperity—and our ability to pay for a robust national defense.

But massive amounts of new spending, new taxes, and European-style government programs will weaken the U.S. economy and make it more difficult for us to exercise global military leadership.

Just look at what happened last year: While $1.2 trillion was pumped into the stimulus bill and the majority in this chamber passed a $2.5 trillion government takeover of health care, the defense budget was practically frozen. Missile defense has been cut, and there's been a reduction in the number of interceptors in Alaska that protect us from a North Korean attack.

So, there has to be balance in spending scarce resources.There is a tipping point at which excessive social spending chokes economic growth and weakens military power.

European nations can get by with relatively low levels of defense spending and high social spending because, for decades, they have enjoyed the protection of America's security umbrella. As Mark Steyn writes in National Review ''Sweden can be Sweden because America is America.''

But if we become more like Europe, if entitlement programs beginto swallow our budget whole, will we still be able to afford the burdens of global military leadership?

I submit that military decline is not an option for the United States. As former Secretary of State Madeline Albright put it, we are ''the indispensable nation.''

That is what American exceptionalism means. It means that, because of our unique history, our unique power, and the unique appeal of our founding principles, America plays a special role in global affairs.

I fear that many of the policies adopted over the past year will make it harder for America to continue playing this special role. I hope that during the year ahead, the administration will pursue a more sensible and responsible course.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. BURRIS. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. We are in morning business.

## MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. BURRIS. Thank you, Mr. President.

Every so often in the winding history of our country there is an entire generation that rises to confront the challenges of a moment. Every so often there is a movement so powerful that it changes the course of history. And every so often there is a visionary leader, a person with singular ideas, who comes along exactly at the right time to harness the energy of a movement and capture the imagination of a generation.

These are rare figures whose names are etched into our national consciousness, whose memorials dot the landscape of our Capital, and whose words and actions help to redefine the very fabric of our Nation. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was just such a leader. He rose to prominence as a key figure of the civil rights movement, but he came to transcend both the movement and the generation that brought him to national prominence.

Earlier this week we came together as a nation to celebrate and commemorate the life and work of Dr. King. His message of equality and fairness for all inspired the transformative civil rights era and continues to resound throughout the United States even today.

The legacy of Dr. King is one that lives on through the service and goodwill of Americans in communities across the country.

And Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day serves as an annual opportunity for people across the Nation to give back and volunteer to help those who are suffering.

It was this generosity of spirit that defined Dr. King's life and work.

And by living out his selfless dedication to our fellow man, we can honor his vision and continue the work he left behind.

The fact that I stand before you today on the floor of the U.S. Senate is proof of the enduring legacy of Martin Luther King.

Out of the chaos, violence, and injustice of segregation, Dr. King found the strength to speak of peace, hope, and righteousness.

Where many saw hate and resentment, Reverend King saw an opportunity to build bridges, to seek out the humanity of those on both sides, and to appeal to the compassion that lives in each of us.

There were some who lashed out with clenched fists. But although he knew he would be met with hostility, Dr. King came to the table, time and again, with arms outstretched.

Half a century ago, most people could barely conceive of a world in which someone like me could address the highest lawmaking body in our land.

Fewer still could have dreamed of the day when a man with a mother from Kansas and a father from Kenya would be sworn in as President of the United States of America.

I never thought I would live to see the day, Mr. President.

But even 50 years ago, when much of America could barely dream of such a future, Dr. King knew this day would come.

His vision never faltered, in spite of the dark days he witnessed and the tragic violence that eventually took his life.

The march towards equality has been long.

It began long before Martin Luther King walked this Earth, and it will continue long after all of us are gone.

But so long as this great Nation endures, Dr. King's spirit will live on in our highest aspirations.

His voice rings through our history.

And although he did not live to see the promised land, his steadfast gaze still guides our every step, his booming voice sets the cadence of our march, and we know he will be waiting for us when we get there.

In the near future, a monument to Dr. King will rise on the National Mall, just a short distance from this Senate Chamber.

He will stand shoulder-to-shoulder with other giants in our history: Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and King.

It is fitting that this great leader should be memorialized alongside other Americans who have helped to build a more perfect union.

And as we observed Martin Luther King, Jr. Day earlier this week and as we continue to build this monument, it is my hope that we can keep his spirit alive in our hearts.

As Dr. King might say, let us keep our feet on the march and our hands on the arc of history.

Let us look to the future with the same fierce urgency that he showed us more than 40 years ago.

Let us complete this journey together, arm in arm, and make Martin Luther King's dream a reality.

## HAITI

Mr. BURRIS. Mr. President, I also wish to address a matter that is impacting our hemisphere; that is, the country of Haiti.

In recent days, we have all heard the tragic news and seen the shocking images of the earthquake that devastated the nation of Haiti just last week.

Even today, more than a week after the earthquake, the full measure of this catastrophe is difficult to ascertain.

Relief workers have only just begun to go out into the cities and towns that surround the Haitian capital, and we are starting to get initial reports from the outlying areas.

Essential infrastructure has been destroyed by the earthquake. Shelter, food, and water are in short supply, and it is nearly impossible to get aid to the people who need it most.

But it is the human toll of this natural disaster that is truly the most horrifying.

Estimates have soared to include over 200,000 people who may have died, and as many as 3 million who may be injured or homeless.

My thoughts and prayers are with all those whose lives have been touched by this terrible tragedy—those who have died, those who have been injured, and those who cannot yet get in touch with their loved ones.

I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in pledging steadfast support for the people of Haiti in this time of crisis.

Haiti is one of the poorest nations on Earth, so this earthquake only compounds the challenges its people continue to face every day.

There are shocking disparities between Haiti and all other nations within the Western Hemisphere, and this tragedy has only widened the gap and exposed these disparities for all to see.

That is why it is especially gratifying that, in the wake of great calamity, America has answered the call again.

I commend President Obama for his focused and timely humanitarian response to this situation, and I applaud the excellent work of the volunteers, rescue workers, and military personnel who have rushed to provide aid.

They continue to save lives and provide care to those in need.

And I will work with my colleagues here in the Senate and with the administration to make sure these people have the tools and resources they need to be a part of the recovery.

Americans have already made a difference in the lives of many Haitians.

But we can and should do more.

The humanitarian crisis in Haiti is growing more desperate by the hour. In spite of the best efforts of relief workers, aid is not arriving fast enough, and thousands of lives hang in the balance.

That is why the American people have already responded in record numbers to requests for help.

They realize that, in many ways, the Haitian people are no different than ourselves.

And while they are not our countrymen, they are our neighbors in the world community, and today they require our assistance.

The American people have shown an extraordinary capacity for generosity. Donations and volunteers continue to stream into the disaster area. Here in Washington, we must do everything we can to encourage people to keep giving, and to make sure we can get supplies and assistance to those who need it most.

We must pledge ourselves to this humanitarian cause—to the belief that, in the aftermath of great tragedy, we can help restore hope to the beleaguered people.

Out of rubble, and chaos, and pain, we can help the people of Haiti begin to rebuild their lives and their country.

We can play a constructive part in the rebirth of this island nation, to help them chart a new course as they emerge from these trials and hopefully relegate the days of poverty to the past.

I ask my colleagues in this great body to join me in this pledge, and to join the millions of Americans who have already rallied to this cause. Both individually and as a nation, we can make a difference.

In this situation, we must make a difference because some of our brothers and sisters in that country are in dire need of our assistance and help for which we have responded very aggressively and very favorably to help them.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURRIS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BURRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period of morning business be extended until 3:45, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURRIS. I ask unanimous consent that time under the quorum call be equally divided.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURRIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## HAITIAN CHILDREN

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to call attention to the ongoing humanitarian crisis in Haiti and to the plight of the many Haitian children who have been adopted by American families and are still waiting to be brought from the disaster to loving homes, to families who are waiting to welcome them. Many have been waiting for a year, 2 years. Many of the families in my State have actually gone to Haiti, and they have met these children.

In the days immediately following the earthquake, the United States, the United Nations, other nations, and organizations have moved swiftly to provide food and water, medicine and clothing, as well as international aid workers to assist in these disaster areas. The people of this country, the people all over the world, have been extraordinarily generous. Currently, thousands of American civilians, as well as members of our Federal agencies and Armed Forces, are in Haiti lending their hands to help the Haitian people.

Unfortunately, though the United States is doing much to save lives in Haiti, lives continue to be lost. And unfortunately, some of the most helpless of Haiti's people—its children—are among those in most need of our help. I am focusing on this issue, this small but important piece of our aid relief, because I have had so many families come to me from my State who are clutching photos of children they are waiting to bring home.

Minnesota has one of the highest rates of international adoptions in the country. Part of that is because we have had a strong tradition of aid, of bringing people from Somalia, the Hmong community, to our State. We have also had a strong tradition of reaching out for decades and adopting children from other countries.

Many of the families I met with over the weekend have been able to confirm that their children are safe, and for that they are so grateful. But they have also heard reports of orphanages that are not in the best shape—not enough food, not enough water. They know these children because so many of them have seen them before. They knew even before this in the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere that these children were not always getting adequate diets.

On January 15, I wrote to Secretaries Clinton and Napolitano, urging them to use their authority under the Immigration and Nationality Act to grant humanitarian parole to all U.S. families applying for entry to the United States on behalf of their prospective children during this period of emergency. I also spoke with Secretary Clinton. She was amazingly generous with her time, and sympathetic and working on this issue.

I am thankful that on Monday, January 18, Secretary Napolitano announced her authorization of the use of humanitarian parole for orphans who are eligible for adoption in the United States. Humanitarian parole is typically used sparingly in cases of compelling emergency. But as I noted in my letter, the magnitude of this disaster clearly warrants broader application of this policy.

There are details, and the details are important. How are these kids going to get to the United States so the paperwork can be processed? There has been talk of a safe haven set up, but we have not seen that happen. Meanwhile, our families in Minnesota are getting more desperate as they hear about the second quake today, as they hear about the problems from the people who are running the orphanages.

This is what I am talking about. Betsy Sathers, a Minnesota resident, was widowed when her husband of 10

months was killed in the tragic I–35W Minneapolis bridge collapse on his way home from work. They talked about having children. So Betsy Sathers decided to adopt some children. She signed up to adopt kids in Haiti. She recently returned from celebrating their second birthday—twins. That is who I am talking about when I talk about someone who is awaiting the arrival of these children in her home.

This is another family—I have their picture here—I met over the weekend. Ginger and Dale Reynolds are adopting two kids, Roselene and Rodeley. They were in the final stages and hoping to bring their kids home. They were told they were in the next batch of adoptions when they last visited before the earthquake hit.

What is striking about this family is that Ginger still signs all of her e-mails with blessings, and they are still incredibly positive despite having their kids in this orphanage. They are also stressing how they want us to help all families, not just theirs. When I met with them, another family was there who was not quite as far along in the process. They spent most of their time talking about how this other family should be helped as well.

Finally, Dawn and Lee Sheldon—I have their photo as well. This is when they were in Haiti. These are the two children they want to adopt who are not with them yet. They are adopting two children. The conditions have been very bad for the particular orphanage where their two kids have been staying. This family has been glued to CNN, which has filmed at the orphanage, looking to see these children's faces.

While we talk legalities, understandably, orphans in Haiti are continuing to suffer from lack of water, lack of food, lack of shelter. Many orphanages have been partially or entirely destroyed in the shocks from this quake. In others, the bodies of deceased personnel still lie near the children, for aid agencies are unable to take away all of the dead.

The hardship and the horror that these orphans face is extreme, and we must act now to bring them out from the unsanitary and potentially traumatizing situation in which they find themselves.

I am grateful for the quick work of Secretary Napolitano and Secretary Clinton. They are on the scene. They are doing the work. But we have to do everything we can to bring these children home. These orphanages, the ones that have not been damaged and are still functioning, need the beds, sadly, for other children. These children have homes to go home to—homes that are welcoming them, homes that consider them their children.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURRIS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## INCREASING THE STATUTORY LIMIT ON THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask consent to execute the order of December 22, 2009, with respect to H.J. Res. 45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the Committee on Finance is discharged of H.J. Res. 45 and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 45) increasing the statutory limit on the public debt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3299

Mr. BAUCUS. Pursuant to the previous order, on behalf of the majority leader, I have a substitute amendment at the desk which I now call up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], for Mr. REID, proposes an amendment, numbered 3299.

Mr. BAUCUS. I ask unanimous consent that further reading be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following: ''That subsection (b) of section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking out the dollar limitation contained in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof $14,294,000,000,000.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3300 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3299

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, pursuant to the previous order, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS] proposes an amendment numbered 3300 to amendment No. 3299.

Mr. BAUCUS. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To protect Social Security)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

( )(a) LIMITATION ON CHANGES TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, it shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any bill or resolution pursuant to any expedited procedure to consider the recommendations of a Task Force for Responsible Fiscal Action or other commission that contains recommendations with respect to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program established under title II of the Social Security Act.

(b) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(c) APPEALS.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, Ralph Waldo Emerson enjoined:

Pay every debt as if God wrote the bill.

Today, we will debate whether the United States continues to pay its bills. We will debate whether the United States will continue to pay the interest it owes on the money it has borrowed.

The spending laws that created the current national debt are behind us. The only question that remains is whether the government will honor its obligation to pay the bill. We have gone to the restaurant, we have eaten the meal, the waiter has delivered the check, and now the only question is whether we will pay the check. To state the question is to answer it: We simply must do so. We must pay the check for the bill, for the restaurant, for the meal we have eaten.

The legislation before us would increase the limit on the amount of money the U.S. Treasury can borrow. If Congress does not enact this legislation, and soon, then the Treasury would default on its debt for the first time in history. If Congress does not enact this legislation, then the government would fail to pay the benefits to a portion of Social Security recipients, the Government would fail to pay benefits to a portion of the beneficiaries of all other Federal programs. That plainly would be unacceptable, and plainly we must enact this legislation.

When the Federal budget runs a deficit, the U.S. Treasury must borrow money to make up the difference. In language around here, we call it the shortfall. That shortfall results from laws enacted in the past that spent money and cut taxes. If we want to avoid the need to borrow, then Congress and the President must enact laws that will cause the Federal Government to spend less money or raise more revenue in the future. Simply preventing the Treasury from borrowing more money is not the solution.

If Congress does not allow the Treasury to borrow more money, then the Treasury will not have the money to pay its bills. The Treasury has no legal authority to prioritize spending and pay only the most important bills. They do not have that authority. If the bills are due, they are due. The Treasury does not even have a way to determine which are the most important bills. If the debt ceiling is not raised, the Treasury would have to pay bills on a first-come, first-served basis. Some of these bills would be interest

payments on previously borrowed money. If the Treasury does not pay these interest payments, then the Federal Government would default on its financial obligations. That would be the first time in the history of the country. If that were to happen, financial entities would be afraid to loan the Treasury money. They would charge astronomically higher interest rates. This would only worsen already high budget deficits.

In some situations, the financial entities would not loan us money at all. This could prevent the Federal Government from meeting all of its programmatic commitments, but the disastrous economic effects would go well beyond that. The price of Treasury securities in the secondary markets would drop. This would cause an immense wealth loss for owners of assets in many other financial markets. This, in turn, would cause untold damage in those markets and further worsen the recession.

What is more, the value of the dollar could drop even further. This would increase inflation in the United States. It could well end the dollar's role as the reserve currency of the world, further exposing the American economy to global economic forces beyond our control.

In addition to paying interest costs, the Treasury pays many other important bills. Among those bills are Social Security benefits. If Congress does not raise the debt limit, then Social Security benefits would have to compete for funding on a first-come, first-served basis with all other Federal payments. If Social Security payments did not come up for funding first, then they would not be paid.

Clearly, we should not let this happen either. The conclusion is simple. We must raise the debt ceiling. Federal budget deficits are at record highs. Why is that? The reasons are simple. We have been and still are in the deepest recession since the Great Depression. We have been in an unprecedented financial crisis. The current administration inherited those problems.

How have these problems contributed to record deficits, we might ask? Well, first, the recession directly affects the Federal budget. The recession has caused revenues to fall to record lows. Since 1970, the Federal Government has collected an average 18 percent of the gross domestic product in tax revenues. That is since 1970. In 2009, however, revenues accounted for only 14.9 percent of GDP, a drop of more than 3 percent.

Meanwhile, the recession has required much greater sums to be spent on unemployment benefits and on Medicaid payments. Second, Congress has had to pass legislation to fight the recession. We needed to enact a large stimulus package to foster economic growth. The package Congress enacted provided stimulus of about $185 billion in fiscal year 2009, and it is estimated to provide stimulus of about $400 billion in fiscal year 2010. This package has done some good—not perfect, but it has done some good. It helped prevent a deeper recession. It has significantly increased economic growth.

Regrettably, the package has not produced enough jobs yet. The Finance Committee and other committees will be looking at additional options to increase job growth as soon as we can turn to them. But let's be clear. If Congress had not enacted the stimulus package, then the country would be in a depression instead of a recession. The stimulus package was the right thing to do.

Third, as a result of the financial crisis, the Bush administration asked for and Congress gave legal authority under the Troubled Asset Relief Program, known as TARP. TARP gave the President authority to help financial institutions, as well as the struggling automotive industry, to weather the financial storm.

The Bush administration was using these authorities before the Obama administration took office. So the recession and financial crisis created needs that, in turn, led to high deficits and record borrowing. How do we reduce such commitments for the future? They are too high. We have to stop. We have to do something about all this. How do we avoid having to borrow such huge sums of money in the future? First, we have to fix our health care system. The current health care system has led to skyrocketing costs in Medicare and Medicaid.

To reduce those costs for the long run, we need to pass comprehensive health care reform. That is a good first step to get that deficit under control. That is exactly what we are doing. In late December, the Senate passed health care reform. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, our health care reform bill reduced the Federal deficit by $132 billion in the first 10 years. Let me say that again.

According to the CBO, this health care regulation will reduce the Federal deficit by $132 billion in the first 10 years—not increase but reduce. That helps. The bill would reduce Federal deficits by $650 billion to $1.3 trillion in the second 10 years; that is, in the second 10 years, there is a much greater reduction in deficit spending, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, a reduction of between $650 billion to $1.3 trillion, a reduction in the Federal deficit in the second 10 years. This deficit reduction is likely to continue in subsequent decades.

Second, after we do all that, after we do all we can do to increase job growth, we need to start working on deficit reduction for the coming decade and also subsequent decades. Because the economy was in a deep recession and the financial markets were frozen, the government borrowed a lot of money. Once the recession is over, we have to reduce borrowing to a fiscally responsible level, and we should begin doing that as soon as we can.

But in the meantime, we cannot allow the Nation to default on its debt. We cannot allow benefits from programs such as Social Security to be paid on a first-come, first-served basis. No one enjoys raising the debt limit. Nobody. It is not something that is a lot of fun to do. No one enjoys paying debts either, but it is simply what we must do to honor our commitments.

There were times when the Senate joined together in recognition that we have this obligation as a joint obligation. Four times in the last 26 years, the Senate has raised the debt limit by unanimous consent. Let me repeat that. Four times in the last 26 years, the Senate has raised the debt limit by unanimous consent. The Senate did so as recently as 1996, under a Republican Senate and a Democratic President.

The Senate did so by unanimous consent three times in the 1980s, twice under a Democratic Senate and Republican President. It has been more than 17 years since the Senate last divided strictly along party lines on a debt-limit vote. We have raised the debt limit a dozen times since then. Honoring the Nation's obligations should not be a partisan matter, and usually it is not. It has until recently not been a practice of the minority in the Senate to filibuster debt limit increases. Under President George W. Bush, the Senate raised the debt limit four times, with simple majorities, with fewer than 60 votes. The Senate did so twice under President Reagan as well.

All but four sitting Senators have voted for a debt limit increase at one time or another in their careers. Among sitting Senators who have served in more than one Congress, only one Senator has never voted for a debt limit increase.

So I call upon my colleagues to rise to the occasion. Let us pay our debts. Let us honor our obligations. Let us allow the debt limit to be raised.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I think most of the people watching this debate, studying how Congress works and how the Federal Government works, know there is a statutory limit on the amount of debt that can be issued by the Federal Government. If the public does not know this, they are constantly reminded of it because, from time to time, we pass legislation that does what this legislation does, increase the borrowing capacity of the Federal Government.

Right now this legal limit stands at $12.394 trillion, and it applies to money borrowed from Federal investors such as banks and pension funds, as well as money borrowed from government programs such as Social Security and Medicare. Yes, we ought to admit that a lot of the Federal debt is owned by various foreign governments as well. I think the latest I saw, in the case of China maybe investing and holding about 8 percent of all the Federal debt

and then you have other countries as well.

This determination is made when the Secretary of Treasury goes to the market and says: We want to borrow X number of dollars, and people bid on it. Obviously, we take it for the lowest interest rate we can get, whatever individuals or pension fund or foreign entity might want to take our debt for that interest. That happens throughout the year.

The decision to increase the debt limit is never an easy one. In recent years, I have reluctantly supported increases in the debt limit on the grounds that Congress must pay its bills. That is quite obvious. Some countries—such as Argentina—decided, from time to time, they did not want to pay their debt, and they are paying the piper for making those unwarranted public decisions in those countries. We do not want to be in that shape.

But Congress sometimes, and too often, has been very irresponsible. I am going to get into some of this current irresponsibility but, at the same time, I do not wish to say some other political party is entirely responsible, over a period of decades, for irresponsible spending. But I think it has reached a new height recently. Because of that, I will be voting no.

Sometimes deficits are unavoidable. People know about wars. The No. 1 responsibility of the Federal Government is to provide for the national defense, the protection of Americans or a threat to our security. We meet that threat. If that requires borrowing to do it, to protect the United States, we consider that justified.

But you cannot plan for wars. You can plan for peace by having a strong national defense. So war is one reason, recession is another. Natural disasters are another example. All of these can result in lower taxes and higher spending, which produces bigger deficits that add to our Federal debt.

But sometimes deficits can be avoided. Since the beginning of 2009, the majority in Congress has approved a $787 billion stimulus bill, a $408 billion supplemental appropriations bill, an additional $350 billion for the financial bailout, and, most recently, an Omnibus appropriations bill that increased Federal spending by 12 percent over the previous year's levels.

In my recent 21-county tour of southeast Iowa, I discussed the most recent example as an example of how spending recently has gotten entirely beyond the commonsense view that Midwesterners look at spending by government. I pointed out how 1 year ago today, the new President was sworn in. The previous President was under a budget that was established for a 5-month period of time. That last budget under Bush had spending at a 3-percent increase. But just as soon as the new majority came into power with a new President, that 3-percent increase was not enough for the remaining 7 months, it was jacked up to 9 percent and then, for the year we are in, the 12 percent I just spoke about.

I think you have to adopt a principle of spending that has increases in expenditures related to the economic growth of the tax policies that provide revenue to the Federal Government. That doesn't have to be on a year-to-year basis, but over a long period we ought to have that balance. In other words, without increasing tax rates, with economic growth of the tax base, more money will come in to the Federal Treasury under the same tax rates.

Well, that growth in Federal income coming in makes it possible to appropriate more money, but there ought to be some relationship between the amount of money coming in and the expenditures made by the Congress.

The bills I just referred to—the stimulus bill, the Omnibus appropriations bill, and others—I voted against every one of those on the grounds that we could not afford them. The fact that we are here this week facing yet another vote to increase the debt limit proves that is true. Many of my colleagues, particularly on the other side of the aisle, insist that it is not their fault. They continue to blame previous administrations for all fiscal problems.

I want to make it clear that we in the Republican Party got kicked out of the majority in 2006 because we lost fiscal integrity. I hope we are reestablishing that, and I hope that in the process of reestablishing that we can convince the people who had doubts about Republicans that we can regain their trust.

More recently, as I indicated, it seems a great deal of the current debt problem is related to irresponsible spending that has taken place near term.

What do they target us with when they want to blame us for the deficit? They criticize the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts which they insist were excessive and unfair. Such criticism overlooks several facts. First, these were not Republican tax cuts. They passed both the House and Senate with bipartisan support. Second, Federal revenue quickly returned to the historical average following these tax cuts, so they were not excessive relative to the government's historic claim on revenue.

I suppose you can take any period of time you want, but in the post-President Kennedy period of time, it seems to me the average take of the economy that has come through the Federal Government in the way of taxes has been about 18 to 19 percent. Even including the tax cuts of 2001 and 2003, those cannot be considered excessive relative to the government's historic claim on revenue; in other words, what the government takes as opposed to what they leave in the pockets of taxpayers in the United States.

It is very important to remember that our Tax Code is not fully indexed to inflation and economic growth. Thus, every year without a tax cut results in a small but not insignificant tax increase or more revenue coming into the Federal Treasury without our actually changing rates. Indeed, without the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, Federal revenue would have risen well above that historic average of 18 to 19 percent. In fact, when we passed those tax cuts, it was very near 21 percent.

Third, critics insist that the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts unfairly benefitted the wealthy. Again, critics are wrong. I quote the Congressional Budget Office. Around here, we don't question the Congressional Budget Office. Maybe you want to. But if you want to question them, it takes 60 votes to override their determination of something, if there is a budget point of order.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the bottom 90 percent of households pays the smallest share of Federal taxes in nearly 30 years while the top 10 percent pays the largest share. When taxes are measured as a share of income, the bottom 90 percent of households pays the lowest effective rates in nearly 30 years while the top 10 percent pays their historic average.

You can say it many times, but it never sinks in because people have their own ideas of how to show populism, and it is to always hit the wealthy of America. From that standpoint, you have to understand that percentage of top income earners, if you compare what they are paying into the Federal Treasury now with what they were paying in even during the Reagan years, you will find it is a much higher percentage right at this point.

In regard to what I just said about historical averages, President Obama's budget and the budget resolution adopted by the Democratic majority in Congress last year both called for the continuation of 70 to 80 percent of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts. So you can badmouth those tax bills all you want, but the new President, the new majority wants to maintain about 70 to 80 percent of them. So some of it isn't so bad, but you never hear that. It is all about the 2001 tax cuts being everything for the wealthy.

If these tax cuts were so excessive and so unfair then, why does the majority party support so many of those tax cuts right this very day?

The desire to blame our current predicament on the previous administration also overlooks two other facts. First, the Democrats controlled the majority of the Senate during half of the previous administration, including its final 2 years. I think it is disingenuous for them to deny any responsibility for where we are today.

Second, when the new administration took office in 2009, it sent up a budget that proposed to increase the debt three times faster than the previous administration. You know where that takes us to from the 40-year average? I talked about the 40-year average of the proportion of the GNP that is coming into the Federal Treasury as far as

taxes are concerned at 18 to 19 percent. Take a 40-year average on what the percentage of the national debt is to gross national product. It is about 40 percent. This is going to be reaching 80 to 90 percent under this budget that was sent here in the previous year.

The majority party essentially approved most of that very same budget. So they have now signaled the intention to continue to increase the national debt at a record pace.

Finally, let me say a word about the health care bill adopted by the Senate. Rather than taking an incremental approach and waiting for the results to see what works and what doesn't work, the majority wants to raise taxes and cut Medicare to pay for a brand new health care entitlement program. If they use all of the tax hikes, and all of the Medicare cuts they can support to pay for more spending, how will they ever reduce the deficit? At what point will those who want to blame our current predicament on previous administrations take responsibility for actions that are taking place now?

This week we have an opportunity to do that. I am glad we have a long period of time to discuss the debt limit but connect it with a lot of policies that seem to be out of proportion to problems that we previously had. If they want to continue to vote for more deficit spending, it seems to me they should vote to raise the debt limit or take actions that would reduce the need for such a dramatic increase in the debt limit.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, on another matter which is topical and tragic and which is on the minds of Americans and people all over the world today, I rise to share a few remarks involving the overwhelming disaster that has hit Haiti.

Words do not begin to describe the extent of the disaster—thousands dead, more than 1 million homeless. Just imagine how bad it is. It is almost impossible to imagine. Families continue to search and mourn for lost mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, and sons and daughters. The earthquake may be the most lethal disaster to ever occur in the Western Hemisphere. This is not a disaster on some distant shore. Haiti is closer to Florida, for example, than the distance from one end to the other of my State of Montana.

I am encouraged by the outpouring of help from around the world. Many have flown to volunteer. Others have helped through in-kind contributions, cash. In fact, I recently heard that a vast number of people responded on the Internet through Blackberry and Twitter to give contributions. It is a huge number—not individually large, but the total is a massive outpouring of support.

Americans have shown remarkable generosity. These are tough economic times, but millions still want to give. This is the American spirit. It is who we are as Americans.

Amidst this destruction and great sorrow, there are stories that offer incredible hope. Maxine Fallon, a 23-year-old student, was buried for 6 days without food or water. She was buried deep in the rubble which was once her university. She sent text messages pleading for help. A search-and-rescue team rescued her from the ruins of her cratered school. Since arriving, rescue teams from the United States and other countries have saved more than 75 victims from the rubble.

As Americans, we rise to aid our friends and neighbors who are in need. There is no people in greater need right now than the people of Haiti. Haiti is the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere. Fifty-four percent of the population lives on less than a dollar a day. With so many struggling to survive, the earthquake's swift destruction must be met with a response equally forceful and rapid.

I propose we pass legislation as soon as possible called the Haiti Assistance Income Tax Incentive Act or simply the HAITI Act. The HAITI Act will allow U.S. taxpayers to make charitable contributions to Haiti relief programs until March 1, 2010, and claim those contributions on their 2009 income tax returns. The proposal is similar to legislation that passed unanimously in 2005, following the tsunami disaster along the Indian Ocean.

The HAITI Act is a bipartisan bill I am introducing with Senator GRASSLEY and several other Senators. The same language passed the House of Representatives earlier today.

This is simple legislation that would make a big impact. It will make it a little easier for Americans to contribute to the victims of the Haiti disaster. Frankly, most Americans want to contribute anyway. The American Red Cross and UNICEF's United States Fund raised about $7.3 million in donations over a 4-hour period while a Larry King Live special on Haiti aired. But the relief and rebuilding effort in Haiti will require billions and will take a long time. This legislation is an additional incentive for Americans to contribute to that effort. As search and rescue efforts give way to building, these donations will ensure that our efforts have a lasting impact.

While we must do what we can to provide relief now, the people of Haiti will need our help for many years to come. This is not just a 1-week, 1-month, several-month effort. Trade programs such as the HOPE and HOPE II Acts provide an opportunity to create new jobs in Haiti's export sector. As the people of Haiti work to rebuild what was destroyed, I will continue to work to provide generous access to the U.S. market for products produced in Haiti.

The suffering in Haiti is heartbreaking and the generosity in response to the Haiti earthquake is a reflection of the American spirit. Today I stand with the people of Haiti and I ask my colleagues in the Senate to stand with me. Let's pass the HAITI Act and let's do everything we can to help those who have lost so much in this terrible disaster.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes, and that after my speech Senator THUNE be recognized, unless the Senator from Montana has somebody in between he wishes to be recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I reserve the right to have somebody else speak following the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent that the next Member to be recognized on our side be Senator THUNE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. I wish to thank Senator THUNE for his courtesy.

Mr. President, I wish to speak a little bit here on this debt ceiling issue because it is critical. It is critical because of the size of it. We as a nation are running up debt at a rate we have never seen in history. The budget which we are presently functioning under will add approximately $1.4 trillion of debt from last year and potentially another $1.2 trillion next year. Under the budgets that were brought forward by the President, it looks as though we are going to have $1 trillion in deficits every year for the next 10 years. That is an expansion of our debt at a rate we have never seen before, except in a time of war.

What is the implication of that? Nobody understands what $1 trillion is. I don't understand what $1 trillion is. It is very hard to conceptualize $1 trillion. So I wish to try to put it in context.

We know for a fact that certain nations get into trouble when they allow their debt to get so large that their economy doesn't have the capacity to pay it down in an orderly way. We are regrettably seeing that today in Greece. There are other nations in Europe that appear to have the same types of problems, including Ireland, where their national debt, their sovereign debt, has gotten so large they are basically in a position where their capacity to pay it off is at risk. So the value of that debt gets adjusted by the marketplace and it becomes much more expensive for those nations to borrow, and at some point, even, potentially they can't borrow and they end up in what amounts to a national bankruptcy.

That has never been a threat to us as a nation because we have always had a vibrant economy, and because the dollar, ironically, is the currency of world reserve, we have been able to basically what is known as monetarize our own debt. There have always been people out there willing to lend to us as a nation because they have always presumed that the United States, because of our resilience, because of our economic strength, will always pay our debt, and that is why Treasurys are considered to be one of the safest investments in the world, or traditionally have been. That has been a great strength of our Nation, of course, to have this sort of integrity to our currency and to our ability to repay our debt. However, on the course we are presently pursuing, all of that is going to be called into question and called into question much sooner than we had expected, I suspect, or anybody had anticipated who had looked at this objectively 2 or 3 years ago.

We know there are certain thresholds that generate huge warning signs where red flags go up and say, your Nation is in trouble. A couple of those thresholds have actually been adopted by the European Union as they have looked at their membership and said, What is the proper deficit of an industrialized nation? What is the proper public debt ratio to GDP of an industrialized Nation? In Europe what they say is, You can't be a member of the European Union if your deficits exceed 3 percent of GDP and your debt exceeds 60 percent of GDP, your public debt. Well, our deficits are around 12 percent of GDP right now. They will ultimately go down, but there is no time in the next 10 years where they are projected to fall below 5 percent of GDP under President Obama's budgets. Our public debt is going to cross that 60 percent of GDP threshold probably within the next year. So arguably, as I said before on this floor, we would not be able to get into the European Union if we wanted to, because we would not meet their standards for fiscal responsibility as a nation. That is pretty serious.

What is even more serious is there is no end in sight to this. We are looking at a deficit and debt situation which will continue to expand and become even more and more problematic for us as a nation for as far as the eye can reasonably see which, for the purposes of discussion around here, is about 10 years.

We know that the public debt-to-GDP ratio, under the President's budget as proposed last year before this health care bill was taken up—and I would argue that this health care bill is going to radically aggravate the public debt issue in the outyears, and there will be debate about that because CBO will debate that point, but I don't think all the pay-fors will ever occur—independent of that, we know that under the budget as it is presently presented, the public debt is going to exceed 80 percent of GDP—80 percent of GDP—by the year 2019. In fact, there are some estimates that say it will exceed 100 percent of GDP before we hit 2020. Those are intolerable situations.

What is the practical implication of our adding that much debt through deficit spending over the next few years to our economy? A few things occur, and they are undeniable. They will occur on the path we are presently on. The first thing that will occur is it will be much harder for us to sell our debt because nations will start to say—people around the world, including our own public, I suspect, will start to say, Can they really pay that back. When they cross that 60-percent threshold, which is basically a key tipping point on the ability of a nation to manage itself, and they start heading up towards 80, 90, 100 percent of GDP as the public debt ratio, can they really pay back their debt? People are going to say, Well, I am not so sure. I am going to charge them a fairly significant premium before I am going to lend them any money. So the cost of our interest will go up dramatically. In fact, it is projected that in the year 2019, interest on the public debt alone will exceed $800 billion a year. That is more being paid out in interest which goes to people all over the world—people in China, people in Saudi Arabia, all over the world—that interest will be higher than any other item of Federal spending. What a waste of money that is. What a waste of money that is. What a misuse of money. All of that money could be used for something constructive in the United States—building infrastructure, building schools, assisting education, whatever. If you are going to spend it, why would you spend it on interest?

So we will be in a position where it will be harder for us to sell our debt. Actually, we will probably get to a position fairly soon—and I am willing to bet on this; I won't be in this Congress at the time, but before we hit the year 2020—where we will actually have to take some radical step as a nation in order to deal with our debt. Because if we allow it to go up under its present scenario, it becomes totally unsustainable. It is like a dog chasing its tail; it can't get there. We can't pay down the debt.

The practical implications of that are twofold: Either, No. 1, you inflate the economy and devalue the currency, and that is a very harsh thing to do to the American public because it devalues their savings and it makes it harder for the economy to be productive or, No. 2, you radically raise taxes to try to reach the obligations of the debt, and that also dramatically impacts the economy. It makes us less productive. It means less jobs will be created. Either one of those scenarios, or only one of those two scenarios, or maybe a combination will occur if we continue on our present course, which means that the next generation will actually have a lower standard of living than our generation. It means it will be much more difficult for the next generation of Americans to buy a house, send their kids to school, buy a car, to live the quality lifestyle we have had as a nation. In fact, it will be the first time in history, if we stay on our present course, that one generation has handed to another generation a lower standard of prosperity and quality of life. It is inexcusable to do that. It is unacceptable. Nobody in this body who has a public responsibility to the next generation—and we all have that responsibility—should do that to our children.

So what are we going to do to address it? Well, put very simply, we need to stop spending so much money. That is the bottom line. We need to stop spending so much money. Under the projections in this budget as it presently exists and was passed in this Congress, over my objection and over the objections of everybody on this side of the aisle, it is projected that we are going to be in a situation where, as I said, there will be $1 trillion deficits for as far as the eye can see and the size of government spending will go from 20 percent of GDP up to about 24, 25 percent of GDP if the health care bill is also passed. That will be the highest level of Federal spending that has occurred in this government since World War II. We have never had those types of levels of spending. So it is not a revenue issue—although right now it is a revenue issue because, obviously, right now the economy is in a recession—but over the long run it is not a revenue issue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. It is a spending issue. It is not a revenue issue. It is primarily a spending issue. The fact is that we are spending a great deal more than we can afford as a nation, and this government has committed to a great deal more than we can afford. So we need to do something on the spending side of the ledger.

There is going to be a series of proposals brought forward by our side, and Senator THUNE is going to offer one in a minute, to try to get to the issue. They won't solve the whole problem, but they will at least make significant steps down the road of restraint and show that we are starting to get serious about it, and they are reasonable ones. Senator THUNE: End TARP. End TARP. We don't need it anymore. We should take those dollars and put them toward debt reduction. Freeze discretionary spending. That will be Senator SESSIONS' amendment, or something like that. Rescind some of the stimulus spending that is going to occur after 2011; that may be one of our amendments. I know Senator COBURN is going to suggest a series of other issues. All of these are steps in the right direction.

So I think on our side of the aisle the basic philosophy is this: It is irresponsible to increase the debt ceiling if you

don't do something responsible about addressing what is driving the debt ceiling, which is spending. So we are going to suggest a series of initiatives around here that we believe are responsible on the issue of controlling spending, and I hope those initiatives will be passed so we can begin to put this country back on the road toward fiscal responsibility.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. Again, I wish to thank the Senator from South Dakota for his courtesy and the Senator from Montana as well.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3301 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3299

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE], for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHANNS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. LEMIEUX, Mr. BURR, Mr. ENZI, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNETT, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. CORNYN, proposes an amendment numbered 3301.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To terminate authority under the Troubled Asset Relief Program, and for other purposes)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. ___. REPEAL OF THE TROUBLED ASSET RELIEF PROGRAM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorities provided under section 101(a) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (excluding section 101(a)(3)) and under section 102 of such Act shall terminate on the date of enactment of this resolution.

(b) LOWERING OF NATIONAL DEBT LIMIT TO CORRESPOND TO TARP REPAYMENTS.—Section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by inserting after the dollar limitation contained in such subsection the following: '', as such amount is reduced by the amount described under subsection (d)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) The amount described under this subsection is the amount that equals the amount of all assistance received under title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 that is repaid on or after the date of enactment of this subsection, along with any dividends, profits, or other funds paid to the Government based on such assistance on or after the date of enactment of this subsection.''.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we entered into this debate about the debt limit today. I appreciate the comments of my colleague from New Hampshire with respect to the overall picture of our financial and fiscal condition in the country right now. I think it is important to put that context out there because we are debating now a substitute amendment that the Senator from Montana is offering on the debt limit increase. I think that was originally proposed in the $650 billion range. We are now talking about tripling that—a $1.9 trillion increase in the debt limit—after having just voted on raising the debt limit before we went out for the Christmas holiday by about $290 billion.

So we have this proposal on the Senate floor that would increase the total amount of indebtedness of the U.S. Government by $1.9 trillion. As the Senator from New Hampshire very well pointed out, we are looking at deficits now into the foreseeable future that exceed $1 trillion. It doesn't look like in the 10-year window in which we do budgeting in the Senate that we are ever going to have a year where we don't have a deficit that isn't in the $1 trillion range. We had a $1.4 trillion deficit last year and will have another $1.2 trillion deficit this year. We keep racking up more and more debt that gets passed on to future generations and taxpayers.

As the Senator from New Hampshire pointed out, for admission into the European Union there are a couple of key thresholds. One is debt as a percentage of GDP, which is 60 percent, which is the threshold for admission into the European Union, and deficits, which is about 3 percent. He pointed out very effectively that we are at a threshold in this country that exceeds dramatically the deficit, the GDP threshold that wouldn't even allow us to get into the European Union, and we are going to blow by the debt to GDP threshold in the next year, which is 60 percent to GDP.

My point is, we are getting in perilous territory when it comes to the confidence and trust the American people have in the Federal Government's ability to manage responsibly and exercise fiscal discipline with their tax dollars. We are also getting to a point where I think those who are acquiring U.S. debt—and by that I mean the Chinese who, of course, are a big holder of U.S. debt—get to start saying: If we are going to continue to buy this debt, we are going to get a higher return. The higher our debt goes, the more risk they take on.

It is a fundamental rule of economics that we all learned that there is a corresponding relationship between risk and return. If an investor is going to assume more risk, they are going to demand a higher return. What we are doing now by piling up more debt is saying to the people who would buy that debt, the investors out in the world or in this country is, this is becoming a more risky proposition for you. As we pile up more debt, they are going to start saying: OK, if we are going to buy that debt and finance your spending into the future, we are going to need a higher return. That means higher interest rates.

Of course, when you start seeing Federal Government debt go up in terms of interest rates, generally what happens is other interest rates in our economy will go up as well. So you will start seeing student loans, for example, and homeowners and small businesses all being impacted by higher interest rates as a result of what inevitably happens when you run these kinds of deficits year after year and add as much as we are to the Federal debt.

We are not showing any evidence that there is a willingness to restrain that. In fact, if we look at just the last year—of course, the $1 trillion stimulus bill sort of started off the spending. Then since then we have had an omnibus, or minibus, spending bill, both of which increased spending year over year by about twice the rate of inflation, and sometimes in excess of that.

But what we have seen now between fiscal years 2008 and 2010 are astronomical increases in the size of the Federal Government. If we start with the legislative branch appropriations bills between 2008 and 2010—that covers a couple of appropriations years—we are looking at a 17.3-percent increase. If we look at appropriations for the Interior and the Environment, it is an increase of 21.4 percent over that time period; appropriations for Commerce, Science, and Justice, an increase of 24.2 percent. Appropriations for Transportation and HUD increased a whopping 39.1 percent. The State and Foreign Operations appropriations bill beat even that and was increased by 48.7 percent.

Taken as a whole, the entire government grew by 16.8 percent during that time period. When I say that, I am talking between 2008 and 2010. We saw a 16.8-percent increase in the size of the Federal Government. That is just speaking to the appropriations bills over those 2 years. Of course, we all know that dramatically outpaces and dwarfs the rate of inflation and the growth we have seen in our economy over that time period.

What is even more notable is that none of those increases included the increased funding through the stimulus bill, which I mentioned was an additional $1 trillion. Of course, I am concerned that will be built into the budget baseline into the future, and we will see our appropriators assume that stimulus money is part of the baseline in spending.

Of course, those appropriations bills don't include this proposed stimulus 2 that we are hearing about: the bailouts of the banks, the insurance companies, and the car companies, or the $2.5 trillion expansion that would occur with a new health care proposal, or entitlement, in this country. So we have seen this dramatic increase in the growth of

government and in spending in Washington, most of which is financed with borrowing.

Last year, in fact, 43 cents out of every dollar we spent in the Federal Government was borrowed. We cannot continue to sustain a pattern of borrowing 43 cents out of every dollar we spend. In fact, as American families and households and small businesses are having to tighten their belts, in Washington, DC, the spending continues unabated.

What I am hoping to do with this amendment is to at least demonstrate that, as an institution, the Senate is willing to say we are going to take some steps, no matter how modest they are—and I would say my amendment isn't going to go a long way toward eliminating this Federal debt, but certainly I think it demonstrates to the American people that we get it; we are hearing that they are uncomfortable with the massive amount of borrowing and spending and taxes going on here. Americans are going to pay for this in the form of higher taxes and in the form of higher inflation. As I said, it will be also in the form of higher interest rates on mortgages and small business loans and student loans and those sorts of things. So we have a responsibility to demonstrate to the American people that we are serious about getting our fiscal house in order.

The most recent example, of course, as I mentioned earlier, in this pattern of expansion of the Federal Government is the health care bill, which is in the process right now of discussions, evidently, between the House and Senate and the negotiations that are ongoing. It passed the House and the Senate before the Christmas holiday. I happen to hope that people will come to their senses and defeat this bill and that it would not emerge in the conference committee, and we can start over and do it the right way—in a step-by-step way, not in a way that expands the size of government by $2.5 trillion.

That being said, the $2.5 trillion expansion of the Federal Government includes higher taxes, Medicare cuts, and also at the end of the day, according to the CBO, does very little for most people in this country to actually reduce the cost of their health care insurance.

In fact, what we have seen through studies done by CBO and by the CMS Actuary is that for most Americans, they are going to see, at best, their health insurance premiums stay the same. If they are in the individual market, they will see them go up. So the health care bill is an example of this runaway Federal spending. In fact, in the latter part of that debate, we got a response from the CBO to a question posed by the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, with regard to how the accounting is done in Medicare. One of the arguments we heard throughout the course of the debate was that it would extend the lifespan of Medicare. The question was posed to CBO: What happens with this additional Medicare tax and these Medicare cuts that would be imposed upon providers and senior citizens in this country?

The argument was always made that this will extend the lifespan of Medicare. Our question was, how do you spend money to create this entitlement program and pay for the health care expansion and say you are expanding Medicare? The answer that came back was that under the accounting convention regarding trust funds in a unified budget, in fact, there would be notes put into these trust funds that technically, legally speaking, would extend the lifespan of Medicare. But those dollars are also being spent on the new health care expansion.

From an economic standpoint, the conclusion you draw is that you cannot spend the same money twice. What they said is that you are spending the same money twice. You are double counting this money.

My view is that we have complicated this situation dramatically by this new health care entitlement program. That is why I think it is so important that we reverse course and start over and do this right, in a way that is step by step and gets at the fundamental issue most Americans are concerned about, which is the high cost of health care and providing access to more Americans and a higher quality of care.

I say all that as a background to get into this debate about the debt limit and to say I am very concerned. I also think most Americans are concerned about the amount of spending and borrowing and taxing that is occurring in Washington, DC. My amendment, very simply, says the Troubled Asset Relief Program that was enacted in late 2008—a $700 billion authority for the Treasury to use to help bring stability to the financial services industry in this country—would end. We would basically say that job, that mission, and that purpose has been served, completed. In fact, any unobligated funds should not be spent, and we should not allow TARP to become a sort of revolving loan fund, a political slush fund, to be used for all kinds of purposes. Most of the people who voted for it believed it would be used to bring stability to our financial services industry. We were told at the time that if we didn't do something, we were on the verge of imminent financial collapse, a financial meltdown. So many of us supported that at the time, with the belief that it would in fact be used to acquire the troubled assets that were on the balance sheets of a lot of financial institutions.

What happened is it evolved and morphed into something entirely different. It has been used to take equity positions not only in insurance companies but in auto manufacturers. It was suggested by the Treasury Department, whose interpretation is that they could use this for other purposes. We think the statute is plain about how these funds ought to be used. The Treasury has taken a different interpretation. When they chose to extend this program, it was set to expire at the end of December of last year. The Treasury Department chose to extend it. The assumption most of us made was that they have designs on how to use the funds. If they don't, certainly Members of Congress do.

I don't say that as a partisan statement. I think there are probably people on both sides who would love to know there is a few hundred billion dollars available to go toward some program they think is important. I am not saying anybody's ideas about government programs that might serve a particular constituency's needs are not important. They are important in the minds of individual Senators. But if we are thinking about the overall good of the country, we have to begin thinking about what we are doing.

This authority that was created under TARP—the $700 billion—is, if we don't shut it down, going to be used for all kinds of other ideas and purposes. We saw that most recently with the stimulus 2 bill that is proposed in the House of Representatives. They wanted to use TARP funding as an offset to pay for the new stimulus bill. We have seen proposals to use it for small businesses.

Frankly, I think we need to focus any efforts we make to create jobs in this country on small businesses because, after all, they create two-thirds or three-quarters of the jobs in our economy. Frankly, the TARP program wasn't designed to do that. It had a specific statutory purpose. That purpose is now being adulterated. It is used in all these different ways.

I happen to believe—and I hope a majority of my colleagues will as well—we should vote to end this program and not allow it to be used and misused and abused in a way that creates greater liabilities for the American taxpayers, creates more debt and borrowing because, after all, that is what it is.

The TARP authority is debt. When we talk about spending TARP money, it is not as if there is a big bank of money out there. What it means is that when TARP authority is used, we go out and borrow the money. Basically, we add to the Federal debt that we continue to pile up.

So the ENDTARP program—there is an acronym for everything around here—the ENDTARP program, Erasing Our National Debt Through Accountability and Responsibility Plan, or ENDTARP, is what my amendment embodies. Basically, we believe we ought to, as a body, as an expression of our willingness to, again, demonstrate to the American people we can get our fiscal house in order, vote to end this program.

I would like to illustrate, if I may, what I am talking about in graphic terms. This is a pie chart that shows the whole $700 billion that was authorized under TARP. The blue represents that the $545 billion—the latest information we have—has been spent or at

least committed. That was as of January 6, 2010. What this side, the red, represents is the unobligated funds. The unobligated funds is a combination of both the authority that was not used, and that was about $155 billion, and payments that have been made back into the fund. That is about $165 billion. So we have about $319 billion—$320 billion in round numbers—of unobligated authority in TARP. What my amendment simply would say is, this amount of money cannot be spent. We would end TARP, and instead of allowing the program to continue through October of this year, at which point, incidentally, they don't have to shut down the spending—the spending can continue to go on. The program, in effect, would shut down in October of this year. But we believe that this unobligated money in here, that we ought to not spend it. When we do not spend it, it is money we do not have to borrow, and that reduces the overall amount of the Federal debt and the amount of debt we are passing on to future generations.

Again, this is a way of illustrating what we are talking about, what the amendment would do. The blue represents the amount that has been committed or spent as of January 6. The other side, the red, represents the amount that has not been used, authorized but not spent, and has been paid back—in other words, unobligated balances in the TARP fund of about $320 billion.

It is a fairly straightforward amendment. I hope a majority of my colleagues in the Senate will vote with me to say to the American people that we hear you; we do not believe using this program in a way that was not intended, that further aggravates a very serious fiscal situation for this country, ought to be allowed to continue.

I think the American people have made it clear that they are tired of the bailouts. There was a Wall Street Journal/NBC poll indicating that 53 percent of Americans are unhappy with the government's current role in the private sector. In fact, 65 percent of Americans are opposed to government intervention by taking a majority stake in General Motors.

Again, despite the original projections when TARP was signed into law that we were going to be made whole and this was actually going to generate additional revenue for the American taxpayers, I think we now know the estimates that are coming forward suggest we are going to lose money. The amount of money that was authorized for this program, we are not going to get it all back, but the one thing we can do right now is to cut our losses by making sure that these unobligated funds do not get spent, that they do not go onto the Federal debt, and that they do not go onto additional borrowing. When we are borrowing 43 cents out of every dollar spent in Washington, DC, we need to exercise some fiscal discipline.

I hope my colleagues will vote to support this amendment. My understanding is there will be a vote sometime tomorrow on this amendment. I hope to have another opportunity to speak to it tomorrow morning. I wanted to lay the amendment down, make my colleagues aware of it, and encourage them to support it.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, frankly, I think the fundamental question facing us is, Are we going to pay our bills? That is the question before us today.

On the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota, I suspect the chairman of the Banking Committee, Senator DODD, will have something to say about that when we come back into session tomorrow. But the fundamental question we are facing with the debt limit extension resolution is, Are we going to pay our bills? We have incurred obligations. We have, as a country. Are we going to pay them? Are we going to pay our bills? That is the basic question. Are we going to live up to our commitment to pay our bills?

The discussion here quite correctly is somewhat—not correctly. The subject has moved over to, well, gee, aren't our deficits too high? Haven't we been spending too much compared with the revenue we are taking in? Yes. There is no one here who would argue the point that our deficits are too high. That is right. They are what they are partly because of the recession we are in, the subprime mortgage crisis that somewhat prompted all the problems we face as a country, a lot of loose lending by lots of institutions, packaging of obligations, of loans, and securitizing those loans, all the fees earned by banks and so forth. Pretty soon, all the mortgages became if not worthless, at least not worth very much at all. Our country consequently faced a recession by and large because of a lot of loose financial thinking in the last couple of years, beginning with the subprime mortgage crisis. We are where we are. We are trying to work ourselves out of the recession. But the basic question is, Are we going to pay the debts we obligated? Are we going to live up to our commitments?

The Senator from New Hampshire, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, quite correctly talked about our deficits being too high. He raised the prospect of, gee, maybe fairly soon various countries are going to charge us more on the debt we are borrowing, may want to charge a premium because they wonder if they can trust the obligation of the United States to pay its debts. I don't know whether that is true. I don't know when that may or may not be true. That is a very speculative question. We just do not know. A lot of people have very formed opinions on that point. But I do know something that is absolutely true, over which there is no debate; that is, if we default on our debts, then we are going to find the economy is going to collapse. I do know that as a fact. Every Member of this body knows that to be a fact. We must extend the debt limit so we can pay our debts. That is pretty simple. In the meantime, as a Congress, clearly we have to work to get these deficits under control. We have to do both, frankly. We have to extend the debt limit so we can pay our debts. If we do not raise it, we cannot pay our debts. So we have to raise it. In addition, we have to work at getting these deficits under control. There is no doubt about that.

Frankly, one good way to get deficits under control is to pass health care reform. The Congressional Budget Office, which we all think is doing a pretty good job even though they frustrate us a lot—by and large we agree with their conclusions—the Congressional Budget Office has said the health care bill that passed the Senate would reduce the deficits by $132 billion over the first 10 years. That is a reduction in deficits. That is going to help reduce the deficits. So all this talk—it is very proper talk—about the size of our deficits will be slightly less urgent once we start reducing the budget deficit. I am not one to stand up here and say health care reform is the total solution. I am only saying it reduces the budget deficit, according to the Congressional Budget Office, by $132 billion over the first 10 years. They go even further and say that the next 10 years the health care reform bill that passed the Senate will reduce the Federal deficit by between $650 billion and $1.3 trillion—reduce the Federal deficit by between $650 billion and $1.3 trillion. Now we are talking real money. Now we are talking about a more-than-significant reduction in the deficit.

I heard some numbers flying around here several minutes ago about it costs $2 trillion and this and that. That is not true. That is not what the Congressional Budget Office says. The Congressional Budget Office says, as I mentioned, a $132 billion reduction in the deficits in the first 10 years and between $650 billion and $1.3 trillion in deficit reduction in the second 10 years. That is what CBO says. I don't know where the Senator gets his numbers, but he did not get them from CBO. CBO's conclusions are as I have stated.

I urge us, frankly, to keep our heads screwed on straight and our feet on the ground. Let's decide what we have to do, and that is we have to pay our national debt and then go on and find ways to reduce the budget deficits. I think all of us can agree that is something we have to do.

To default on our national debt is certainly no way to run a government. We are supposed to be responsible people around here. Clearly, it would be irresponsible for us to not act in a way that prevents a default on our obligations.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am going to speak a little bit about the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. CONRAD, cosponsored by the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. GREGG. It has not been offered yet. I am not totally certain it will be offered. I think it will be offered. I am going to speak on the amendment now, but if we are ready to enter a unanimous consent agreement as to the proceedings of the Senate tonight and tomorrow, I will stop my presentation so we can enter that order.

As I said, under the previous order, the amendment by the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. CONRAD, and the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. GREGG, proposing a fiscal task force is in order to the pending measure.

Yesterday evening, the Vice President met with a number of interested parties, including our colleague, the Senate majority leader, the Speaker, the Senator from North Dakota, and others. I was at that meeting. Yesterday evening, that group discussed a fiscal commission to be created by an Executive order. I want to distinguish that effort, that is, that effort for the President to create a commission by an Executive order, from the amendment the Senators from North Dakota and New Hampshire propose on the bill.

I support the President's efforts to create a commission by Executive order, and I oppose the amendment to be proposed by the Senators from North Dakota and New Hampshire. The difference is that the Executive order would preserve the Senate's regular order. The amendment, on the other hand, would create a fast-track procedure to short-circuit the Senate's regular order.

Let me take this opportunity to share with my colleagues what a number of respected groups have been saying about the Conrad-Gregg amendment.

On January 14, the chief executive officer of AARP wrote to Senators about the Conrad-Gregg commission. As my colleagues know, AARP is the nonpartisan membership organization that represents 40 million people age 50 and older. AARP is the Nation's largest membership organization for people 50 and over and has offices in all 50 States. Listen to what AARP says:

We urge you to vote against an amendment to be offered by Senators Conrad and Gregg to establish a fiscal task force and to instead focus on addressing the challenges of the nation's long-term debt through regular order . . .

AARP goes on:

We oppose providing fast-track authority to a task force that will function with limited accountability outside the regular order of Congress, and with an exclusive focus on debt reduction. . . .

Quoting further, AARP says:

AARP believes the issues that the fiscal task force is meant to address—including the revenue gap, health care costs and the long-term solvency of Social Security—are among the most fundamental challenges we face as a nation. As such, they are issues Congress itself, through its regular order, should tackle.

AARP recognizes that doing things the normal way is not always easy. Quoting again, AARP says:

We recognize that these issues test regular order, as has been demonstrated by the long and difficult debate surrounding health care reform. Simply because these issues are difficult to address is not reason enough to abdicate the responsibility Congress has to act. However, an open debate is essential in a representative democracy to resolve issues that have as broad and deep an impact on its citizenry as changes to Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security and the tax system.

AARP focuses on the human costs. Quoting further, AARP says:

. . . a task force that is directed to identify proposals to restore the nation's long-term balance sheet cannot do so without regard to the impact its recommendations would have on individuals. Broad, deep cuts to the nation's health and economic security pillars—Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security—could reduce long-term debt, but would do so by shifting significant burdens and risks to older Americans and millions of others who rely on these benefits.

AARP recommends in particular that Social Security be excluded from the commission's deliberations. AARP says:

We urge that Social Security not be considered in the context of debt reduction; this program does not contribute to the annual deficit, and its long-term solvency can be resolved by relatively modest adjustments if they are made sooner rather than later.

That is true. It is very true. Social Security does not contribute to the annual deficit. It does not. And if one looks at the long-term prospect of Social Security, it is in healthy shape for 25, 50 years. It does not add in any way significantly to the national debt.

Here is how AARP concludes its letter. AARP says:

Given the significance of Social Security and Medicare to the well-being of nearly all Americans, AARP believes a full and open debate is essential to ensuring the development of balanced solutions. As such, we oppose any legislative proposals that bypass or short circuit the protections afforded by regular order . . . to reach debt reduction goals.

That is what AARP writes, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full text of AARP's letter to Senators.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AARP,
*Washington, DC, January 13, 2010.*

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of our nearly 40 million members, AARP writes to express opposition to three budget amendments you will be considering on January 20, 2010. We urge you to vote against an amendment to be offered by Senators Conrad and Gregg to establish a fiscal taskforce, and to instead focus on addressing the challenges of the nation's long-term debt through regular order. We also urge you to vote against an amendment to be offered by Senator Reid to establish statutory paygo, and by Senator Sessions to establish multi-year caps on discretionary spending.

FISCAL TASKFORCE

AARP agrees that the nation's long-term debt requires urgent action. We are committed to supporting balanced policies that address the nation's long term fiscal challenges while also honoring the contributions of our members and the needs of millions of other Americans who rely on Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. However the current fiscal crisis is far broader than these lifeline programs. We oppose providing fast-track authority to a task force that will function with limited accountability outside of the regular order of Congress, and with an exclusive focus on debt reduction. We further oppose the establishment of such a task force in light of the targeted Medicare savings and proposed Medicare Payment Board (that would have further authority to reduce Medicare spending) in the pending Senate health care reform legislation.

AARP believes the issues that the fiscal task force is meant to address—including the revenue gap, health care costs and the long-term solvency of Social Security—are among the most fundamental challenges we face as a nation. As such, they are issues that Congress itself, through its regular order, should tackle. We recognize that these issues test regular order, as has been demonstrated by the long and difficult debate surrounding health care reform. Simply because these issues are difficult to address is not reason enough to abdicate the responsibility Congress has to act. However, an open debate is essential in a representative democracy to resolve issues that have as broad and deep an impact on its citizenry as changes to Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security and the tax system.

Moreover, a task force that is directed to identify proposals to restore the nation's long-term balance sheet cannot do so without regard to the impact its recommendations would have on individuals. Broad, deep cuts to the nation's health and economic security pillars—Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security—could reduce long-term debt, but would do so by shifting significant burdens and risks to older Americans and millions of others who rely on these benefits. If a task force is formed to address long-term deficits, it should focus on systemic solutions that balance the twin goals of managing our national debt and ensuring the long-term health and economic security of Americans—not simply on authorizing budget cuts to eliminate the fiscal gap. Furthermore, we urge that Social Security not be considered in the context of debt reduction; this program does not contribute to the annual deficit, and its long-term solvency can be resolved by relatively modest adjustments if they are made sooner rather than later.

In addition, any meaningful examination of the nation's long-term fiscal challenges should include a serious assessment of both traditional revenue sources and tax entitlements. The tax code contains a multitude of tax preferences that automatically convey benefits, similar to spending entitlements, and entail significant amounts of foregone revenue. However, unlike Social Security and Medicare, which distribute their earned benefits broadly, tax entitlements are highly skewed to the most affluent. Moreover, the federal tax base has eroded over the past several years. For these reasons, it is both reasonable and fair to expect that a fiscal task

force prioritize an examination of revenue policies, and develop recommendations regarding revenues as a key premise of an overall strategy to address long-term deficits.

STATUTORY PAYGO AND MULTI-YEAR DISCRETIONARY CAPS

AARP is very troubled that Medicare is virtually singled out for arbitrary and automatic cuts should sequestration result from the establishment of statutory paygo. While we agree that some spending should be protected from sequestration, such as Social Security, very few mandatory programs are subject to automatic cuts under statutory paygo. Further, no automatic increase in revenues is required by sequestration, even though the possibility of such a result would undoubtedly prompt even stricter adherence to paygo. These limitations on sequestration leave Medicare especially vulnerable to arbitrary and automatic cuts that are unrelated to making the program more efficient or effective. This approach is especially unacceptable in light of the significant Medicare savings contained in the House and Senate health reform bills, and the proposed Medicare Payment Board in the Senate bill. Consequently, we oppose statutory paygo as a process that threatens to arbitrarily cut Medicare and the health security it promises for older Americans.

Finally, AARP is opposed to a multi-year cap on discretionary spending. Capping spending on less than a third of the federal budget will not result in any significant deficit reduction and would have a substantial negative impact on the federal governments ability to deliver the services our members expect. Congress routinely evaded the 1990 Budget Enforcement Act spending caps by ignoring them in session-ending budget deals, and averted cuts by simply adopting language each year wiping the paygo scorecard clean. Discretionary caps would pit programs that serve the elderly, the disabled and children against defense and homeland security programs. Moreover, given the ongoing military actions in Iraq and Afghanistan, discretionary spending limits would ultimately require steep cuts to non-defense discretionary programs—the vast majority of which have been funded well below current services levels for the past eight years.

AARP is committed to working on a bipartisan basis with Congress to develop and advance responsible policies to address the nation's long term fiscal challenges. However, given the significance of Social Security and Medicare to the well-being of nearly all Americans, AARP believes a full and open debate is essential to ensuring the development of balanced solutions. As such, we oppose any legislative proposals that bypass or short circuit the protections afforded by regular order, or that rely on imbalanced, automatic, and arbitrary spending cuts to reach debt reduction goals.

If you have any further questions, feel free to call me, or please have your staff contact David Sloane, Senior Vice President of Government Relations and Advocacy, 202–434–3754.

Sincerely,

ADDISON BARRY RAND,
*Chief Executive Officer.*

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, AARP is by no means alone in taking these positions. On January 7, Barbara Kennelly, our former congressional colleague and now president and CEO of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, wrote to White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel. The National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization representing millions of members and supporters nationwide. For more than 26 years, the organization has fought for the interests of older Americans.

Here is what the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare says:

The National Committee strongly opposes the fiscal commission legislation authored by Senators Conrad and Gregg.

The national committee also focused on Social Security, arguing that it is inappropriate for such a commission, and they wrote:

Incorporating Social Security into such a commission would signal to America's seniors that the President is willing, and even eager, to cut Social Security benefits. Ultimately, older Americans will accept changes in Social Security only if they have a voice in the decision and feel confident that changes are solely for the purpose of improving and strengthening the program. For this reason, Social Security solvency should not be taken up in the context of a fiscal commission.

Turning to the specifics of the Conrad-Gregg commission, the national committee wrote:

The legislation would effectively remove nearly every government program, including the Federal tax system, from the legislative jurisdiction of Congress. By fast-tracking the commission's recommendations through Congress with no allowance for amendments, the Conrad-Gregg measure would prevent Congress from exercising its legislative responsibilities with respect to Social Security. Enacting legislation that would push through changes of this importance to millions of Americans, especially seniors, without the opportunity for members of an elected Congress to amend them, ultimately disenfranchises the public and undermines the legitimacy of the political process.

Later in the letter, the national committee wrote:

The National Committee strongly believes that decisions relating to complex or essential programs such as Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid and taxes should be made through the regular legislative committee process. Such a process allows each program to be considered separately by substantive experts based on program solvency and policy goals.

That is what the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare writes, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full text of the letter from the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO PRESERVE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE,
*January 7, 2010, Washington, DC.*

Hon. RAHM EMANUEL,
*White House Chief of Staff,*
*Washington, DC.*

The National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare is deeply concerned about the push to create a fiscal commission designed to reduce the -federal debt. Incorporating Social Security into such a commission would signal to America's seniors that the President is willing, and even eager, to cut Social Security benefits. Ultimately, older Americans will accept changes in Social Security only if they have a voice in the decision and feel confident that changes are solely for the purpose of improving and strengthening the program. For this reason, Social Security solvency should not be taken up in the context of a fiscal commission.

The National Committee strongly opposes the fiscal commission legislation authored by Senators Conrad and Gregg. The legislation would effectively remove nearly every government program, including the federal tax system, from the legislative jurisdiction of the Congress. By fast-tracking the commission's recommendations through Congress with no allowance for amendments, the Conrad-Gregg measure would prevent Congress from exercising its legislative responsibilities with respect to Social Security. Enacting legislation that would push through changes of this importance to millions of Americans, especially seniors, without the opportunity for members of an elected Congress to amend them, ultimately disenfranchises the public and undermines the legitimacy of the political process.

The President has made clear his strong interest in pressing for fiscal responsibility measures. He has studied the Conrad-Gregg proposal and listened to the views of Senator Conrad and others on the subject. He has also contemplated creating his own commission through executive order. The National Committee believes that the advantage of an executive process is that it does not allow for a fast-track mechanism. However, we are concerned about an executive order for some of the same reasons we are concerned about the fast-track process.

The National Committee strongly believes that decisions relating to complex or essential programs such as Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid and taxes should be made through the regular legislative committee process. Such a process allows each program to be considered separately by substantive experts based on program solvency and policy goals. Moreover, we are concerned that an executive order which permits Social Security to be taken up in the context of fiscal or budgetary decisions will ignore the needs of Social Security and the well-being of its beneficiaries.

Seniors already believe that Social Security is being used by the government as a piggy bank. Now they fear that the President and the Congress are ready to use a fiscal commission to cut Social Security benefits, making seniors pay the price for the excesses of Wall Street. Those fears will only be unfounded if Social Security is strengthened and made solvent on its own merits and by people who recognize the importance of Social Security and the many protections it provides.

Cordially,

BARBARA B. KENNELLY,
*President and CEO.*

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, as well, on January 13, the president, secretary-treasurer, and executive director of the Alliance for Retired Americans sent a letter to all Senators on the Conrad-Gregg commission. The Alliance for Retired Americans is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization representing retired union members. They wrote:

The Alliance for Retired Americans, on behalf of its nearly four million members throughout the nation, writes in opposition to the Bipartisan Task Force for Responsible Fiscal Action Act of 2009, S. 2853. We oppose attempts to attach it to debt ceiling or any other legislation. We cannot support the bill's fast-track means of implementing vast

changes to programs such as Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid outside the regular legislative process.

The alliance talked about how the process would work, and they wrote:

Under the legislation, the jurisdiction for major long-term changes to programs including Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid would be turned over to an 18-member task force, made up of 16 members of Congress and 2 administration officials.

Then the alliance wrote about what is wrong with the process, and here is what they wrote:

Regardless of the expertise of task force members, their representations would be crafted behind closed doors and subject to a fast-track up-or-down vote by Congress. Forcing changes to these critical benefit programs by eliminating open debate or amendments is an undemocratic way to address the future of such programs.

The alliance contrasted the new task force process with the existing committee process, and here is what they wrote:

Currently, congressional committees of jurisdiction consider changes and improvements to these vital programs with the opportunity for due consideration and debate. These committees, with their broad-based and detailed knowledge of the programs under their jurisdiction, are the proper forums for considering any changes to Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

The alliance concluded:

We strongly caution against a process that would bypass the regular legislative process in favor of an expedited, fast-track process that leaves room for little accountability and almost no room for input from the American people.

That is what the Alliance for Retired Americans writes, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full text of the letter from the Alliance for Retired Americans.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALLIANCE FOR
RETIRED AMERICANS,
*Washington, DC, January 13, 2010.*

DEAR SENATOR: The Alliance for Retired Americans, on behalf of its nearly four million members throughout the nation, writes in opposition to the Bipartisan Task Force for Responsible Fiscal Action Act of 2009, S. 2853. We oppose attempts to attach it to debt ceiling or any other legislation. We cannot support the bill's fast-track means of implementing vast changes to programs such as Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid outside the regular legislative process.

Under the legislation, jurisdiction for major and long-term changes to programs including Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid would be turned over to a 18–member task force, made up of 16 members of Congress and 2 administration officials. Regardless of the expertise of task force members, their recommendations would be crafted behind closed doors and subject to a fast-track up or down vote by Congress. Forcing changes to these critical benefit programs by eliminating open debate or amendments is an undemocratic way to address the future of such programs.

Since their creation, Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid have worked well to keep millions of America's seniors healthy and out of poverty. Social Security has been the bedrock of income security for nearly all Americans, providing guaranteed benefits to retirees, those with disabilities, and the survivors of retired and deceased workers. Likewise, Medicare and Medicaid has helped our nation deliver the promise of well-being and improved quality of life for retirees.

Currently, congressional committees of jurisdiction consider changes and improvements to these vital programs with the opportunity for due consideration and debate. These committees, with their broad-based and detailed knowledge of the programs under their jurisdiction, are the proper forums for considering any changes to Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. We strongly caution against a process that would bypass the regular legislative process in favor of an expedited, fast-track process that leaves room for little accountability and almost no room for input from the American people.

The Alliance for Retired Americans is committed to enacting legislation that improves the quality of life for retirees and all Americans. If we can be of assistance, please contact Richard Fiesta or Sarah Byrne in the Department of Government and Political Affairs at the Alliance.

Sincerely yours,

BARBARA J. EASTERLING,
*President.*
RUBEN BURKS,
*Secretary-Treasurer.*
EDWARD F. COYLE,
*Exercutive Director.*

Mr. BAUCUS. What is more, on January 12, a broad consortium of organizations—56 in number—wrote to all Senators to express their concerns with the Conrad-Gregg commission. Among the organizations signing this letter were the AFL–CIO, AFSCME, Change to Win, the Campaign for America's Future, Common Cause, moveon.org Political Action, NAACP, the National Organization for Women, People for the American Way, the SCIU, and many others. This broad consortium of organizations wrote:

We write with strong opposition to the proposal of Senators Kent Conrad, Judd Gregg and others to create a deficit-reduction commission to override the normal legislative process and replace it with expedited procedures prohibiting amendments and limiting debate. If the Conrad-Gregg proposal were to become law, it could dramatically change by stealth critical benefits and services so vital to America's families.

The consortium of groups continued about the need for responsibility by writing:

Americans—seniors, women, working families, people with disabilities, youth, young adults, children, people of color, veterans, communities of faith and others—expect their elected representatives to be responsible and accountable for shaping such a significant, far-reaching legislation.

The consortium of groups continued about the problems with the commission, and here is what they said:

The American people are likely to view any kind of expedited procedure, where most members are sidelined to a single take-it-or-leave-it vote, as a hidden process aimed at eviscerating vital programs and productive investment.

The consortium of groups once again focused on problems with allowing the budget commission to change Social Security. They wrote:

An American public that only recently rejected privatization of Social Security would undoubtedly be suspicious of a process that shuts them out of all decisions regarding the future of a retirement system that's served them well in the current financial crisis.

The consortium of groups concluded:

We urge you to act decisively to prevent the creation of such an extraordinary and undemocratic budget commission.

That is what this consortium of groups, from Common Cause, to NOW, to People for the American Way, writes, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full text of their letter.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA DOES NOT NEED AN UNDEMOCRATIC ''DEFICIT COMMISSION''

The following statement, signed by more than 40 national organizations (see below) was written and distributed by Roger Hickey (202 955–5665), co-director, Campaign for America's Future, and Nancy Altman (301 229–2651) and Eric Kingson, (315 374–8338), co-directors, Project to Defend and Improve Social Security.

This statement has been sent to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, all members of the Senate and House, and President Barack Obama (and key administration officials).

We write with strong opposition to the proposal of Senators Kent Conrad, Judd Gregg and others to create a deficit-reduction commission that would override the normal legislative process and replace it with expedited procedures prohibiting amendments and limiting debate. We write with an increasing sense of urgency, because plans to vote on the Conrad-Gregg proposal on January 20th or soon thereafter, as part of the debt ceiling bill. If the Conrad-Gregg proposal were to become law, it could dramatically change by stealth critical benefits and services so vital to America's families.

Those supporting this circumvention of the normal process have stated openly the desire to avoid political accountability. Americans—seniors, women, working families, people with disabilities, youth, young adults, children, people of color, veterans, communities of faith and others—expect their elected representatives to be responsible and accountable for shaping such significant, far-reaching legislation.

Any deficit reduction measures should be carried out in a responsible manner, providing a fairer tax system and strengthening—rather than slashing—Social Security and Medicare. We should be strengthening, not slashing, vital programs like Medicaid, Unemployment Compensation, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (food stamps), EITC, Supplemental Security Income, school meals, Early Head Start, Head Start, Child Care Development Fund, Chafee Foster Care Independence Program, National Family Caregivers Support Program, Individual Disability Education Act, vocational rehabilitation and other programs and services crucial to struggling lower income and middle-income people in every corner of our country.

And as unemployment continues to grow, we need a real debate about how to balance the need for economic recovery and productive public investment with the goal of long-term budget responsibility. The American people are likely to view any kind of expedited procedure, where most members are sidelined to a single take-it-or-leave-it vote, as a hidden process aimed at eviscerating vital programs and productive investment.

As you know, the current effort to reform the health-care sector seeks to achieve reductions in Medicare spending, without cutting benefits. But the proposed budget commission which will be viewed as a way to actually cut Medicare benefits, while insulating lawmakers from political fallout could confuse people and undermine the reform effort. And an American public that only recently rejected privatization of Social Security will undoubtedly be suspicious of a process that shuts them out of all decisions regarding the future of a retirement system that's served them well in the current financial crisis.

We urge you to act decisively to prevent the creation of such an extraordinary and undemocratic budget commission.

GROUPS THAT HAVE ALREADY AGREED TO SIGN (AS OF JANUARY 12, 2010)

AFL–CIO—American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations; AFSCME—American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; Alliance for Retired Americans; American Society on Aging; American Association of People with Disabilities; American Association of University Women; Americans for Democratic Action; Change to Win; Campaign for America's Future; and Center for Medicare Advocacy.

Common Cause; Demos; Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund; Food Research and Action Center; Frances Perkins Center; Generations United; Global Policy Solutions; Health & Medicine Policy Research Group; International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural; and LGBT Caucus of the American Academy of Physician Assistants, Inc.

MoveOn.org Political Action; NAACP; National Asian Pacific Center on Aging; National Association for Hispanic Elderly; National Association of Area Agencies on Aging; National Association of Mother Centers and Its MOTHERS Initiative; National Caucus and Center on Black Aged, Inc.; National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare; and National Council of Women's Organizations.

National Indian Council on Aging; National Organization for Women; National Hispanic Council on Aging; National Senior Citizens Law Center; National Women's Law Center; OWL—The Voice of Midlife and Older Women; OpenLeft.com; and Pathways PA.

Pension Rights Center; People for the American Way; Progressive Democrats of America; Project to Defend and Improve Social Security; SEIU—Service Employees International Union; United Methodist General Board of Church & Society; USAction; Voices for America's Children; Wider Opportunities for Women; Women's Institute for a Secure Retirement; and the Women's Research and Education Institute.

STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

AFGE Council 220; AFGE Local 3937, AFL–CIO; California Alliance for Retired Americans; Coalition of Wisconsin Aging Groups; DelcoAction Seniors; New York Statewide Senior Action Council; Pennsylvania Alliance for Retired Americans; and Puget Sound Alliance for Retired Americans.

Mr. BAUCUS. It is not just progressive groups that oppose the Conrad-Gregg amendment. On January 15, a broad consortium of conservative groups sent what they called ''An Open Letter to U.S. Senators Urging Opposition to the Conrad-Gregg Bipartisan Tax/Spending 'Reform' Commission.'' This conservative consortium said:

On behalf of the millions of taxpayers, small businesses, families, senior citizens and shareholders represented by our respective organizations, we urge you in the strongest terms to oppose and vote against the ''Bipartisan Task Force for Responsible Fiscal Action Act of 2009,'' sponsored by Senators Kent Conrad and Judd Gregg, be it in stand-alone form or as an amendment.

These conservative groups explained their motivation. In their view, they said:

As written, the Conrad-Gregg proposal would lead to a guaranteed tax increase.

These conservative groups concluded as follows:

We urge you to oppose and vote against the misguided plan when it comes before you.

Among the signatories of this letter are the American Conservative Union, Americans for Tax Reform, the American Shareholders Association, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, and the National Taxpayers Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full text of the consortium letter.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 15, 2010.

AN OPEN LETTER TO U.S. SENATORS URGING OPPOSITION TO THE CONRAD-GREGG BIPARTISAN TAX/SPENDING ''REFORM'' COMMISSION

DEAR U.S. SENATOR: On behalf of the millions of taxpayers, small businesses, families, senior citizens and shareholders represented by our respective organizations, we urge you in the strongest terms to oppose and vote against the ''Bipartisan Task Force for Responsible Fiscal Action Act of 2009,'' sponsored by Sens. Kent Conrad (D–ND) and Judd Gregg (R–NH), be it in stand-alone form or as an amendment.

As written, the Conrad/Gregg proposal would lead to a guaranteed tax increase.

The plan put forth by Sens. Conrad and Gregg establishes an eighteen-member task force comprised of ten Democrat and eight Republican Congressmen, Senators, and Administration officials. A report from the commission would need to gather fourteen votes in order to make an expedited recommendation to both bodies. The recommendation would only pass with a supermajority vote in each chamber.

Despite the appearance of protection for taxpayers, this commission would guarantee a net tax increase be in its proposal. Every Democrat on the commission would insist on tax increases to ''balance'' spending cuts in the recommendation.

There is no conceivable scenario whereby the commission would issue a report that does not contain tax hikes, and history underscores the dangers of such a bipartisan deal that puts everything on the table:

In the 1990 Andrews Air Force Base debacle, Congressional Democrats convinced a number of Republicans to join them in a bipartisan deal promising $2 in spending cuts for every $1 in tax increases. Every penny of the tax increases ($137 billion from 1991–1995) went through. Not only did the Democrats break their promise to cut spending below the CBO baseline—they actually spent $23 billion above CBO's pre-budget deal spending baseline.

In order to make such a commission acceptable from a taxpayer perspective, language must be included that explicitly removes tax increases and/or new taxes from commission consideration.

However, the proposal in its current form will likely come before you later this month as am amendment to yet another bill to increase the debt limit, as Democrats will be looking to use this commission idea as a way to cover their big-spending tracks.

This bipartisan commission is a veiled attempt to lure Republicans into taking joint ownership of massive tax increases to pay for their crisis and is arguably one of the biggest threats to taxpayers. What's worse, it could become the Trojan horse for a European-style Value-Added Tax (VAT).

We urge you to oppose and vote against this misguided plan when it comes before you.

Sincerely,

Jim Martin, chairman, 60 Plus Association; Stephen P. Gordon, media director, Alabama Republican Liberty Caucus; Brian Johnson, executive director, Alliance for Worker Freedom; Susan A. Carleson,* chairman and CEO, American Civil Rights Union; David A. Keene, chairman, American Conservative Union; Grover Norquist, president, Americans for Tax Reform; Tim Phillips, president, Americans for Prosperity; Ryan Ellis, executive director, American Shareholders Association; John Tate, president, Campaign for Liberty; Sandra Fabry, executive director, Center for Fiscal Accountability; Timothy Lee, vice-president of legal and public affairs, Center for Individual Freedom; Chuck Muth, president, Citizen Outreach; Barbara Anderson, executive director, Citizens for Limited Taxation (MA); Wayne Crews, vice president for policy, Competitive Enterprise Institute; Tom Schatz, president, Council for Citizens Against Government Waste; Rick Watson, chairman, Florida Center-Right Coalition; Jamie Story, president, Grassroot Institute of Hawaii; Gregory Blankenship, president, Illinois Alliance for Growth.

Andrew Langer, president, Institute for Liberty; Robert McClure, president and CEO, James Madison Institute; Rep. James DeCesare, chairman, Kentucky Taxpayer Protection Caucus, House of Representatives; Colin Hanna, president, Let Freedom Ring; Del. Warren Miller, chairman, Maryland Taxpayer Protection Caucus, House of Delegates; Shane Osborn, Nebraska State Treasurer; Andrew Moylan, director of government affairs, National Taxpayers Union; Jerry Cantrell, president, New Jersey Taxpayers' Association; Deborah Owens, co-chair, Ohio Center-Right Coalition; Brandon Dutcher, vice president for policy, Oklahoma Council of Public Affairs, Inc.; Kim Thatcher, chairman, Oregon Taxpayer Protection Caucus, House of Representatives; Todd Kruse, Property Rights Association of Minnesota; Jason Williams, executive director, Taxpayer Association of Oregon; William Greene, president, RightMarch.com; Ben Cunningham, spokesman, Tennessee Tax Revolt; Laura Lee Adams, chairman, Utah Center-Right Coalition; Susan Gore, founder, Wyoming Liberty Group.

Mr. BAUCUS. Also on the conservative side, on December 29, 2009, the Wall Street Journal editorial page—no friend of progressive causes—published an editorial entitled ''The Deficit Commission Trap.'' The editors of the Wall Street Journal wrote:

We only hope Republicans aren't foolish enough to fall down this trap door.

I conclude by saying that people on both sides of the political spectrum have very grave reservations and urge opposition to the amendment to be offered by our good friends and colleagues, Senators CONRAD and GREGG, and I hope we do not adopt that amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

## VOTE EXPLANATION

● Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, due to the fact that I was ill and concerned for others traveling on the same airplane to Washington, DC, I was unable to cast a vote for rollcall No. 1 in the second session of the 111th Congress, the nomination of Beverly Baldwin Martin, of Georgia, to be a U.S. Circuit Judge for the 11th Circuit. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' to confirm the nominee.●

## HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

### PRIVATE FIRST CLASS BRIAN R. BOWMAN

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I rise with a heavy heart to honor the life of PFC Brian R. Bowman from Waveland, IN. Brian was 24 years old when he lost his life on January 3 when insurgents attacked his unit in Ashoque, Afghanistan. Brian was serving as a medic in the 1st Battalion, 12th Infantry Regiment, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division at Fort Carson, Colorado, as a part of Operation Enduring Freedom.

Today, I join Brian's family and friends in mourning his death. Brian will forever be remembered as a loving son and friend to many. Brian is survived by his devoted wife Casie, his father Robert Bowman and mother Paula J. Gerdes, two sisters and countless friends and relatives.

Brian was a Crawfordsville native who grew up in Waveland. Prior to entering the service in August of 2006, Brian graduated from Southmont High School in 2004. A gifted musician, he played the baritone for the Royal Mounties who were perennial contenders in the Indiana State Fair's band competition. His father said that he gave up sports to be in the band because he loved music.

While we struggle to express our sorrow over this loss, we can take pride in the example Brian set as a soldier, a husband, a son and a brother. Today and always he will be remembered by family, friends and fellow Hoosiers as a true American hero, and we cherish the legacy of his service and his life.

As I search for words to honor this fallen soldier, I recall President Lincoln's words to the families of soldiers who died at Gettysburg: ''We cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here.''

It is my sad duty to enter the name of Brian R. Bowman in the RECORD of the U.S. Senate for his service to this country and for his profound commitment to freedom, democracy and peace. I pray that Brian's family finds comfort in the words of the prophet Isaiah who said, ''He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces.''

May God grant strength and peace to those who mourn, and may God be with all of you, as I know He is with Brian.

## CELEBRATING MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish today to honor the life of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

I would like to take this opportunity not only to talk about the man but also the movement. During a time of segregation, violence, unnecessary bloodshed, and ignorant bigotry, a man named Martin Luther King, Jr., graced the world with his poignant determination for peace. His life continues to inspire not only Americans but the world in continued efforts for equality amongst all men and women.

This week the Nation reflects on Dr. King's life and legacy. I remember being a young man during his lifetime. I remember not only the struggles he faced but the justice he longed for. As I reread Dr. King's letter from Birmingham Jail, where he wrote about trying to explain to one's child why she can't go to a public amusement park because she was Black; where he wrote about the humiliation of nagging signs that read ''white'' and ''colored;'' where he wrote about the internal fight against a ''degenerating sense of nobodiness,'' I ask our Nation not to return to such a time but instead continue to move our Nation forward in accepting all people.

While Dr. King was fighting for national civil rights, I was growing up in Baltimore City, MD. I attended a segregated public school, and I remember with great sadness how discrimination was not only condoned but, more often than not, actually encouraged against Blacks, Jews, Catholics, and other minorities in the community. I remember the local movie theater denying admission to African Americans. I remember the community swimming pools that had signs hanging that read, ''No Jews, No Blacks allowed.'' In the wake of death threats, physical attempts on his life, home bombings, and jail time, Dr. King fought for the rights Americans hold so dear. He fought for the right to vote, the right to equal access, the right to an equal education, and the right to be treated and seen as an equal.

More than 40 years later, our Nation has made significant progress. We have elected our first African-American President, we have women running Fortune 500 companies, we have the first female Speaker of the House, we have our first Latina Supreme Court Justice, and many more accomplishments have occurred. And while we have come a long way from segregated lunch counters and firehouses and dogs being unleashed on protesters, we still have not reached the mountaintop. There are still laws, policies, and negative perceptions that infringe on individual civil rights.

The issues of today are not so different than the issues of Dr. King's time. We are at war. There is discrimination. There are disparities. There is hate. We must fight and expose these injustices. Dr. King believed that you must expose injustices ''with all the tension its exposure creates.'' We must take up these issues. We must address health care disparities, discrimination in all forms, abuses in our criminal justice system, and bad legislative policies. We must not shy away from what great people before us worked so hard to bring to light. This is not the time for what Dr. King called the ''moderate.'' This is not the time for those who say they agree with us in the goal but fail to take direct action. This is the time for action against injustices.

When more than 40 million Americans don't have access to quality health care, an injustice has occurred. When Americans receive discriminatory sentencing, an injustice has occurred. When Americans are subjected to discriminatory lending, an injustice has occurred. When hate crimes are perpetrated, an injustice has occurred. When our country uses torture, an injustice has occurred. When any form of discrimination is used, an injustice has occurred.

So I ask my fellow colleagues in the Congress and my fellow Americans nationwide, as we start a new year, a new decade, remember that ''human progress never rolls in on wheels of inevitability; it comes through the tireless efforts of men willing to be coworkers with God . . .'' Stand with us as we take up the controversial issues of the day—immigration, employment nondiscrimination, pay equity for women, hate crimes, sentencing reform, education reform, and remember such actions are taken in dedicated efforts toward a more loving and just union.

Dr. King said that the ultimate measure of a man or woman is not where he or she stands in the moments of comfort and convenience, but where

he or she stands at times of challenge and controversy. He stood up and fought for what was just in a world of controversy. I ask you all to stand up on the shoulders of Dr. King and fight for the elimination of hate and discrimination. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., will always be remembered for his courage, elegance and tireless endurance for the fight of equality in America.

## PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT OF 2009

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these letters commenting on the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2009—the majority's ''health reform bill''—be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHYSICIAN ORGANIZATIONS THAT OPPOSE SENATE'S PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

To date 43 state, county and national medical societies, representing nearly one-half million physicians, have stated their public opposition to the Senate healthcare overhaul bill, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (H.R. 3590).

NATIONAL MEDICAL ASSOCIATIONS

American Academy of Cosmetic Surgery, American Academy of Dermatology Association, American Academy of Facial Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, American Academy of Otolaryngology Head and Neck Surgery, American Association of Neurological Surgeons, American Association of Orthopaedic Surgeons, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American College of Osteopathic Surgeons, American College of Surgeons, and American Osteopathic Academy of Orthopaedics.

American Society for Metabolic & Bariatric Surgery, American Society of Anesthesiologists, American Society of Breast Surgeons, American Society of Cataract and Refractive Surgery, American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons, American Society of General Surgeons, American Society of Plastic Surgeons, and American Urological Association.

Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Coalition of State Rheumatology Organizations, Congress of Neurological Surgeons, Heart Rhythm Society, National Association of Spine Specialists, Society for Vascular Surgeons, Society of American Gastrointestinal and Endoscopic Surgeons, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, and Society of Gynecologic Oncologists.

STATE AND COUNTY MEDICAL ASSOCIATIONS

Medical Association of the State of Alabama, Arizona Osteopathic Medical Association, California Medical Association, Medical Society of Delaware, Medical Society of the District of Columbia, Florida Medical Association, Medical Association of Georgia, and Kansas Medical Association.

Louisiana State Medical Society, Missouri State Medical Association, Nebraska Medical Association, Medical Society of New Jersey, Ohio State Medical Association, South Carolina Medical Association, Texas Medical Association, and Westchester (NY) County Medical Society.

DECEMBER 7, 2009.

Hon. HARRY REID,
*Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR REID: The undersigned state and national specialty medical societies are writing you on behalf of more than 92,000 physicians in opposition to passage of the ''Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act'' (H.R. 3590) and to urge you to draft a more targeted bill that will reform the country's flawed system for financing healthcare, while preserving the best healthcare in the world. While continuance of the status quo is not acceptable, the shifting to the federal government of so much control over medical decisions is not justified. We are therefore united in our resolve to achieve health system reform that empowers patients and preserves the practice of medicine—without creating a huge government bureaucracy.

H.R. 3590 creates a number of problematic provisions, including:

The bill undermines the patient-physician relationship and empowers the federal government with even greater authority. Under the bill, 1) employers would be required to provide health insurance or face financial penalties; 2) health insurance packages with government prescribed benefits will be mandatory; 3) doctors would be forced to participate in the flawed Physician Quality Reporting Initiative (PQRI) or face penalties for nonparticipation; and 4) physicians would have to comply with extensive new reporting requirements related to quality improvement, case management, care coordination, chronic disease management, and use of health information technology.

The bill is unsustainable from a financial standpoint. It significantly expands Medicaid eligibility, shifting healthcare costs to physicians who are paid below the cost of delivering care and to the states that are already operating under severe budget constraints. It also postpones the start of subsidies for the uninsured long after the government levies new user fees and new taxes to cover expanded coverage and benefits. This ''back-loading'' of new spending makes the long-term costs appear deceptively low.

The government run community health insurance option eventually will lead to a single-payer, government run healthcare system. Despite the state opt-out provision, the community health insurance option contains the same liabilities (i.e. government-run healthcare) as the public option that was passed by the House of Representatives. Such a system will ultimately limit patient choice and put the government between the doctor and the patient, interfering with patient care decisions.

Largely unchecked by Congress or the courts, the federal government would have unprecedented authority to change the Medicare program through the new Independent Medicare Advisory Board and the new Center for Medicare & Medicaid Innovation. Specifically, these entities could arbitrarily reduce payments to physicians for valuable, life-saving care for elderly patients, reducing treatment options in a dramatic way.

The bill is devoid of real medical liability reform measures that reduce costs in proven demonstrable ways. Instead, it contains a ''Sense of the Senate'' encouraging states to develop and test alternatives to the current civil litigation system as a way of addressing the medical liability problem. Given the fact that costs remain a significant concern, Congress should enact reasonable measures to reduce costs. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) recently confirmed that enacting a comprehensive set of tort reforms will save the federal government $54 billion over 10 years. These savings could help offset increased health insurance premiums (which, according to the CBO, are expected to increase under the bill) or other costs of the bill.

The temporary one-year SGR ''patch'' to replace the 21.2 percent payment cut in 2010 with a 0.5 percent payment increase fails to address the serious underlying problems with the current Medicare physician payment system and compounds the accumulated SGR debt, causing payment cuts of nearly 25 percent in 2011. The CBO has confirmed that a significant reduction in physicians' Medicare payments will reduce beneficiaries' access to services.

The excise tax on elective cosmetic medical procedures in the bill will not produce the revenue projected. Experience at the state level has demonstrated that this is a failed policy. In addition, this provision is arbitrary, difficult to administer, unfairly puts the physician in the role of tax collector, and raises serious patient confidentiality issues. Physicians strongly oppose the use of provider taxes or fees of any kind to fund healthcare programs or to finance health system reform.

Our concerns about this legislation also extend to what is not in the bill. The right to privately contract is a touchstone of American freedom and liberty. Patients should have the right to choose their doctor and enter into agreements for the fees for those services without penalty. Current Medicare patients are denied that right. By guaranteeing all patients the right to privately contract with their physicians, without penalty, patients will have greater access to physicians and the government will have budget certainty. Nothing in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act addresses these fundamental tenets, which we believe are essential components of real health system reform.

Senator Reid, we are at a critical moment in history. America's physicians deliver the best medical care in the world, yet the systems that have been developed to finance the delivery of that care to patients have failed. With congressional action upon us, we are at a crossroads. One path accepts as ''necessary'' a substantial increase in federal government control over how medical care is delivered and financed. We believe the better path is one that allows patients and physicians to take a more direct role in their healthcare decisions. By encouraging patients to own their health insurance policies and by allowing them to freely exercise their right to privately contract with the physician of their choice, healthcare decisions will be made by patients and physicians and not by the government or other third party payers.

We urge you to slow down, take a step back, and change the direction of current reform efforts so we get it right for our patients and our profession. We have a prescription for reform that will work for all Americans, and we are happy to share these solutions with you to improve our nation's healthcare system.

Thank you for considering our views.

Sincerely,
Medical Association of the State of Alabama,
Medical Society of Delaware,
Medical Society of the District of Columbia,
Florida Medical Association,
Medical Association of Georgia,
Kansas Medical Society,
Louisiana State Medical Society,
Missouri State Medical Association,
Nebraska Medical Association,
Medical Society of New Jersey,
South Carolina Medical Association,
American Academy of Cosmetic Surgery,
American Academy of Facial Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery,

American Association of Neurological Surgeons,
American Society of Breast Surgeons,
American Society of General Surgeons, and
Congress of Neurological Surgeons.

Past Presidents of the American Medical Association: Daniel H. Johnson, Jr., MD, AMA President 1996–1997. Donald J. Palmisano, MD, JD, FACS, AMA President 2003–2004. William G. Plested, III, MD, FACS, AMA President 2006–2007.

---

DECEMBER 1, 2009.

Hon. HARRY REID,
*Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR LEADER REID: On behalf of the over 240,000 surgeons and anesthesiologists we represent and the millions of surgical patients we treat each year, the undersigned 19 organizations strongly support the need for national health care reform and share the Senate's commitment to make affordable quality health care more accessible to all Americans. As you know, we have been working diligently and in good faith with the Senate during the past year and have provided input at various stages in the process of drafting the Senate's health care reform bill. To this end, we have reviewed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2009.

As you may recall, on November 4 our coalition sent you a letter outlining a number of serious concerns that needed to be addressed to ensure that any final health care reform package would be built on a solid foundation in the best interest of our patients. Since those concerns have not been adequately addressed, as detailed below, we must oppose the legislation as currently written.

We oppose:

Establishment and proposed implementation of an Independent Medicare Advisory Board whose recommendations could become law without congressional action;

Mandatory participation in a seriously flawed Physician Quality Reporting Initiative (PQRI) program with penalties for nonparticipation;

Budget-neutral bonus payments to primary care physicians and rural general surgeons;

Creation of a budget-neutral value-based payment modifier which CMS does not have the capability to implement and places the provision on an unrealistic and unachievable timeline;

Requirement that physicians pay an application fee to cover a background check for participation in Medicare despite already being obligated to meet considerable requirements of training, licensure, and board certification;

Relying solely on the limited recommendations of the United States Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) in determining a minimum coverage standard for preventive services and associated cost-sharing protections;

The so-called ''non-discrimination in health care'' provision that would create patient confusion over greatly differing levels of education, skills and training among health care professionals while inappropriately interjecting civil rights concepts into state scope of practice laws;

The absence of a permanent fix to Medicare's broken physician payment system and any meaningful proven medical liability reforms; and

The last-minute addition of the excise tax on elective cosmetic medical procedures. This tax discriminates against women and the middle class. Experience at the state level has demonstrated that it is a failed policy which will not result in the projected revenue. Furthermore, this provision is arbitrary, difficult to administer, unfairly puts the physician in the role of tax collector, and raises serious patient confidentiality issues.

This bill goes a long way towards realizing the goal of expanding health insurance coverage and takes important steps to improve quality and explore innovative systems for health care delivery. Despite serious concerns, there are several provisions in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2009 that the surgical community supports, strongly believes are in the best interest of the surgical patients, and should be maintained in any final package. Specifically these include: health insurance market reforms, including the elimination of coverage denials based on preexisting medical conditions and guaranteed availability and renewability of health insurance coverage; strengthening patient access to emergency and trauma care by ensuring the survival of trauma centers, developing regionalized systems of care to optimize patient outcomes, and improving emergency care for children; well-designed clinical comparative effectiveness research, conducted through an independent institute and not used for determining medical necessity or making coverage and payment decisions or recommendations; and the exclusion of ultrasound from the increase in the utilization rate for calculating the payment for imaging services.

Further, while redistribution of unused residency positions to general surgery is a positive step in addressing the predicted shortage in the surgical workforce, we believe that the Senate should look more broadly at the issue of limits on residency positions for all specialties that work in the surgical setting that are also facing severe workforce problems.

Finally, we are pleased that you have accepted our suggestion and removed language which would reduce payments to physicians who are found to have the highest utilization of resources—without regard to the acuity of the patient's physical condition or the complexity of the care being provided. We thank you for making this important change.

While we must oppose the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act as currently written, the surgical coalition is committed to the passage of meaningful and comprehensive health care reform that is in the best interest of our patients. We are committed to working with you to make critical changes that are vital to ensuring that this legislation is based on sound policy, and that it will have a long-term positive impact on patient access to safe and effective high-quality surgical care.

Sincerely,

American Academy of Facial Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, American Academy of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, American Association of Neurological Surgeons, American Association of Orthopaedic Surgeons, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American College of Osteopathic Surgeons, American College of Surgeons, American Osteopathic Academy of Orthopedics, American Society of Anesthesiologists, American Society of Breast Surgeons, American Society of Cataract and Refractive Surgery, American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons, American Society for Metabolic & Bariatric Surgery, American Society of Plastic Surgeons, American Urological Association, Congress of Neurological Surgeons, Society for Vascular Surgery, Society of American Gastrointestinal and Endoscopic Surgeons, Society of Gynecologic Oncologists.

ALLIANCE OF SPECIALTY MEDICINE,
*December 2, 2009.*

Hon. HARRY REID,
*Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID: As the Alliance of Specialty Medicine (Alliance), our mission is to advocate for sound federal health care policy that fosters patient access to the highest quality specialty care and improves timely access to high quality medical care for all Americans. As patient and physician advocates, the Alliance believes that true health reform should be enacted through a responsible and transparent process. Over the past year, the Alliance has provided substantive comments on those health reform provisions that concern specialty physicians and patients in their care. We are extremely concerned that your substitute amendment, the ''Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act,'' to H.R. 3590, fails to address our previously mentioned concerns. Therefore, we oppose the substitute amendment in its current form. We stand ready to work with you to address the issues, outlined below, that continue to concern us.

PHYSICIAN PAYMENT UPDATE (SECTION 3101)

Medicare's sustainable growth rate (SGR) formula needs to be replaced with a permanent, stable mechanism for updating Medicare fees to continue to assure Medicare beneficiary access to high quality care. Rather than come back year after year, providing a short-term fix to this large problem, we must stop utilizing band-aid solutions and establish a new baseline for physician reimbursement. President Obama agreed with that proposal when he sent this year's budget to the Congress. The cost of interim updates to the physician fee schedule should not be shifted to out years, making permanent SGR reform even more difficult, and costly, to achieve. Already, as a result of previous interim updates, physicians currently face a 21% fee reduction beginning in January 2010. Medicare physician payment rates already are below market rates. Therefore, any long-term solution should, at the very least, recognize reasonable inflationary cost increases.

VALUE-BASED PHYSICIAN PAYMENT MODIFIER (SECTION 3007)

Rather than create a stable physician payment schedule, Section 3007 would dramatically alter the current payment system by adding a new, untested payment modifier that would redistribute Medicare payments based on quality and geographic cost variation, without a more systematic review of the potential consequences. While the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) has been testing various models in this area, CMS does not have the current capability to implement such a proposal and no valid methodology that incorporates appropriate risk adjustment factors and outcome measures even exists. Furthermore, there are many reasons for geographic cost variation, including differences in population demographics that merit significantly more study before such a measure could be implemented. Therefore, rather than add stability to the physician payment mechanism, the proposal would create yet more instability with an unrealistic and unachievable timeline.

CMS should be allowed to fully test models for value-based payment and determine which system would achieve maximum benefit before further modification of a flawed Medicare physician payment formula. There is widespread agreement that the current SGR process results in arbitrary and damaging cuts to Medicare physician payment. We cannot achieve a reliable or stable incentive for quality care by modifying arbitrarily—and arbitrarily changing—reimbursement rates. And because this new modifier in Section 3007 would be budget neutral,

some providers would face the dual blow of arbitrary SGR cuts and neutrality-imposed value-based purchasing cuts.

PAYMENT CUTS FOR SPECIALTY CARE (SECTION 5101)

While we understand the potential need to increase the payment rates of primary care physicians, many surgical and specialty medicine disciplines have faced significant cuts over the years while primary care fees have increased. As Medicare payments have continued their steady decline over the past few years, reimbursement for primary care services has actually increased. For example, CMS recently approved a more than $4 billion increase in the fee schedule for primary care services, as well as a 37 percent increase in one key code used by primary care physicians. In its March 2009 report, MedPAC noted that Medicare payments for primary care have increased 10.6 percent between 2006 and 2009. And these changes will continue in the future. Indeed, under the 2010 Medicare Physician Fee Schedule, reimbursement for primary care physicians will increase between 2–4 percent.

While primary care payments have been increasing, specialty care payments have been decreasing. Since 1992, specialists have seen significant reductions in the fees they receive for procedural services. Although modest increases may have been provided for physician services in recent years, they have not kept up with the rate of inflation nor have all physicians seen increases. In fact, many surgical services were cut again in 2008 and a number of specialties are facing additional cuts in 2010 as a result of changes CMS has made in the fee schedule. Specialists continue to lose more ground in the fees they receive for serving Medicare beneficiaries while their practice costs continue to steadily rise. This is particularly troubling because much of the funding for this health care reform proposal already relies on cuts to Medicare and to the physicians that provide those key services. Additional cuts will likely result in decreased patient access to critical health care services. With a shortfall of 49,000 surgeons and other specialists predicted by the year 2025, we can ill-afford to further exacerbate the access to care problem.

INDEPENDENT MEDICARE ADVISORY BOARD (SECTION 3403)

Congress should retain proper oversight of the process that determines how services are provided under Medicare and not relegate it to another entity. If the goal of a new Advisory Board is to find new ways to eliminate spending in the Medicare program, the end result may well be detrimental to patient care for our nation's elderly. Already, Medicare reimbursement rates are well below market rates for similar services. And yet, the solution seems to be to further ratchet down the costs, without oversight, without care to ensure that our seniors receive the care that they deserve. Further, the construct of the Board seems to selectively exempt certain providers from its purview—placing more pressure to cut Medicare in those areas under its jurisdiction. There is no question we need to improve the Medicare program to make it sustainable well into the future. However, Medicare cannot be ''fixed'' when we do not look at the whole program, but rather, chop it up and force program savings into specific areas, such as provider reimbursement. We certainly understand and appreciate concerns with the rising costs of health care. But this is not the way to approach this problem. Rather than develop a coherent proposal to appropriately address the issue, the proposal contained in the substitute amendment abdicates Congress' fundamental responsibility and instead hopes that others can develop additional solutions and then allows them to be implemented. If we go forward with this process, there will be myriad unintended consequences, including restricting access to important interventions and services for Medicare patients. You should not allow important health care decisions to be made with little clinical expertise, resources or oversight required to ensure that seniors are not placed in jeopardy.

MEDICAL LIABILITY REFORM (SECTION 6801)

We remain concerned that the current health care proposal before us does not address our broken medical liability system. Medical liability reform will help achieve health system savings by reducing the incentives for defensive medicine and it will also protect physicians from unaffordable liability premiums. Last fall, President Obama stated in the New England Journal of Medicine that he would be ''open to additional measures to curb malpractice suits and reduce the cost of malpractice insurance.'' Earlier this year, at the American Medical Association's Annual Meeting, the President also noted that we will not be able to implement changes in our health care delivery system that reflect best practices, incentivize excellence and close cost disparities ''if doctors feel like they are constantly looking over their shoulder for fear of lawsuits.'' With a President that understands the need for medical liability reform, we do not understand why your proposal only includes a Sense of the Senate on the topic.

We would prefer a more comprehensive approach to this dire problem, such as federal medical liability reform based on the California or Texas models, which include, among other things, reasonable limits on non-economic damages. As you are aware the Congressional Budget Office recently scored comprehensive and proven medical liability reforms, similar to those above, as saving the federal government $54 billion over the next decade. In addition to this savings, these reforms will also improve patient access to specialty care, particularly in rural and underserved areas. However, at the very least, we should do something in this area, and there are several bipartisan proposals which we should debate, consider, and then include within a comprehensive health care reform package.

EXCISE TAX ON CERTAIN ELECTIVE MEDICAL PROCEDURES (SECTION 9017)

Physicians strongly oppose taxes on distinctive physician services to fund health care programs or to pay for health care reform and we therefore are extremely concerned by the last minute addition of the tax on elective cosmetic surgery and medical procedures. This is a dangerous precedent to set as it places physicians in the role of tax collector, compromises patient safety by encouraging individuals to circumvent the tax by seeking procedures from non-medical personnel or providers in other countries, and jeopardizes patient privacy by opening physician practices up to IRS audits. Furthermore, once in place, we fear that this tax could easily be expanded to other health care services. As demonstrated by New Jersey's experience with a similar tax, the application of such a tax is arbitrary and confusing to administer.

PROVISIONS IMPORTANT TO MAINTAIN IN ANY HEALTH CARE REFORM

We applaud many of the provisions in your substitute amendment that improve access to health insurance and believe a number of provisions must be included in any meaningful health reform package to improve access to affordable health insurance and assure access to specialty medicine. Those provisions included in your substitute amendment that we believe should be maintained include eliminating pre-existing condition exclusions, providing adequate access to specialty care through the benefit package, addressing rescission of health coverage, ensuring continuity in Medicaid coverage for children who go in and out of the system, and prohibiting annual and lifetime coverage limits.

In addition, the Alliance is pleased that your legislation includes a provision to expand comparative effectiveness research (CER). Like you, the Alliance believes appropriately designed CER conducted by an independent entity with full participation of all relevant stakeholders should enhance information about treatment options and outcomes for patients and physicians, helping them to choose the care that best meets the individual needs of the patient. CER needs to recognize the diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity, of patient populations and subpopulations and communicate results in ways that reflect the differences in individual patient needs. It should not be a vehicle for making centralized coverage and payment decisions or recommendations.

The Alliance also appreciates the elimination of a provision which would automatically reduce payment rates by 5% for physician services if they are deemed ''outliers'', regardless of patient acuity or other key factors.

Finally, we appreciate that you addressed our concerns related to imaging services and clarified that the definition of advanced imaging does not include ultrasound as it relates to the increase in the utilization rate for imaging services.

Thank you for commitment and leadership on this issue. Physicians are an integral part of the health care system and are on the front lines of patient care. The Alliance hopes you will work with us to improve the Senate health reform package.

Sincerely,

American Association of Neurological Surgeons; American Association of Orthopaedic Surgeons; American Society of Cataract and Refractive Surgery; American Urological Association; Coalition of State Rheumatology Organizations; Congress of Neurological Surgeons; Heart Rhythm Society; National Association of Spine Specialists; Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions.

---

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF DERMATOLOGY AND AAD ASSOCIATION,
*Washington, DC, Nov. 20, 2009.*

Hon. HARRY REID,
*Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, DC.*
Hon. MAX BAUCUS,
*Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,*
*U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*
Hon. TOM HARKIN,
*Chairman, Senate HELP Committee,*
*U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR LEADER REID, CHAIRMAN BAUCUS, AND CHAIRMAN HARKIN: On behalf of the American Academy of Dermatology Association (AADA), which represents nearly 12,000 dermatologists and our patients across the country, I am writing to state that we are opposed to S. 3590, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA), in its current form. This legislation simply contains too many flawed provisions and policies that will harm vulnerable patient populations, undermine ongoing quality improvement efforts, leave in place an unstable physician payment system, and exacerbate physician workforce shortages—jeopardizing access to quality health care.

We are extremely disappointed to have reached this decision, because AADA fully supports meaningful and comprehensive

health system reform that achieves our shared goals of improving the health care delivery system and providing coverage for more Americans. We are serious about achieving reform—after working closely with leadership on the House side and finding that H.R. 3961 and H.R. 3962 comport with most of our principles for reform, we indeed issued letters supporting the key provisions of those bills. Early this year, AADA readily embraced the Senate's offer to work as constructive partners in finding the common ground that would serve as the foundation of meaningful health system reform. On several occasions, AADA submitted thoughtful, constructive comments on numerous proposed reform components, and subsequent legislative provisions, in an effort to work in a collaborative fashion. However, PPACA has made it clear that the majority of our input has been dismissed.

AADA is on record with the Senate in opposition to the following key provisions:

The Independent Medicare Commission—This commission removes public accountability and Congressional oversight of Medicare payment policy. Even more troubling is the exemption of hospitals from the Commission's jurisdiction, forcing physicians to bear the costs of Medicare Part A inefficiencies. It is unreasonable to expect that the cost curve can be bent solely within the Medicare part B silo.

Misvalued Relative Value Units—This provision creates an unnecessary, duplicative bureaucratic layer. CMS and the RUC are already engaged in extensive efforts to review and correct RVUs that no longer reflect practice realities, and this existing process continues to bring about substantial changes without the need for a duplicative and new panel.

Failure to Address Physician Payment—This legislation seeks to ''transform the health care delivery system,'' which would require physicians to make substantial changes in their practices. However, the bill offers yet another short term solution to a fundamentally flawed physician payment system. Without a stable payment system, physicians will be unable to make the long-term investments required to implement health system reform and continue to modernize their practices. The abject failure to recognize the need for real long- term reform demonstrates a misunderstanding of physician practice costs, including the employment of millions of Americans in these small businesses, and will inhibit transformation in the health care delivery system. We hope that the Senate will follow the House's lead and pass a complete repeal of the Sustainable Growth Rate formula.

While we are appreciative of changes made to the resource use and PQRI provisions, that positive movement was negated by the inclusion of new provisions in PPACA that have the potential to harm patients and conflict with several of our principles for reform.

Tax on Cosmetic Surgical and Medical Procedures—In an effort to offset the cost of this legislation, PPACA would impose a cosmetic procedure tax that disproportionately affects women and the middle class. Furthermore, this tax inserts the federal government into the physician-patient relationship in a new way—specifically, the Internal Revenue Service will become an arbiter of what is cosmetic and what is medically necessary. Under the proposed language, an HIV-infected patient with severe and stigmatizing lipoatrophy (loss of facial fat) resulting from their antiviral medications might be taxed for seeking to reduce their social stigmatization and return their face to a normal shape.

Public Reporting—We have extensively participated in quality measure development and supported incentives for physician participation. However, several unresolved problems still make public reporting of performance results premature. Our ability to assess comparative quality from claims data and to risk-adjust any measures to reflect different patient populations is still in its infancy. Releasing performance measures to the public before physicians have had the opportunity to advance this science and build trust in a system to properly account for variations in patient populations has substantial risk. In particular, the physician profiling that will result from such a premature data release will discourage physicians from taking on the sickest, most vulnerable patients and those with complex medical and social conditions. This can only serve to exacerbate health care disparities and create new barriers to care for those patients who are most in need.

AADA has previously submitted comments related to additional policies, including the value-based physician payment modifier, the lack of any meaningful provision related to the reform of our nation's unbalanced medical liability system, and others in its prior communications.

Our nation's doctors and patients are in need of health care system reform—reform that can happen if we work together to create a system that embraces the principles of quality care, efficient use of resources, and a patient-centered approach to practicing medicine. We are deeply disappointed to find ourselves with a Senate bill which fails to address several of the concerns we have raised, and it is regrettable that our efforts at collaborative dialogue have not resulted in a bill that we can support.

We urge you to work with us to arrive at a legislative proposal that is consistent with our specialty's principles for health system reform—principles which are widely shared by the physician community. AADA believes it is incumbent upon every health care provider to commit to being responsible stewards of the nation's health care resources. The challenge is finding the balance between fiscal prudence, delivering high quality care, and preserving the trusted physician-patient relationship. Please feel free to contact John Hedstrom (jhedstrom@.aad.org) in the Academy's Washington office at (202) 842–3555.

Sincerely,

DAVID M. PARISER, MD, FAAD,
*President.*

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following letter I sent to Mr. Alan Frumin, Parliamentarian of the U.S. Senate, on January 8, 2010, regarding the ruling that occurred in the Senate on December 16, 2009, during consideration of the health care reform bill that permitted Senator SANDERS to unilaterally withdraw his amendment during its reading.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
*Washington, DC, January 8, 2010.*

ALAN FRUMIN,
*Parliamentarian of the Senate, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. FRUMIN: I write to express my dismay with the situation that occurred in the Senate on Wednesday, December, 16th, 2009, regarding Sanders Amendment No. 2837. Specifically, I refer to the ruling that permitted Senator Sanders to unilaterally withdraw his amendment during its reading. This ruling had immediate, untoward, and severe ramifications for consideration of highly consequential legislation.

After thorough research into the matter, I firmly believe the Chair incorrectly applied Senate rules and precedents to permit Senator Sanders to withdraw the amendment. In doing so, the Chair cited a 1992 circumstance in which Senator Adams was allowed to withdraw an amendment during its reading, without unanimous consent. While this particular precedent has generated a significant amount of controversy in its own right, in this case it has only served to distract from the central issue at hand: even if the 1992 procedure were a proper precedent, it cannot be used to justify the withdrawal of the Sanders amendment.

Unlike the situation in 1992, consideration of Senator Sanders' amendment was governed by a unanimous consent order. The order not only sequenced the amendment but provided that no further amendments could be proposed to the Sanders amendment. In calling up his amendment, Senator Sanders expressly stated that he was doing so pursuant to the order. A 1971 precedent reflects well-established Senate practice: ''when the Senate is operating under a unanimous consent agreement or setting time for debate of a specific amendment that is action by the Senate on said amendment and subsequently it would take unanimous consent to withdraw the same.'' If this practice had been followed, Senator Sanders would not have been able to withdraw the amendment as a matter of right. Instead, he needed to propound a unanimous consent request, which he did not. Be assured, consent would not have been granted.

Following the ruling on December 16, your office justified Senator Sanders' unilateral withdrawal of his amendment, even in the face of the order, by claiming that the restrictions under a UC agreement for withdrawing an amendment are not imposed until after an amendment is pending. And you assert that the Sanders amendment could not be considered pending until the reading had been completed. I cannot find a basis for this explanation in Senate rules or precedents.

The assertion that the Sanders amendment was somehow not pending is illogical. A well-established practice, as expressed in a 1943 precedent, states ''the amendment must be before the Senate to be withdrawn.'' Thus, for the Sanders amendment to be withdrawn, it had to have been pending. If the amendment were not pending, and thus not subject to the order, it should not have been in order to withdraw it.

A 1979 precedent definitively demonstrates when an amendment must be considered pending. On December 10, 1979, Senator Roth of Delaware offered a second degree amendment to an amendment from Senator Stevens of Alaska. Objection was entered to dispensing with the reading of the Roth amendment. Upon a parliamentary inquiry during the reading, the Chair twice affirmatively stated that the amendment being read was the ''pending amendment'' and the ''pending order of business.''

Specifically, the Chair expressed the following: ''The Chair would advise that the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware is the pending order of business. A unanimous consent request that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with was objected to. Therefore, the amendment is in the process of being read and now will be read.''

One can clearly draw two inferences from this ruling that demonstrate once an amendment is offered, it is pending:

1. If the amendment were not pending, the Chair would have stated that the order of business would be the reading of the amendment, not the amendment itself. Instead, the Chair stated that the pending order of business was the amendment, which was being read.

2. Furthermore, if the Roth amendment were not yet pending, the Chair would have stated the pending amendment was the underlying Stevens amendment. However, the Chair announced that the pending amendment was the Roth amendment.

Based on this precedent, which is directly on point and controlling, I believe it is conclusive that the Sanders amendment was, in fact, pending, thereby triggering the limitations imposed by a consent order. Because an order applied, ''action'' had been taken on the amendment. Therefore, Senator Sanders should have needed unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment.

If the amendment had been fully read, its disposition would have carried over until the next calendar day. That is what should have happened if Senate procedures were properly applied. Senators from both parties vividly understand that the Parliamentarian's advice in this matter may have been greatly consequential for the consideration of health care legislation.

Finally, it is disturbing to know that the only entities privy to the operative considerations underlying the ruling were your office and the majority party. Senator Cardin, who presided at the time of the ruling, submitted into the Record on December 21, 2009 a statement that mentioned the 1992 and 1950 precedents, supplied by your office, to attempt to justify his ruling.

Unfortunately, at the time of the ruling, I had no way of knowing about the 1992 Adams precedent since it occurred after the latest edition of Riddick's Senate Procedure was published. Furthermore, the 1950 precedent was inaccurately depicted in Riddick's, with the text of Riddick's contradicting the actual precedent cited. Had all the precedents been commonly available in a reliable and updated form, Senators could have had a basis to challenge the Sanders ruling in real time. By the time the dust had settled after the ruling, as Senators struggled to parse what had happened, such a challenge was long moot. In any event, neither of these precedents arose in the context of a consent order. I therefore believe the precedents were off-point and inapplicable.

You are a man of integrity, are a dedicated public servant, and hold the rules and precedents of the Senate in high regard. However, I believe this ruling was incorrect, and that it had a major adverse impact on a monumental piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

TOM A. COBURN, M.D.,
*U.S. Senator.*

## TRIBUTE TO RICHARD GAUTHIER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I would like to recognize Richard Gauthier, Chief of Police in Bennington, VT. Mr. Gauthier has been saving lives and protecting Vermont communities for nearly 30 years.

Chief Gauthier began his career with the Bennington Police Department in 1980 after graduating from the Vermont Police Academy in Pittsford. Six years later, he was promoted to detective, and in 1998, he was named chief of the department, a position he has held for the past 12 years.

Chief Gauthier received his bachelor's degree from Southern Vermont College in 1991, and later attended the FBI National Academy. He also holds a master's degree in criminal justice administration from Norwich University. As chief, he has led by example and consistently sought to improve the department, encouraging officers to seek additional education, improve their training and better their performance. He currently teaches courses in criminal justice at Southern Vermont College, his alma mater, where one former student described him as ''a phenomenal educator.''

During his time as chief, he has overseen a number of positive changes in the department and in the community including the formation of the Bennington County Child Advocacy Center/Special Victims Unit, of which he is a founding member. He also led efforts to specialize police investigation into drugs and gangs, and managed the department's move to a new police headquarters. A celebrated law enforcement officer, Chief Gauthier received the Vermont VFW Law Enforcement Officer of the Year in 2005 and the Vermont Commissioner's Award for Service to Children and Families.

Chief Gauthier will celebrate 30 years of service in September, and plans to step down as Chief of Police. I commend Chief Gauthier for his dedication to the city of Bennington and the State of Vermont. He has selflessly given so much to his community.

I ask unanimous consent that a story from The Bennington Banner about Chief Gauthier's career be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bennington Banner, Jan. 6, 2010]

BPD'S CHIEF GAUTHIER RETIRING: 30-YEAR VETERAN OF FORCE PLANS TO STEP DOWN IN SEPTEMBER

(By Neal P. Goswami)

BENNINGTON.—Bennington Police Chief Richard Gauthier, a longtime member of the town police force, has informed officials of his decision to retire in the fall.

The 54-year-old Gauthier, appointed to the post in 1998, will reach the age of 55 and his 30th anniversary with the Bennington Police Department in September.

''I do have other goals that I want to achieve, and that would be a good time to start that,'' Gauthier said Wednesday in his downtown office. ''When I came on 30 years ago when I was 25, I made up my mind at that point that I was going to finish here if at all possible, and that's what happened.''

Gauthier joined the force two days after his 25th birthday, as a patrol officer. Six years later, he joined the Bureau of Criminal Investigations. After 12 years, and having reached the rank of sergeant, Gauthier was tapped by Town Manager Stuart A. Hurd to replace former Chief David Wooden.

''He was, I think, in the end, an excellent appointment. It was one of my first major appointments I had to face as town manager and, believe me, I was very, very nervous about it,'' Hurd said Wednesday.

''I say, more power to him. I certainly hate to lose him, and I think it's going to be an interesting process to try and replace him,'' he said. ''Overall, there isn't anything bad you can say about Rick Gauthier.''

Gauthier said his initial goal in police work was to become a detective, but his ambitions grew as he ascended the ranks of the department.

''That was as far forward as I was thinking at the time,'' Gauthier said. ''Later on, after I had been at (the Bureau of Criminal Investigation) for a while, I began entertaining the potential, but I was still surprised when I was actually chosen.''

Hurd said Gauthier was selected from a group of three internal candidates. Gauthier had a degree in criminal justice and as head of the police union had worked well with town officials, Hurd said.

''He brought all of those skills and all of those management styles, and in a sense, balance, to the police chief job in Bennington,'' he said.

Locals involved in the legal system had also vouched for him, Gauthier said.

''In talking with people in the law enforcement field—the state's attorney's office, lawyers who had worked with him—he really seemed to be heads and tails above everybody else in terms of his knowledge in police work,'' Hurd said.

For Gauthier, the highlight of his career in Bennington has been the ''ability to help people out that desperately need it at the time.'' As chief, being able to shape the department and focus improvements on training, equipment and the professionalism of the department has been most rewarding, he said.

Gauthier said the department has made substantial in those areas because of a quality command staff. ''I have what I consider to be a superior staff, a superior supervisory staff, and certainly this is a team effort,'' he said ''We are where we are because we have all worked together and done well.''

A strong relationship with other town officials has helped, too, Gauthier said.

''I'm kind of the envy of a lot of other chiefs around the state. My relationship with (Hurd) is excellent. We've disagreed on a couple of things, but the disagreements have always been kind of minor,'' Gauthier said. ''I've also had what I consider to be a very supportive select board, regardless of the members changing.''

Hurd agreed that any disagreements the two have had have been ''nothing of merit.''

''He's always been a part of the team. He's never been sort of egocentric, or sort of self-centered.

''He's always been willing to step up when tough budget times are necessary, and people have to look at their budgets very hard and make tough decisions,'' Hurd said.

Gauthier said he has tried to encourage the officers he commands to ''seek constant improvement,'' and hopes that will be a lasting legacy with the department.

''I hope that if I leave anything here, it's that continuous quest to improve all the time—improve yourself educationally, improve your performance as an officer, improve your training.''

He has followed his own advice, earning a master's degree while serving as chief, and may pursue a doctorate degree following his retirement.

Employment outside of law enforcement is likely, Gauthier said, who already teaches courses at Southern Vermont College. He remains coy, however, about his full plans. ''I've got a number of irons in the fire, and as I get closer to my actual retirement date, it will become clearer which one is the way I should go,'' he said.

Hurd said he intends to first look within the department to find Gauthier's replacement. The hope is to have someone on board at least 30 days before Gauthier departs, he said.

The search, once it begins, is expected to take at least two months. Hurd said he will create a review panel composed of himself, some select board members and possibly former Vermont State Police Director James Baker or former Bennington County Sheriff Gary Forrest. The panel will interview potential candidates, compare resumes to the

job requirements and conduct a ''deep reference check.''

''You're looking for somebody who understands the law, but you're looking for somebody who has the personality to command but also to lead. I think there is a bit of a difference. You can be a good commander, but you might not be a good leader,'' Hurd said. ''Hopefully, I'll be able to find somebody with similar management skills and personality.''

At least two members of the department are interested in the position, according to people familiar with their thinking. Lt. Paul Doucette, currently second in the department's chain of command, and Detective Sgt. David S. Rowland, the third highest ranking officer in the department, have expressed interest, sources said.

Hurd said he doesn't expect any long-term negative impact from the internal search. ''If you're goal is to stay and work and be a leader in Bennington then you're going to have to take some disappointment, because there's only going to be one chief. I'm prepared for that, and I think I'll be able to deal with it.''

## REMEMBERING CHIEF RALPH JACKMAN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated public servant in Vermont who passed away earlier this month.

Ralph Jackman joined the Vergennes Volunteer Fire Department in 1947, and took over the helm as chief of the department in 1954. Some 55 years later, in November 2009, he stepped down from his post—widely recognized as one of the longest serving fire chiefs in the Nation.

During his time as the chief, Jackman saw many changes at the fire department. The department grew immensely— doubling the number of firefighters and tripling the number of vehicles. He oversaw the establishment of a cadet program and the construction of a new fire station. He also found time for a variety of community service activities, including serving as the two-time president of the Vermont State Firefighters Association. Throughout his entire career, Jackman was in the thick of the action, responding to emergency calls and managing the volunteer department's operations.

Chief Jackman's family had firefighting in its blood. Jackman's twin brother Fred, who passed away in 2008, was a member of the Bristol Fire Department for 62 years, including 14 years as that department's chief. Chief Jackman's wife, as well as his five daughters, helped the Vergennes Volunteer Fire Department throughout his career. And eight of Chief Jackman's grandchildren are now firefighters.

My wife, Marcelle, and I wish to express our deepest condolences to Chief Jackman's wife, Myrle Jackman, his immediate family and his extended family in the fire service community throughout Vermont. They are rightly proud of Chief Jackman's long and distinguished career and the legacy he has left behind in Vergennes and Vermont.

I ask unanimous consent that a story from The Burlington Free Press about Chief Jackman's storied career be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington Free Press, Jan. 7, 2010]

LAST CALL FOR CHIEF JACKMAN: HUNDREDS ATTEND FUNERAL

(By Matt Sutkoski)

VERGENNES.—Ralph Jackman made his last fire call Wednesday.

Jackman was chief of the Vergennes Fire Department from 1954 until November—55 years. He died Saturday at the age of 85. Services were held for him Wednesday morning.

Family, friends and more than 200 firefighters crowded into St. Peter's Catholic Church for the services. The firefighters came from surrounding towns and distant communities—Addison, Whiting, Bristol, Cabot, Burlington, Shrewsbury, East Montpelier, even Nashua, N.H.

At the service, Mark Bouvier of the Bristol Fire Department said Jackman's whole family helped with the chief's decades-long career. He had five daughters, and when they were growing up and a fire call came into the Jackman home in the middle of the night, everyone sprang into action. One daughter would answer the phone, others would make sure his gear was ready for him; another would open the garage door. ''He needed all his daughters to get ready for fire calls,'' Bouvier said.

Firefighting runs in the Jackman family blood. His twin brother Fred, who died in 2008, was a member of the Bristol Fire Department for 62 years and was chief for 14 of those years. Eight of Ralph Jackman's grandchildren are firefighters.

Jackman was one of the nation's longest serving fire chiefs, and he was often in the forefront of Vermont firefighting innovations, Bouvier said. Under Jackman, the Vergennes Fire Department was the first to acquire a hose-reel truck and the first to establish a cadet program.

As great a contribution Jackman made to the Vergennes Fire Department, he thought of all the city's residents, Bouvier said. He'd give fuel oil to needy residents during the time he owned a fuel business. Somebody else might get a warm coat from him, and he was heavily involved in a variety of charitable organizations until the end of his life, Bouvier said.

The Rev. Yvon Royer, officiating at the Mass, also took note of Jackman's lifelong contributions. ''He was a true icon of the community. It was a respect that was earned,'' Royer said.

After the service, with an honor guard of firefighters saluting, Jackman's American flag-draped coffin was loaded onto the back of Vergennes Fire Pumper Truck 316. Led by a contingent of Vergennes firefighters and followed by Jackman's family and friends, the truck bearing the coffin rolled slowly up Maple Street, turned right on Main, then right again onto Green Street to the Vergennes fire station.

The fire truck, parked in front of the station, then blasted its horn three times to ceremonially mark Jackman's final alarm.

## 2010 NATIONAL AMBASSADOR FOR YOUNG PEOPLE'S LITERATURE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased that this month Katherine Paterson of Barre, VT, has been named the 2010 National Ambassador for Young People's Literature. Her books, which include ''A Bridge to Terabithia,'' ''Jacob Have I Loved,'' and ''Bread and Roses Too,'' motivate young readers to become excited about reading and understand struggles and joy in their own lives. She has long inspired readers in Vermont and across the country to make reading a daily part of their lives.

Reading at a young age can have a dramatic impact on a child's ability to succeed and learn more than can be taught in a classroom. In my home town of Montpelier, VT, the Kellogg-Hubbard Library serves as the center of the community to many local children. When I am home, I love seeing children flood the library after school and borrow new and exciting books or choose to reread old favorites.

Despite what I witness at my local Vermont library, reading rates among children today are on the decline, which makes Ms. Paterson's role as National Ambassador even more crucial as she tours the country to attract new, young readers. I cannot think of a better suited choice for this challenging role, and I congratulate her on her appointment. On a personal note, Marcelle and I have valued our years of friendship with Katherine and John Paterson.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a January 6, 2010, Washington Post article about this year's National Ambassador for Young People's Literature.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 6, 2010]

KATHERINE PATERSON NAMED NATIONAL AMBASSADOR FOR YOUNG PEOPLE'S LITERATURE

(By David Montgomery)

The Stinky Cheese Man has been replaced by the Queen of Terabithia.

They have nothing in common, these two, and yet everything in common. Tuesday morning in the Library of Congress, with elementary school children as witnesses, the ceremony of succession was accomplished and a proud nation with so-so reading habits got a new National Ambassador for Young People's Literature.

She is Katherine Paterson, the award-winning author of more than 30 books, probably best-known for ''Bridge to Terabithia,'' which was published and Newbery-Medaled in the late 1970s but had its longest run on the bestseller lists after release of the 2007 movie.

The outgoing ambassador wisecracked about all the imaginary diplomatic perks he would be giving up. He is Jon Scieszka, the award-winning author of more than three dozen illustrated books and chapter books and the Web-savvy creator of an online kid empire—but perhaps best known for his 1992 opus, ''The Stinky Cheese Man and Other Fairly Stupid Fairy Tales.''

It's hard to imagine two more different writers being asked to perform the same mission. Scieszka was the first kid-lit ambassador, serving the two-year term.

''We couldn't be more different,'' said Scieszka, 55. ''Sometimes you want to read 'Bridge to Terabithia' and deal with that, sometimes you're feeling like a 'Knucklehead' and 'Stinky Cheese Man.' Kids are willing to try all of it.''

''If you're trying to catch young readers, you have to fish with the right bait,'' said

Paterson, 77. ''Kids that are going to be caught by Jon's books are not going to be caught by my books.''

Corey Shaw, 10, a fifth-grader at Brent Elementary School—one of three Capitol Hill schools that sent about a dozen students each to the ceremony—has read both ''Terabithia'' and Scieszka's ''Tut, Tut.'' He gave thumbs up to both.

''It's actually a very important and surprising book,'' Corey said of ''Tut, Tut,'' about a trip back in time to ancient Egypt.

Of ''Terabithia,'' about a boy and a girl who invent a magical land together, Corey said: ''The ending was very sad. Then I thought about it, and it's not that bad. You have to remember that you have to get over things.''

Indeed, many of the other students also turned out to be what you might call Stinky Cheese Terabithians, fans of both the incoming and outgoing ambassadors, which helped Librarian of Congress James Billington and the others behind the ambassadorships make their larger point. The ambassador's role is to raise national awareness about the importance of young people's literature in getting young readers off to a good start. By picking two such different writers as the first two ambassadors, the program reminds parents that there are many different ways to be a reader, Billington said.

''Read for your life,'' Paterson told the young people in the audience.''Read for your life as a member of a family, as a part of a community, as a citizen of this country and a citizen of the world.''

Meanwhile, reading rates among young people are in decline, while there has been an uptick in reading among adults, according to the latest figures released by the National Endowment for the Arts. Just over half of 9-year-olds, fewer than a third of 13-year-olds and about one-in-five 17-year-olds read almost every day for fun, the NEA reported in 2007.

The ambassador's responsibilities amount to making appearances at major book events around the country to evangelize for young reading—which Paterson has been doing for 30 years. ''It will sound a little fancier now that I have this medal,'' she said.

A selection committee of children's book experts and the outgoing ambassador recommended Paterson to Billington. Sponsors of the ambassador program include the library's Center for the Book and the Children's Book Council, a nonprofit trade association. Several publishers also underwrite expenses.

Paterson's works include ''Jacob Have I Loved,'' ''The Great Gilly Hopkins,'' ''Bread and Roses, Too,'' and, most recently, ''The Day of the Pelican,'' about a refugee family's escape from the war in Kosovo to the United States.

Paterson lives in Barre, Vt., but inspiration for ''Terabithia'' came when she lived in Takoma Park. Her son David had a best friend, Lisa Hill, and the pair played imaginative games in Sligo Creek Park. While away on vacation, Lisa was struck and killed by lightning. Paterson wrote ''Terabithia'' to make sense of the tragedy, with protagonists named Leslie and Jess.

Before the ceremony in the library, David Paterson walked up to the rows of students. Katherine Paterson's four children, seven grandchildren and husband had come to watch her be honored.

''How many kids have read 'Bridge to Terabithia'?'' he asked. Nearly 30 hands shot up. ''You can tell your friends you met the original Jess.''

Charlotte Harrington gasped. She's 9, a fourth-grader at St. Peter's Interparish School. ''Terabithia'' is one of her favorite books. ''It starts out miserable, and then goes joyous, then goes downhill, then uphill,'' she said after David Paterson walked away.

When it was Charlotte's turn to get ''Bread and Roses, Too,'' signed by Paterson, the girl told the author, ''I loved 'Bridge to Terabithia.' It's one of the best books ever.''

The Charlottes of the nation don't need an ambassador. But she and her friends had plenty of ideas for the new ambassador on hooking reluctant young readers.

''Give them a book that shows them what they feel like,'' said Fiona Campbell, 9, a fourth-grader at St. Peter's.

Isn't that what Paterson and Scieszka both have been doing, after their own fashion? Afterwards, they laughed about being such an odd couple.

''I think the No. 3 [ambassador] should be different from both of us!'' Paterson said. ''The variety of books is a wonder to behold, but we also have a variety of readers.''

## 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BUFFALO BILL DAM

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, during the 57th Congress, our predecessors passed the Newland Reclamation Act that changed the landscape of arid Western States. Part of the 1902 act, which created the Reclamation Service, included funding for a dam in a narrow, 70-foot gorge in the Shoshone Canyon, 6 miles from Cody, WY.

The construction of the Shoshone Dam began in 1905. Workers used 78,576 cubic feet of rubble concrete to build the massive structure. When work was completed on January 15, 1910, the Shoshone Dam was the world's highest concrete arch dam at 325 feet. The total bill for the dam was $1,345,000.

Water from the Shoshone River filled a reservoir that covered an area 10 miles long and 4 miles wide—over 300,000 acres of land. Promotional brochures published during the early years boasted that the dam and reservoir created a ''healthful, invigorating and enjoyable climate with an abundance of sunshine and irrigation water.'' Further, in an effort to draw enterprising farmers to the basin, they stated the area is ''immune from storms and that tornadoes and cyclones are unknown in the region.''

The 79th Congress once again passed legislation affecting the dam—this time to rename it for one of the West's favorite sons: William F. Cody. In 1946, the Shoshone Dam formally became the Buffalo Bill Dam. While Buffalo Bill may be most famous for his Wild West Show in the early 1900s, he had the vision to harness the Shoshone River to open the area for development. Cody and his colleagues had big dreams to build more than 50 miles of canals and irrigate more than 150,000 acres. He was only able to bring water to 6,000 acres before his finances and stamina ran out. However, it was because he saw the region's potential that the dam was initially built.

Those of us who are fortunate to call Wyoming home have a great appreciation for the opportunity to live with, utilize and benefit from the Buffalo Bill Dam. It is a positive presence in the world of the West.

Last week marked the tremendous structure's 100th birthday. We remember the ingenuity, courage and foresight of the men and women who made the dam possible. It changed the near desert landscape into one that supports a wide range of agricultural and recreational activities. We often say Wyoming is what America was. The Buffalo Bill Dam is a great reminder of this.

# ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

## TRIBUTE TO CHUCK MACK

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, as Chuck Mack is honored by the Teamsters Joint Council 7, I take this opportunity to commend him for his tireless and dedicated service to the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Chuck Mack first joined the Teamsters as a seasonal plant worker for Del Monte in the summer of 1960. A few years later, he was elected business agent at Local 70 in Oakland, CA. In 1971, Chuck transitioned to a position in Sacramento, working as a lobbyist for the California Teamsters Public Affairs Council. The following year, he returned to Local 70, where he was elected as secretary-treasurer. For the next 27 years, until he retired in 2009, Mr. Mack served as Local 70's secretary-treasurer, where he was a strong and passionate advocate for bay area workers and their families.

Though serving as secretary-treasurer for Local 70 was a full-time job, Mr. Mack further showed his commitment to the International Brotherhood of Teamsters by also serving as the president of Joint Council 7 from 1982 until 2009—the second longest-serving Joint Council president in history. Mr. Mack also held several other distinguished positions during his tenure with the Teamsters, including: vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters Western Region; IBT director of Port Division; and Western Conference of Teamsters Pension trustee. Though retired from many of his positions since June 2009, Mr. Mack continues to serve as the co-chair of the Western Conference of Teamsters Pension Trust.

Mr. Mack is known for his integrity and strong work ethic. From his humble beginnings with the Teamsters in the 1960s, Mr. Mack has worked for more than 40 years to help negotiate first-class rights for workers and their families throughout California. It is through his efforts that some of the strongest rights for workers have been won, including good jobs with good wages, access to health care, and fair and just contracts.

I have known Chuck Mack for many years, and I am continually inspired by his dedication to the labor movement. As a stalwart defender of equal rights and a champion for workers everywhere, I wish him many more years of continued community involvement and leadership.●

## REMEMBERING BART SINGLETARY

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am honored to remember Bart Singletary—a man of great generosity and humility who recently passed away.

Bart was a devoted father and husband, successful businessman, prolific philanthropist and dedicated steward of some of inland southern California's most influential civic institutions. His many achievements and stalwart presence in the Riverside community will have a lasting impact on the people of the Inland Empire.

Bart Singletary had an abiding connection to the city of Riverside. He was a second generation native of the city, and as a young man he tended the grounds of the historic Citrus Experiment Station. Years later, this land became the site of Bart's beloved alma mater, the University of California, Riverside. After marrying his wife, Barbara, Bart took a position at a real estate firm that was offered to him by a fellow Riverside native and childhood friend, William Austin. They eventually became partners in William Austin Co., a property management and development firm based in Riverside. They enjoyed a successful business partnership that spanned more than four decades.

Bart's affection for his community was embodied in his relentless involvement in many of the area's civic organizations and educational institutions. He served as the chairman of the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce, he was the president of Riverside Community Hospital, and he helped to found the city of Riverside Economic Development Committee. He was also president of the board of trustees for the UC Riverside Foundation, and was actively involved with the California Citrus State Historic Park Operating Corporation, serving as its treasurer and on its Board of Directors.

In 1984, at the age of 57, Bart enrolled at UC Riverside to continue studies that he had begun years earlier at UCLA. He approached his schooling with characteristic humility and good humor—taking an internship at the university where his supervisor, Vice Chancellor for University Advancement Emeritus Jim Erickson, was 10 years his junior. His experience as an undergraduate during this time cemented his commitment to the university. In 2006, Bart and Barbara, along with his partner William Austin and his wife Toby, gave $15.5 million to UCR. This gift was the largest in the university's history and represented the largest combined charitable trust given to a University of California campus in the first half of this decade. The donation enabled the university to create 22 endowed professorships and bolstered the university's proposal to establish a medical school.

Singletary leaves a distinguished legacy of service and leadership that is an example to us all. His trusted counsel and willingness to leverage his success for the benefit of others endeared him to, and earned him the respect of, all of those who were fortunate enough to have known him.

He is survived by his wife, Barbara, three children, three step-children, and five grandchildren. I extend my heartfelt condolences to them.

The city of Riverside, State of California and our Nation has lost an exemplary individual with the passing of Bart Singletary.●

## REMEMBERING MICAH H. NAFTALIN

● Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I wish to pay tribute to Micah Naftalin who served as national director of the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews until his death in late December. Micah worked tirelessly as a leader in the grassroots activist movement in the U.S. on behalf of Soviet Jews denied their fundamental freedoms and human rights, including their right to leave the U.S.S.R. His passionate advocacy included close work with the Helsinki Commission over the years, with a particular focus on the cases of individual refuseniks, Jews denied permission by the Soviet authorities to exercise their right to emigrate.

Micah brought a unique zeal to his work on behalf of struggling Soviet Jewry and helped pave the way for an exodus of Jews from the Soviet Union. From the push to enact the Jackson-Vanik amendment in the early 1970s and vigils outside of the Soviet Embassy to the 1987 Freedom Sunday mass rally on the National Mall under the banner, ''Let My People Go,'' Micah was there. He saw the reforms ushered in by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev as an opening that might lead to relief for Jews and others denied their basic human rights in that country. Besides emigration concerns, he also closely monitored manifestations of anti-Semitism in the U.S.S.R. and the plight of political prisoners.

With the easing of restrictions on emigration and the eventual breakup of the Soviet Union, Micah continued his human rights advocacy, contributing to efforts to monitor developments throughout Russia's regions as well as in newly independent countries, including Ukraine and Belarus. In 1993, he served as a public member on the U.S. delegation to the Implementation Meeting on Human Dimension Issues. Micah testified before the Helsinki Commission on numerous occasions drawing on his decades of experience as an activist fervently dedicated to advancing human rights on behalf of others. His voice will be sorely missed. On behalf of the Commission, I offer his family our heartfelt condolences.●

## TRIBUTE TO RAYMOND PAUL PRITCHARD

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to honor a remarkable Iowan, Raymond Paul Pritchard, a native of Bondurant, IA. He is a distinguished World War II Air Force veteran and a civil servant of 29 years.

Following graduation from Bondurant High School in 1937, Mr. Pritchard went to work for Standard Oil Company. In 1941, Mr. Pritchard joined the Army Air Corp and served his country valiantly for the entirety of World War II. As an engineer and top turret gunner in the 384th Bomber Group, Mr. Pritchard was involved in numerous missions in the hostile skies of Europe, including several bombing runs over Germany and Czechoslovakia that were critical to the war effort.

Upon returning from World War II, Mr. Pritchard became a U.S. Postal Service worker. Mr. Pritchard retired in 1974, following 29 years of public service.

Mr. Pritchard and his wife Helen have three children, along with seven grandchildren, and five great-grandchildren. He is a member of Christ United Methodist Church, American Legion Post 374, and a 50-year member of Pioneer Lodge No. 22.

Mr. Raymond Paul Pritchard is a truly remarkable Iowan and American, who exemplifies great military and civilian service to his country.●

## TRIBUTE TO STEVEN C. McCRAW

● Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I commend Mr. Steve McCraw on his appointment to become the director of the Texas Department of Public Safety.

Mr. McCraw is a native of El Paso, TX, and holds a bachelor of science degree and a master of arts degree from West Texas State University. Mr. McCraw began his career in 1977 as a State trooper and sergeant narcotics investigator for the Texas Department of Public Safety prior to his appointment as a special agent with the FBI in 1983.

As an FBI special agent, Mr. McCraw was assigned to the Dallas, Pittsburgh, Los Angeles, Phoenix, Tucson, and San Antonio field offices. His FBI Headquarters assignments included Unit Chief of an organized crime unit; an Inspector; Deputy Assistant Director; Assistant Director of the Office of Intelligence, which was established in February 2002; and Assistant Director for the Inspection Division where he was responsible for strategic planning, internal investigations, and bureau-wide performance evaluations. He also served as the Inspector-In-Charge of the South East Bomb Task Force and the Director of the Foreign Terrorism Tracking Task Force, which was established by the President in October 2001.

After his retirement as an FBI Assistant Director in August 2004, Texas Governor Rick Perry appointed Mr. McCraw as the director of the Governor's Office of Homeland Security. Mr. McCraw has been instrumental in leading the State's homeland security

efforts and spearheading emergency efforts and responses to a variety of security threats to the State and emergencies. His extensive background in the law enforcement and intelligence fields enabled him to make well-informed decisions in preparing for and responding to all hazards and threats in Texas.

On 17 July 2009, Mr. McCraw was selected as the Director of Texas Department of Public Safety which is a capstone to his law enforcement career as he returns to lead the department of over 8,500 commissioned and non-commissioned personnel.

I congratulate Mr. McCraw on this appointment and his long public service and substantial law enforcement career.●

## 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOUTH DAKOTA SCHOOL OF MINES AND TECHNOLOGY

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I celebrate the 125th anniversary of the founding of the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology. Throughout its history, SDSM&T has been consistently providing students with a high-quality, affordable education. Graduates are fully prepared for successful, rewarding careers in engineering and science.

I have had many opportunities during my time in office to personally visit the School of Mines and Technology. I have always been impressed with the professionalism and dedication of the administration and faculty, the tradition of excellence at the institution, and the commitment to learn from the students who attend the school.

I am proud to be a partner with SDSM&T on its innovative research that has tremendous benefits for my State, as well as to the Nation and to the world, especially in the areas of engineering, science and technology, and defense. This work has everyday applications to the general public, the government and to Main Street businesses. The School of Mines has a great tradition as one of the top engineering schools in the Nation and their graduates are always in high demand by some of the top companies in the world. In 2009, South Dakota School of Mines and Technology was the only institution of higher learning where the starting salary for its graduates was more than the cost of the education.

I salute the great legacy and tradition of South Dakota School of Mines and Technology on the occasion of its 125th anniversary and commend the work and commitment, past and present, of the administrators, faculty, alumni and students of Mines. I wish them well in the upcoming year of observances and celebrations.●

## CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I want to share today with the Senate my congratulations to the Central Michigan University Chippewas football team, champions of the Mid-American Conference and of the 2010 GMAC Bowl, on a successful and exciting season.

On January 6, 2010, in Mobile, AL, the Chippewas won their 12th game of the season, against just two losses, defeating Troy University, 44–41, in two overtimes in the GMAC Bowl. It was truly one of the college football season's most thrilling games.

Down by 12 points in the fourth quarter to a talented Troy team, the Chippewas came back to take the lead. They did not flinch when Troy tied the game with a last-second field goal to send the game into overtime, and persevered through two overtimes to triumph.

As expected, quarterback Dan LeFevour played a big role in the victory. LeFevour, a senior, had already become major college football's all-time leader in total touchdowns, set a long list of Mid-American Conference records, and become the only player in NCAA history with both 12,000 career passing yards and 2,500 career rushing yards. At the GMAC Bowl, LeFevour completed 33 of 55 passes for 395 yards, passing for one touchdown and rushing for another in overtime. Another Chippewa star, receiver Antonio Brown, caught 13 of LeFevour's passes for 178 yards, and had 203 yards in kickoff returns, including a 95-yard return for a touchdown that helped kick off CMU's fourth-quarter comeback.

It was a proud moment not just for CMU and Michigan, but across the Midwest, as the Chippewas broke a 14-game bowl losing streak for Mid-American Conference teams.

The team's competitiveness, skill, determination, and grit generated great pride not only in Mount Pleasant, CMU's home, but across the State of Michigan, which is home to half the Chippewas' roster. I join the proud citizens of Michigan in congratulating the Chippewas on a fantastic season, and enter the names of the team's players and coaches into the RECORD as permanent recognition of their success.

Players: Jahleel Addae, Vince Agnew, Andrew Aguila, Deja Alexander, Bryan Anderson, Nick Bellore, Brian Bennyhoff, Jake Bentley, Shamari Benton, Matt Berning, David Blackburn, Dannie Bolden, Tim Brazzel, Antonio Brown, Reggie Brown, John Carr, Derek Carter, Landon Carter, Paris Cotton, Jon Czerwienski, Leron Eaddy, Kirkston Edwards, Jake Ekkens, James Falls, Jeff Fantuzzi, Adam Fenton, Eric Fisher, Cedric Fraser, Kashawn Fraser, Eric Fraser, Connor Gagnon, Cornelius Gallon, Josh Gordy, David Harman, Jerry Harris, Brett Hartmann, Richard Hayes, Richie Hogan, Daniel Jackson, Gary Jackson, Jason Johnson, Todd Johnson, Aaron Kaczmarski, Matt Kanitz, Darren Keyton, Larry Knight, Dan LeFevour, Jake Linklater, Jeff Maddux, Matt Maletzke, Tommy Mama, Ben Masztak, Jordan McConnell, Aaron McCord, Colin Miller, Sean Murnane, Connor Odykirk, Allen Ollenburger, Jake Olson, Mike Petrucci, Cody Pettit, Tim Phillips, Kito Poblah, Ryan Radcliff, Evan Ray, Malek Redd, Tyler Reed, Chris Reeves, Mike Repovz, Nick Reynolds, Derek Rifenbury, Caesar Rodriguez, Adam Schneid, Bryan Schroeder, Will Schwarz, D.J. Scott, Bobby Seay Jr., Valtorrey Showers, Sean Skergan, Alex Smith, Chris Starkey, Armond Staten, Darryll Stinson, Kevin Sweet, Zurlon Tipton, Matt Torres, Kyle Torzy, Shane Torzy, Carl Volny, Rocky Weaver, A.J. Westendorp, Lorenzo White, Zach Wiersma, John Williams, LaVarus Williams, Sam Williams, Cody Wilson, Jeremy Wilson, Steve Winston, Kyle Zelinsky and Frank Zombo.

Coaches: Interim Head Coach Steve Stripling, Offensive Coordinator Mike Bajakian, Defensive Coordinator Tim Banks, Linebackers Coach Mark Elder, Running Backs Coach Jeff Beckles; Recruiting Coordinator and Tight Ends Coach Max Glowacki, Offensive Line Coach Don Mahoney, Special Teams and Defensive Tackles Coach Paul Volero, Graduate Assistants Ryan Oshnock and Tony Pape, Director of Football Operations Plas Presnell, and Strength and Conditioning Coach Dave Lawson.●

## TRIBUTE TO MARK INGRAM, JR.

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, in December, Mark Ingram, Jr. became the 75th college football player to win the Heisman Memorial Trophy as the Most Outstanding College Football Player in the United States for 2009. In winning this award, one of the most coveted and prestigious awards any college athlete can receive, Mark joined an exclusive and distinguished list of college football players, which includes many of the greatest players to ever lace up a pair of cleats. This honor must be especially gratifying for Mark as he becomes both the first person from Flint, MI, and the first player from the University of Alabama to be declared the winner of this award.

This year was an especially close race. In fact, it is reported that this was one of the closest ballots in the history of the award. There are many great players on the college level today, and Mark can take particular pride in knowing that, as a sophomore, he put together a 2009 season that outshone them all. Clearly, he has earned the respect and admiration of the many that follow and cover college football on a daily basis.

Mark had an outstanding sophomore season. He scored 17 touchdowns and amassed 1,658 rushing yards, a single-season school rushing record. In addition to winning the Heisman, Mark was honored as the SEC Offensive Player of the Year. These are tremendous honors, and in a emotional acceptance speech, Mark spoke about the many people and situations that helped him to develop the drive and determination

necessary to excel on the gridiron. Mark grew up and played high school football in Flint, MI, and is, simply the latest athlete from this talent rich area of Michigan to excel in collegiate or professional competition.

After winning this award, Mark went on to lead his football team to a 37 to 21 victory in the BCS Championship Game, which was played in the Rose Bowl in Pasadena, CA, on January 7. In that game, Mark scored a late touchdown that sealed his team's victory. He rushed for 116 yards in 22 carries, which helped his team secure a hard fought victory and earned him recognition as the offensive player of the game.

While his exceptional athletic qualities are now well known to many, I am equally delighted to know that Mark also has distinguished himself in the classroom. This, to me, speaks volumes about his character, focus, and determination. His future appears to be bright both on and off of the football field. I know my colleagues join me in congratulating Mark Ingram, Jr. on this most impressive achievement. I wish him the best for a long and rewarding career, both on and off of the gridiron.●

## 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE CITY OF LANSING

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I recognize an important milestone for the city of Lansing, the 150th anniversary of its founding. This is a moment worthy of celebration, and I am delighted to have this opportunity to share the pride of the residents of Lansing with my colleagues. The city and its citizens have been an integral part of Michigan's rich history, contributing much to the progress of the State and to its citizens. In the past 150 years, the city of Lansing has grown into a thriving community, and it is affectionately referred to by its residents as ''the small city with the big city feel.''

The city of Lansing had a rather humble beginning. In fact, Lansing's tenure as the capital of Michigan exceeds its history as a city. Lansing has served as Michigan's capital since 1847, when it was moved from Detroit. Chosen largely for its central location and its equal distance from some of Michigan's larger cities, the small township with fewer than 100 residents located 40 miles from the nearest railroad was designated the capital of Michigan. On February 15, 1859, the town of Lansing officially became a city. In the 1870s, Elijah E. Myers began to design the capitol structure that has endured as Michigan's center of government. The capitol building was completed in 1879.

Events in Lansing's early history helped to shape the city's rich culture and heritage. Transportation vastly improved in 1865 when Lansing was connected to the State railroad system. With this advance in infrastructure, business and industry in Lansing grew steadily throughout the 1870s. In 1887, R.E. Olds produced the first horseless carriage in Lansing, and in 1903, Olds Motor Works was the first car company to use an assembly line and interchangeable parts in the production of automobiles. A thriving business community attracted many new residents to Lansing, which included a major migration of African Americans and other workers from the South, as well as returning soldiers from WWI and WWII. This hardworking and diverse population helped to shape Lansing's distinct character.

Lansing also is home to many nationally recognized institutions. Among them is the Ingham Medical Center, which opened its doors in 1980 as the world's first arthroscopic surgery center. Just next door, in East Lansing, is home to one of our country's leading universities, Michigan State University. Originally named the Michigan Agricultural College, MSU has educated many throughout the State and from across the Nation since 1855. In 1969, Dr. Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., became the first African American to head a major research university when he was appointed president of Michigan State University. Another impressive landmark is the Michigan Library and Historical Center, which is just a short walk from the Michigan State capitol. It opened on March 6, 1989, and became the second largest State library in the Nation.

The city has endured its share of challenges through the years, from natural disasters, such as earthquakes and floods, to epidemics and economic downturns. We once again find ourselves in a defining moment in our State's history, as we continue to navigate one of the deepest economic recessions in decades. It will be in Lansing where our Governor and State legislators will work to craft policies that will steer Michigan toward a more prosperous future.

I am proud to recognize Lansing's history and to honor all who have made significant contributions over the years. It is Lansing's legacy of policymaking and its rich history that has created a diverse and thriving community, one that will continue to grow and prosper for generations.●

## TRIBUTE TO BUDD LYNCH

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, 65 years ago, a young Canadian serving his nation was struck by German artillery fire on a Normandy battlefield. The blast tore away his right arm and shoulder, and at a field hospital, a chaplain performed last rites on young Joseph James Lynch.

It is the good fortune of the Detroit Red Wings hockey club and thousands of fans in Michigan and across the United States and Canada that ''Budd'' Lynch survived the loss of his right arm with his life, his talent, and his sense of humor intact. Now 92 years old, Budd remains a leading citizen of Hockeytown after 60 years as a radio and television broadcaster, publicity and community affairs executive and public address announcer.

His broadcasting skills have been widely honored: He is a member of the Michigan Sports Hall of Fame and a winner of the Ty Tyson Award for Excellence in Sports Broadcasting from the Detroit Sports Broadcasters Association. In 1985, he received the Foster Hewitt Memorial Award, the highest honor in hockey broadcasting, and was inducted into the Hockey Hall of Fame.

As much as his talent at the microphone, it is Budd Lynch's unstoppable good humor that has endeared him to generations of hockey fans. Only someone with Budd's upbeat personality could refer to himself as ''the one-armed bandit.''

But even many of Budd's many fans don't know of all he has done for his community. For 20 years, he has hosted an annual charity golf tournament, with proceeds benefitting the Guidance Center, a Wayne County nonprofit organization that provides services including substance abuse and mental health counseling, parenting skills training, literacy promotion and educational programs for metro Detroit families. And he has spent countless hours providing guidance to fellow amputees, providing a living, breathing example that the loss of a limb does not stand in the way of a life lived joyfully.

The city of Wyandotte, which Budd has long called home, has planned a salute for him later this month, with the proceeds going to the Guidance Center. He will be presented with a key to the city, but Budd Lynch already has the key to the hearts of hockey fans in Detroit and around the NHL. I salute him for his years of service and sacrifice—to Canada, to the Red Wings, to hockey, and to the community and to our State that have for so many decades been proud to claim him as one of our own.●

## TRIBUTE TO DR. CLAUD YOUNG

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to pay tribute to Dr. Claud Young, the founder of the Michigan Chapter of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and a tireless and dedicated advocate for civil rights and social and economic justice. His significant contributions as a physician and as an advocate for social and economic justice have impacted many across Michigan and the Nation.

Dr. Young's more than four decades of service will be recognized by the Michigan SCLC at a dinner in his honor. This is a fitting tribute to a man who has spent his career engaged in the noble fight for justice for all. In 1970, Dr. Young, a noted physician, founded the Michigan Chapter of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference with the mission to continue the noble efforts of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. to achieve social, economic, and political justice through nonviolence and the strength of love.

Under his leadership, the Michigan SCLC has waged numerous successful battles and has had an enduring impact on the lives of many. I guess one could say, it is in his genes, having come from a family historically noted for its commitment to public service and community empowerment.

Once again, I am delighted to congratulate Dr. Young, a community leader and my good friend. I wish him and the SCLC the best as they continue their important work.●

## TRIBUTE TO THE BRANDON BAUMAN FAMILY

● Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, today I congratulate the Brandon Bauman Family for being named the 2009 Northern Arkansas County Farm Family. The recognition comes in honor of the Baumans' efficiency of production, conservation of energy and resources, leadership in agriculture and community affairs, home and farm improvement, and home and farm management.

Brandon and his wife Amy have two daughters, Caroline and Abigail. They farm 2,200 acres with rice, soybeans, wheat, and oats. I was pleased to help recognize the Baumans earlier this month during the 70th Annual Stuttgart Chamber of Commerce Membership Meeting and Banquet in Stuttgart.

As a seventh-generation Arkansan and farmer's daughter, and as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I understand firsthand and appreciate the hard work and contributions of our farm families. Agriculture is the backbone of Arkansas's economy, creating more than 270,000 jobs in the state and providing $9.1 billion in wages and salaries. In total, agriculture contributes roughly $15.9 billion to the Arkansas economy each year.

Our farm families are critical to our Nation's economic stability. Agriculture leads all U.S. product groupings with the largest trade surplus at $23 billion in fiscal year 2009, almost triple the next largest category of transportation products. We must work to continue the farm family tradition, so families such as the Baumans are able to maintain their livelihoods and continue to help provide the safe, abundant, and affordable food supply that feeds our own country and the world and that is essential to our own economic stability.

I salute the Baumans and all Arkansas farm families for their hard work and dedication.●

## TRIBUTE TO NORMA STRABALA AND DEBBIE AHRENS

● Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, today I congratulate Norma Strabala as ''Citizen of the Year'' and Debbie Ahrens as ''Volunteer of the Year'' for Stuttgart, AR.

I was pleased to be on-hand as Norma and Debbie were recognized earlier this month during the 70th Annual Stuttgart Chamber of Commerce Membership Meeting and Banquet in Stuttgart. I have felt a long kinship to Stuttgart, one of our delta communities not far from and very similar to my hometown of Helena. Stuttgart always feels like home, and I am grateful for the friendships I have made there. As members of a community with such a great spirit of volunteerism and caring, Norma and Debbie should be particularly proud of their recognitions.

According to those who know her best, Norma always strives to help other people through her attitude and actions. She has consistently worked to establish programs that help those less fortunate. She was a key figure in coordinating volunteer efforts during and after the 2008 tornado and 2009 straight-line winds that damaged much of the city, and during each holiday season.

Similarly, Debbie is known throughout Stuttgart for her volunteer efforts. Through the years, she has been active on many local Chamber of Commerce committees and is a deserving recipient of the designation of ''Volunteer of the Year.''

We should all embrace the spirit of service and volunteerism on display by these deserving individuals. I send my heartfelt congratulations to both Norma and Debbie.●

## RECOGNIZING THE WYNNE INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL

● Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, today I would like to congratulate Wynne Intermediate School, in Wynne, AR, on achieving the designation as a ''Program of the Month'' from the national ''Reading Is Fundamental,'' or ''RIF,'' program for the month of December 2009. RIF prepares and motivates children to read by delivering free books and literacy resources to children and families who need them most.

Located in the Arkansas Delta, not far from where I attended public school myself, the Wynne Intermediate School RIF program serves 462 children in the 4th and 5th grades. For the past 16 years, Wynne Intermediate School has held engaging motivational activities for both students and parents. With the closest bookstore 50 miles away, families depend on the RIF program to enjoy reading together.

I believe that education is the key to success for our young people. The knowledge and training that students receive today are the tools that carry them for the rest of their lives.

That is why I am so proud to help recognize Kaley Boeckmann, RIF coordinator, and the entire faculty and staff at Wynne Intermediate School for their dedication in helping increase opportunities for students to read and learn. Through their leadership and good example, countless students have been motivated to expand their horizons through the written word.

Most important, I would also like to congratulate all of the students in Wynne who have discovered the joy of reading. I encourage them to make the most of their education and opportunities.●

## TRIBUTE TO ALBERT D. ROSELLINI

● Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to recognize a very special advocate and former Governor of my home State of Washington who is celebrating his 100th birthday on Thursday.

Albert D. Rosellini served two terms as Governor of Washington State, first being elected in 1956. Before he was elected Governor, he served as the deputy prosecutor of King County and 18 consecutive years in the State senate.

Throughout his career, Governor Rosellini has been a dedicated public servant and an inspiration to generations of public servants. I know that Governor Rosellini's knowledge, drive and passion for service has made my home state a better place to live and work. It is an honor to have had the opportunity to earn the support and advice of such an extraordinary figure in my State's history.

In the State senate, Albert was a champion for labor, small business and equality, introducing an unfair practice bill to ensure small businesses receive decent prices, a fair employment practices bill, and an equal wage bill for women.

He strived to improve the quality of education in Washington State by supporting measures to improve retirement programs and raise salaries for teachers. He also promoted improvements to schools for the mentally disabled, deaf and blind. As a sponsor of the Youth Protection Act, Albert promoted progressive correctional programs for delinquents and revitalized penal institutions and juvenile institutions that are still in use today.

In 1951, he introduced a bill that created a teaching hospital on the campus of the University of Washington, continuing his goal to improve education and medical facilities across the State. That hospital is the basis of the acclaimed medical center we have there today.

As Governor, Albert worked to diversify Washington State's industry by creating the Department of Commerce and Economic Development which brought international trade to Washington. This department helped launch the high tech industry in this area and developed Overlake Park in Bellevue where Microsoft and other high tech companies are currently established.

The leadership abilities displayed by Governor Rosellini were quickly noticed by his colleagues and he was elected chairman of the National Governors Association during his second term as Governor.

Since leaving office, Governor Rosellini has continued his commitment to better Washington State. In 1979 he helped our State's athletes attend and compete on the world's stage

as the chairman of the United States Olympic Committee for Washington State. Additionally, as a result of the great improvements made to Washington's transportation system while Governor, he was made a member of the Washington State Transportation Committee for 11 years, acting as chairman for the last 2.

I greatly respect the Governor for his unmatched dedication to public service and the State of Washington and thank him for making such a critical difference in the history of my State.●

## TRIBUTE TO GLENDA MLADY REIMER

● Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, on the occasion of her retirement, I take this opportunity to honor Glenda Mlady Reimer for her many years of service to our great Nation. I have known Glenda for a number of those years and will miss her unfailing good humor and her dedication to public service.

Glenda began her illustrious career in 1989 after graduating from Northeast Nebraska Community College in Norfolk, NE. She spent the next 7 years working for my good friend, former U.S. Senator Jim Exon, first on his reelection campaign, then as his scheduler and office manager. During that time, Glenda distinguished herself, continually helping others and coordinating activities. She was the volunteer coordinator for Vice President Al Gore's first Inaugural Ball. In 1993 she served as president of the board of directors of the Nebraska Society of Washington, DC, where she still remains an active member today. Glenda also served as the coordinator with Members of Congress for the 1995 National Champion Cornhusker Football Team presentations at the White House. In 1996, Glenda became a member of the board of directors, Cornhusker Capital Chapter, University of Nebraska Alumni Scholarship program, where she continues her lifelong support of my home State's university.

After a few years working in the private sector, Glenda returned to Capitol Hill in 2001, joining Maryland Senator BARBARA A. MIKULSKI's Washington office. At the end of that year, the U.S. Air Force hired Glenda for her current position as legislative specialist and scheduler in the Congressional Budget and Appropriations Liaison Office. Over the past 8 years, Glenda has touched the lives of countless uniformed military servicemen and women. She always worked to instill a sense of direction, dedication and family, marking her exemplary career with superb professionalism.

While serving in a variety of positions within the U.S. Senate and Air Force, Glenda has assisted me and many members of the Appropriations and Budget Committees with numerous scheduling and coordinating challenges. Her thorough and efficient planning, experience, wisdom, hard work, and organizational skills assured mission success every time. Glenda will definitely be missed.

In closing, I firmly believe that Glenda Mlady Reimer deserves acknowledgment and appreciation for her outstanding service to both the legislative and executive branches of our Federal Government. She consistently conducted herself in a manner which brought great credit upon her, the U.S. Senate, and the U.S. Air Force. Glenda's outstanding character and dedication to service have resulted in a career of which she and her son Joel can be very proud; and I am sure my fellow Members of the Senate join me in thanking her for her commitment to our country and in wishing her all the best for her future.●

## 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF POWNAL, VERMONT

● Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the State of Vermont will celebrate the year 2010 by marking the 250th anniversary of the historic town of Pownal, VT.

In celebrating Pownal, we celebrate a town that has done much more than merely survive the centuries. This bucolic little hamlet represents the strength and progress of our great State through the years.

Since its original charter in 1760, Pownal was built on a rich history that dates back to the divisive years of the revolution. During its earliest days many Pownal residents were stirred to join the Green Mountain Boys to fight for our independence. The fervor demonstrated by the original residents of this town set its course as the bedrock of loyalty and excellence in the State of Vermont.

Today we cherish the historic Mooar-Wright House which is the oldest house in both Pownal and the Green Mountain State. We commend the town's early emphasis on education, with two former U.S. Presidents serving as teachers in north Pownal. Over the centuries this town was a pocket of industrial accomplishment in Vermont. Some of the State's largest cotton and woolen mills were housed in Pownal and later replaced by lime quarries. They helped carry Vermont through years of industrial development and growth. These auspicious achievements, however, also served as a reminder of our capacity for change because the industrial mills in Pownal were singled out for child labor. This documented injustice symbolized the past and put the town on the national map in 1916 when it was depicted on a United States postage stamp to commemorate the passage of the first child labor laws. The heart of the town became its national image in 1946 when the United Nations Bulletin featured a photo of the Pownal Center as ''a picture of peace.'' Throughout the years this town was both the root of tradition and the spark of progress: a balance that few places or populations can claim.

Today, Pownal has developed into a town of more than three thousand. The buildings have grown and the industries have changed, but the ideals remain the same. On its 250th anniversary, Pownal continues to encapsulate the beauty and independence of our State. I thank the residents of Pownal for their contributions to our State's rich and unique history.

Mr. President, it is indeed an honor to represent the State of Vermont and the Town of Pownal and to promote its many successes.●

## ABERDEEN FEDERAL CREDIT UNION

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize the Aberdeen Federal Credit Union, AFCU, a member-owned not-for-profit financial cooperative located in Aberdeen, SD.

Chartered on April 11, 1935, this year marks the 75th anniversary of the AFCU. As a community charter, membership is open to all who live, work, worship, or attend school in Brown County. Building upon their mission of being responsive to their members' needs by providing competitive financial services, their membership has grown to nearly 10,000 Brown County residents. The AFCU has much to be proud of and I am confident that their success will continue well into the future.

As a credit union member myself, I understand firsthand the benefit of a credit union membership. Credit unions are a part of the community and they are well aware of the specific needs of their members. Their commitment to providing the best possible service is commendable, especially in the financial environment we are faced with today.

The AFCU will commemorate their 75th anniversary during their annual meeting held in Aberdeen, SD, on January 23, 2010. I would like to offer my congratulations to the leaders and membership of the AFCU on this milestone anniversary and wish them continued prosperity in the years to come.●

## TRIBUTE TO FRED ROSENBAUM

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I honor Fred Rosenbaum, a brigadier general, businessman, public servant, philanthropist, Holocaust survivor and one of Oregon's greatest residents. I have known few others who matched Fred's courage and dedication to improving the lives of every American. Although cancer may have taken Fred from this world, nothing can take away the remarkable legacy he left to Oregon and the Nation as a whole.

From his childhood as a Jew in Nazi Germany, Fred Rosenbaum saw the worst of humanity. Growing up in Vienna, Austria, Fred experienced the anti-Semitic riots of Kristallnacht

first-hand. At age 12, shortly after Kristallnacht, school officials attempted to round up Fred and his Jewish classmates in a school basement, for eventual capture by the Nazi SS. Fred narrowly escaped them by crawling out a window and eventually finding his way to England. From England, Fred helped his parents escape from Austria.

Fred and his family eventually immigrated to Portland, OR, to start a new life. Within just a few years, Fred began serving his new country. At age 16, Fred lied about his age and joined the Army, serving in the Philippines. In a sense, Fred experienced both fronts of the Second World War.

Fred's service to his country extended for long after the conclusion of the war. After Fred returned home, he joined the Oregon National Guard and, by his retirement in 1986, earned the rank of brigadier general.

At the same time, Fred built up a successful insurance business and employed his success for the public good. He chaired Portland's Housing Authority for 13 years, served as president of the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry, served on the board of trustees of Reed College, and became an associate national commissioner of the Anti-Defamation League. Service to others was an essential part of Fred's life, and we are all richer for it.

However, if the name ''Rosenbaum'' lives on in Oregon for one reason, it is his work improving the lives of children. Fred drew upon his experience both as an officer in the Oregon National Guard and as a chairman of the Housing Authority of Portland to create a summer camp for at-risk youth. He founded the camp 40 years ago, and the camp continues to operate to this day, buoyed by Fred's tireless dedication to its fundraising and survival.

The camp, located at the National Guard's Camp Rilea and now called ''Camp Rosenbaum'' in Fred's honor, provides pre-teens who live in public housing with an opportunity to fill their days with sports, the arts, and computer skills, while counselors and the Portland Police Bureau educate the children on the dangers of gangs and drugs. For many of the young and impoverished campers, it gives them their first chance to see the Pacific Ocean, and that moment always excites the kids. For the first time in their lives, they see a limitless horizon and Camp Rosenbaum helps them see that their potential is just as limitless.

Even though Fred has passed away, Camp Rosenbaum will continue to educate and engage at-risk youth. He would ask for nothing more.

Fred lived a life of service that immeasurably benefited both America and Oregon, and his legacy will live on for long after his passing. Not satisfied to just improve his own life, Fred dedicated himself to giving every child an opportunity to achieve their dreams.

His life is an inspiration to refugees everywhere, and a demonstration of the promise our country offers to those in even the direst of straits. Oregon and America have lost a humble hero who achieved greatness by helping others. Living up to his example of kindness and caring is a challenge he left to us all. Every American should rise to that challenge and give back to their communities and our country as much as Fred did. It would be a fitting tribute to an extraordinary man and a great American.●

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mrs. Neiman, one of his secretaries.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are pointed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

## REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED ON JANUARY 23, 1995, WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN TERRORISTS WHO THREATEN TO DISRUPT THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS—PM 40

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process is to continue in effect beyond January 23, 2010.

The crisis with respect to the grave acts of violence committed by foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that led to the declaration of a national emergency on January 23, 1995, has not been resolved. Terrorist groups continue to engage in activities that have the purpose or effect of threatening the Middle East peace process and that are hostile to United States interests in the region. Such actions constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process and to maintain in force the economic sanctions against them to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 20, 2010*.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of January 6, 2009, the Secretary of the Senate, on January 19, 2010, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 692. An act to provide that claims of the United States to certain documents relating to Franklin Delano Roosevelt shall be treated as waived and relinquished in certain circumstances.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the following resolution:

H. Res. 999. Resolution that the Clerk of the House inform the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1377. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand veteran eligibility for reimbursement by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for emergency treatment furnished in a non-Department facility, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1817. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 116 North West Street in Somerville, Tennessee, as the ''John S. Wilder Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2877. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 76 Brookside Avenue in Chester, New York, as the ''1st Lieutenant Louis Allen Post Office''.

H.R. 3072. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9810 Halls Ferry Road in St. Louis, Missouri, as the ''Coach Jodie Bailey Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3319. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 440 South Gulling Street in Portola, California, as the ''Army Specialist Jeremiah Paul McCleery Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3539. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 427 Harrison Avenue in Harrison, New Jersey, as the ''Patricia D. McGinty-Juhl Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3667. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16555 Springs Street in White Springs, Florida, as the ''Clyde L. Hillhouse Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3767. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 170 North Main Street in Smithfield, Utah, as the ''W. Hazen Hillyard Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3788. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3900 Darrow Road in Stow, Ohio, as the ''Corporal Joseph A. Tomci Post Office Building''.

## MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:03 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2646. An act to amend title 31, United States Code, to enhance the oversight authorities of the Comptroller General, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3237. An act to enact certain laws relating to national and commercial space programs as title 51, United States Code, ''National and Commercial Space Programs''.

H.R. 3892. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 West Highway 64 Bypass in Roper, North Carolina, as the ''E.V. Wilkins Post Office''.

H.R. 4139. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7464 Highway 503 in Hickory, Mississippi, as the ''Sergeant Matthew L. Ingram Post Office''.

H.R. 4173. An act to provide for financial regulatory reform, to protect consumers and investors, to enhance Federal understanding of insurance issues, to regulate the over-the-counter derivatives markets, and for other purposes.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD) announced that he had signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 1377. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand veteran eligibility for reimbursement by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for emergency treatment furnished in a non-Department facility, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1817. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 116 North West Street in Somerville, Tennessee, as the ''John S. Wilder Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2877. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 76 Brookside Avenue in Chester, New York, as the ''1st Lieutenant Louis Allen Post Office''.

H.R. 3072. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9810 Halls Ferry Road in St. Louis, Missouri, as the ''Coach Jodie Bailey Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3319. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 440 South Gulling Street in Portola, California, as the ''Army Specialist Jeremiah Paul McCleery Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3539. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 427 Harrison Avenue in Harrison, New Jersey, as the ''Patricia D. McGinty-Juhl Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3667. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16555 Springs Street in White Springs, Florida, as the ''Clyde L. Hillhouse Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3767. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 170 North Main Street in Smithfield, Utah, as the ''W. Hazen Hillyard Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3788. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3900 Darrow Road in Stow, Ohio, as the ''Corporal Joseph A. Tomci Post Office Building''

---

At 12:08 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 725. An act to protect Indian arts and crafts through the improvement of applicable criminal proceedings, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3759. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant market-related contract extensions of certain timber contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and timber purchasers, and for other purposes.

H. Con. Res. 228. An resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President.

## MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2646. An act to amend title 31, United States Code, to enhance the oversight authorities of the Comptroller General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3237. An act to enact certain laws relating to national and commercial space programs as title 51, United States Code, ''National and Commercial Space Programs''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3759. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant market-related contract extensions of certain timber contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and timber purchasers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 3892. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 West Highway 64 Bypass in Roper, North Carolina, as the ''E.V. Wilkins Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4139. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7464 Highway 503 in Hickory, Mississippi, as the ''Sergeant Matthew L. Ingram Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4173. An act to provide for financial regulatory reform, to protect consumers and investors, to enhance Federal understanding of insurance issues, to regulate the over-the-counter derivatives markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

## MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following measure was discharged from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1854. An act to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 to modify an environmental infrastructure project for Big Bear Lake, California; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

## MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3961. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reform the Medicare SGR payment system for physicians and to reinstitute and update the Pay-As-You-Go requirement of budget neutrality on new tax and mandatory spending legislation, enforced by the threat of annual, automatic sequestration.

H.R. 4154. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the new carryover basis rules in order to prevent tax increases and the imposition of compliance burdens on many more estates than would benefit from repeal, to retain the estate tax with a $3,500,000 exemption, to reinstitute and update the Pay-As-You-Go requirement of budget neutrality on new tax and mandatory spending legislation, enforced by the threat of annual, automatic sequestration, and for other purposes.

## MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2939. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code to require an audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks, and for other purposes.

## EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–4168. A communication from the Director of Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Electric Program: Definition of Rural Area'' ((7 CFR Part 1710) (RIN0572–AC15)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2009; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4169. A communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Average Procurement Unit Cost for the Remote Minehunting System (RMS) Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4170. A communication from the General Counsel, Selective Service System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the vacancy in the position of Director of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4171. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Jack L. Rives, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4172. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Mississippi Coastal Improvements Program (MsCIP), Hancock, Harrison and Jackson Counties, Mississippi; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–4173. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Updated Statements of Legal Authority to Reflect Continuation of the Emergency Declared in Executive Order 12938 and Changes to the United States Code'' (RIN0694–AE76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 23, 2009; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4174. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reporting of Offsets Agreements in Sales of Weapon Systems or Defense-Related Items to Foreign Countries of Foreign Firms'' (RIN0694–AE40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 23, 2009; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4175. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments to the Export Administration Regulations (EAR) Based upon the Accession of Albania and Croatia to Formal Membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)'' (RIN0694–AE62) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 23, 2009; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4176. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Authorization Validated End-User: Amendment to Existing Validated End-User Authorizations in the People's Republic of China (PRC) and India'' (RIN0694–AE77) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 23, 2009; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4177. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to the Federative Republic of Brazil; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4178. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month report on the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13159 relative to the risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4179. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4180. A communication from the NRDAR Program Manager, Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Natural Resource Damages for Hazardous Substances'' (RIN1090–AA97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2009; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4181. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Area Source Standards for Prepared Feeds Manufacturing'' (FRL No. 9095–2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2009; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4182. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Area Sources: Chemical Preparations Industry'' (FRL No. 9095–1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2009; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4183. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana'' (FRL No. 8985–4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2009; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4184. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri'' (FRL No. 9096–4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 23, 2009; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4185. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Operating Permits Program; State of Iowa'' (FRL No. 9096–6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 23, 2009; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4186. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Corporate Reorganizations; Distributions Under Sections 368(a)(1)(D) and 354(b)(1)(B)'' ((TD 9475) (RIN1545–BF83)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 23, 2009; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4187. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Tax-Exempt Bonds in Certain Disaster Areas'' (Notice 2010–10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 23, 2009; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–4188. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to Kuwait in support of the Combat Support Services Contract for the U.S. Army Support Group in the amount of $50,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4189. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed amendment to a manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to Canada relative to the design, manufacture, and repair of the APS–508 Radar to support the Canadian CP–140 Maritime Patrol Aircraft; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4190. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed amendment to a manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to Turkey relative to the design, manufacture, and repair of F–35 Center Fuselages and related Assemblies in the amount of $100,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4191. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services relative to the development of the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) Program involving the United States, Austria, Italy, and Germany in the amount of $50,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4192. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to Germany relative to the design and manufacture of the H–726 Dynamic Reference Unit for Military Vehicles; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4193. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to the United Kingdom relative to the manufacture and repair of aircraft vertical and azimuth rate gyros as well as attitude heading reference systems (AHRS) and attitude indicators; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4194. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed amendment to a technical assistance agreement for the export of defense articles, including, technical data, and defense services to the United Arab Emirates relative to the design and development of the Vehicle Launched Scatterable

Anti–Tank System (VLSAS) in the amount of $50,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4195. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's Fiscal Year 2009 Agency Financial Report; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–4196. A communication from the Deputy Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Methyl Esters of Conjugated Linoleic Acid (Cis-9), Trans-11 and Trans-10, Cis-12-Octadecadienoic Acids'' (Docket No. FDA-2003-F-0398) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 21, 2009; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4197. A communication from the Deputy Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Current Good Manufacturing Practice for Positron Emission Tomography Drugs'' (Docket No. FDA–2004–N–0449) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2009; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4198. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the use of the exemption from the antitrust laws provided by the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–4199. A communication from the Director, Center for Employee and Family Support Policy, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Continuation of Eligibility for Certain Civil Service Benefits for Former Federal Employees of the Civilian Marksmanship Program'' (RIN3206–AJ55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2009; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4200. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18–138, ''Initiative Measure No. 59, Legalization of Marijuana for Medical Treatment Initiative of 1999''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4201. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semi-Annual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 2009; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4202. A communication from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2009; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4203. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Legislative Affairs, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2009; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4204. A communication from the Policy Editor, Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extending Period of Optional Practical Training by 17 Months for F–1 Nonimmigrant Students with STEM Degrees and Expanding Cap-Gap Relief for All F–1 Students with Pending H–1B Petitions (RIN1653–AA56) received on December 22, 2009; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4205. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes to Patient Limitation for Dispensing or Prescribing Approved Narcotic Controlled Substances for Maintenance or Detoxification Treatment by Qualified Individual Practitioners'' (Docket Number DEA–275F) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 23, 2009; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4206. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 18–248, ''Religious Freedom and Civil Marriage Equality Amendment Act of 2009''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mrs. BOXER, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with amendments:

S. 2778. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 111–114).

By Mr. DORGAN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1105. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, to develop water infrastructure in the Rio Grande Basin, and to approve the settlement of the water rights claims of the Pueblos of Nambe, Pojoaque, San Ildefonso, and Tesuque (Rept. No. 111–115).

By Mr. DORGAN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1735. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 111–116).

By Mr. DORGAN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments:

S. 965. A bill to approve the Taos Pueblo Indian Water Rights Settlement Agreement, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 111–117).

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. LEMIEUX, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2931. A bill to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the earthquake in Haiti; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 2932. A bill to amend the public charter school provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VOINOVICH (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2933. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Colonel Charles Young Home in Xenia, Ohio, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 2934. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of imported seafood; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 2935. A bill to clarify that the revocation of an alien's visa or other documentation is not subject to judicial review; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. REID, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. LEMIEUX, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. KERRY, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DODD, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. BURRIS, and Mr. BROWNBACK):

S. 2936. A bill to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the earthquake in Haiti; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. LEMIEUX, and Mr. KERRY):

S. 2937. A bill to provide a temporary suspension of limitation on charitable contributions and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the enhanced charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHANNS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. LEMIEUX, Mr. BURR, Mr. ENZI, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNETT, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2938. A bill to terminate authority under the Troubled Asset Relief Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DEMINT:

S. 2939. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code to require an audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 2940. A bill to increase the use of security cameras at airport security screening checkpoints and exits, to impose increased penalties on individuals who circumvent security screening at airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) (by request):

S. 2941. A bill to provide supplemental ex gratia compensation to the Republic of the Marshall Islands for impacts of the nuclear testing program of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. Res. 388. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding unfair and discriminatory measures of the Government of Japan in failing to apply the Eco-Friendly Vehicle Purchase Program to vehicles made by United States automakers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. Res. 389. A resolution commending The University of Alabama Crimson Tide for being unanimously declared the 2009 NCAA Football Bowl Subdivision National Champions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 428

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 428, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 476

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 476, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reduce the minimum distance of travel necessary for reimbursement of covered beneficiaries of the military health care system for travel for specialty health care.

S. 491

At the request of Mr. WEBB, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal civilian and military retirees to pay health insurance premiums on a pretax basis and to allow a deduction for TRICARE supplemental premiums.

S. 624

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 624, a bill to provide 100,000,000 people with first-time access to safe drinking water and sanitation on a sustainable basis by 2015 by improving the capacity of the United States Government to fully implement the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005.

S. 663

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 663, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish the Merchant Mariner Equity Compensation Fund to provide benefits to certain individuals who served in the United States merchant marine (including the Army Transport Service and the Naval Transport Service) during World War II.

S. 841

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 841, a bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to study and establish a motor vehicle safety standard that provides for a means of alerting blind and other pedestrians of motor vehicle operation.

S. 870

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 870, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the credit for renewable electricity production to include electricity produced from biomass for onsite use and to modify the credit period for certain facilities producing electricity from open-loop biomass.

S. 891

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) were added as cosponsors of S. 891, a bill to require annual disclosure to the Securities and Exchange Commission of activities involving columbite-tantalite, cassiterite, and wolframite from the Democratic Republic of Congo, and for other purposes.

S. 1005

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1005, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act to improve water and wastewater infrastructure in the United States.

S. 1067

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1067, a bill to support stabilization and lasting peace in northern Uganda and areas affected by the Lord's Resistance Army through development of a regional strategy to support multilateral efforts to successfully protect civilians and eliminate the threat posed by the Lord's Resistance Army and to authorize funds for humanitarian relief and reconstruction, reconciliation, and transitional justice, and for other purposes.

S. 1076

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1076, a bill to improve the accuracy of fur product labeling, and for other purposes.

S. 1111

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1111, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to enter into agreements with States to resolve outstanding claims for reimbursement under the Medicare program relating to the Special Disability Workload project.

S. 1156

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1156, a bill to amend the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users to reauthorize and improve the safe routes to school program.

S. 1183

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1183, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide assistance to the Government of Haiti to end within 5 years the deforestation in Haiti and restore within 30 years the extent of tropical forest cover in existence in Haiti in 1990, and for other purposes.

S. 1203

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1203, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the research credit through 2010 and to increase and make permanent the alternative simplified research credit, and for other purposes.

S. 1313

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1313, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory.

S. 1317

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1317, a bill to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of firearms or the issuance of firearms and explosives licenses to known or suspected dangerous terrorists.

S. 1389

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1389, a bill to clarify the exemption for certain annuity contracts and insurance policies from Federal regulation under the Securities Act of 1933.

S. 1445

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1445, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and reduce the

occurrence of sudden unexpected infant death and to enhance public health activities related to stillbirth.

S. 1582

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1582, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against income tax to facilitate the accelerated development and deployment of advanced safety systems for commercial motor vehicles.

S. 1744

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1744, a bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to prescribe regulations to ensure that all crewmembers on air carriers have proper qualifications and experience, and for other purposes.

S. 1771

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1771, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a program of grants to newly accredited allopathic medical schools for the purpose of increasing the supply of physicians.

S. 1787

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1787, a bill to reauthorize the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1859

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. BURRIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1859, a bill to reinstate Federal matching of State spending of child support incentive payments.

S. 2128

At the request of Mr. LEMIEUX, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2128, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Office of Deputy Secretary for Health Care Fraud Prevention.

S. 2743

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of S. 2743, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the award of a military service medal to members of the Armed Forces who served honorably during the Cold War, and for other purposes.

S. 2747

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2747, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the land and water conservation fund to maximize the effectiveness of the fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 2758

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2758, a bill to amend the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 to establish a national food safety training, education, extension, outreach, and technical assistance program for agricultural producers, and for other purposes.

S. 2760

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2760, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an increase in the annual amount authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out comprehensive service programs for homeless veterans.

S. 2781

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2781, a bill to change references in Federal law to mental retardation to references to an intellectual disability, and to change references to a mentally retarded individual to references to an individual with an intellectual disability.

S. 2789

At the request of Mr. VOINOVICH, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2789, a bill to establish a scholarship program to encourage outstanding undergraduate and graduate students in mission-critical fields to pursue a career in the Federal Government.

S. 2812

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2812, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out programs to develop and demonstrate two small modular nuclear reactor designs, and for other purposes.

S. 2853

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 2853, a bill to establish a Bipartisan Task Force for Responsible Fiscal Action, to assure the long-term fiscal stability and economic security of the Federal Government of the United States, and to expand future prosperity growth for all Americans.

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 2853, supra.

S. 2858

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2858, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an Office of Mitochondrial Disease at the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes.

S. 2868

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2868, a bill to provide increased access to the General Services Administration's Schedules Program by the American Red Cross and State and local governments.

S. 2869

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2869, a bill to increase loan limits for small business concerns, to provide for low interest refinancing for small business concerns, and for other purposes.

S. 2886

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2886, a bill to prohibit certain affiliations (between commercial banking and investment banking companies), and for other purposes.

S. 2908

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2908, a bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to require the Secretary of Energy to publish a final rule that establishes a uniform efficiency descriptor and accompanying test methods for covered water heaters, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 22

At the request of Mr. LEMIEUX, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 22, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to requiring a balanced budget and granting the President of the United States the power of line-item veto.

S.J. RES. 23

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 23, a joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Election Commission with respect to travel on private aircraft by Federal candidates.

S. RES. 316

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 316, a resolution calling upon the President to ensure that the foreign policy of the United States reflects appropriate understanding and sensitivity concerning issues related to human rights, ethnic cleansing, and genocide documented in the United

States record relating to the Armenian Genocide, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 373

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 373, a resolution designating the month of February 2010 as ''National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month''.

S. RES. 381

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 381, a resolution designating the week of February 1 through February 5, 2010, as ''National School Counseling Week''.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 2935. A bill to clarify that the revocation of an alien's visa or other documentation is not subject to judicial review; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2935

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

**SECTION 1. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF VISA REVOCATION.**

Section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)) is amended by striking ''There shall be no means of judicial review'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including section 2241 of title 28, United States Code, any other habeas corpus provision, and sections 1361 and 1651 of such title, a revocation under this subsection may not be reviewed by any court, and no court shall have jurisdiction to hear any claim arising from, or any challenge to, such a revocation.''.

**SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

The amendment made by section 1 shall—

(1) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to all visas issued before, on, or after such date.

---

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) (by request):

S. 2941. A bill to provide supplemental ex gratia compensation to the Republic of the Marshall Islands for impacts of the nuclear testing program of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President. Today, I join the Ranking Member of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Senator MURKOWSKI, in reintroducing, the Republic of the Marshall Islands Supplemental Nuclear Compensation Act at the request of the President of the Marshall Islands, the Honorable Jurelang Zedkaia.

This legislation is identical to legislation introduced by myself and Senators Domenici, AKAKA and MURKOWSKI in 2007 at the request of then-President Kessai Note. The Committee held a hearing on the bill, S. 1756, on September 25, 2007, S. Hrg 110–243, and staff had follow-up discussions with the administration and with other committees which have interests in matters addressed by the bill. However, before the Committee could formally consider an amendment in the nature of a substitute that was developed during these discussions, the government in the Republic of the Marshall Islands, RMP, was replaced and the position of the new government on the substitute amendment was not obtained until it was too late for further action.

The process for reconsideration of this legislation in the 111th Congress will need to be pushed back because there is a new Administration with new officials who will need to be educated on the issues. There are also new members and staff on many of the Committees who will need to be educated on the history and need for this legislation before they can provide their input. Finally, the fiscal position of the U.S. government has weakened since 2007 and funding this legislation will be more challenging today than it would have been when the legislation was last considered.

To begin this process of education on this issue, I offer the following background.

For over 50 years, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources has worked with the government of the RMI to respond to the tragic consequences of the U.S. nuclear weapons tests that were conducted in the islands from 1946 to 1958 when the islands were a district of the U.S.-administered, U.N. Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. In 1986, this Trusteeship ended when the RMI entered into free association with the U.S. pursuant to the Compact of Free Association Act of 1985, (P.L. 99–239). Under Section 177 of the Compact, the U.S. accepted responsibility for damage and injuries resulting from the testing program and the law authorized two basic sources of compensation: 1) a legal settlement of $150 million under Section 177, and 2) additional ex gratia assistance under sections 103, 105, and 224.

The $150 million legal settlement and its Subsidiary Agreement funded a Claims Tribunal to adjudicate and pay awards arising from the test program, regular distribution payments to the affected communities, a supplemental health care program, a radiological and health monitoring program, and it allowed the RMI to request additional compensation if there were ''changed circumstances''—that is, if information and injuries came to light after the settlement was reached which rendered the settlement ''manifestly inadequate.''

The RMI submitted such a ''changed circumstances petition'', CCP, in 2000 in which it sought over $3 billion in addition compensation from Congress. At the Committee's 2005 hearing on the CCP, S. Hrg 109–178, the administration testified in opposition to further financial compensation because the 1985 settlement was ''full and final'' and the CCP was not based on new information or injuries arising after the original settlement date. The Administration and other witnesses also questioned the RMI' s contention that radiation from the tests caused health injuries well beyond the four northern atolls of the Marshall Islands, and questioned the policies and methodologies used by the Tribunal in determining eligibility for compensation and the amount of awards. The Committee took no further action on the CCP. In 2006, facing the statute of limitations, the atolls of Bikini and Enewetak filed suit in the U.S. Court of Claims, but the Court upheld the U.S. motion to dismiss.

In addition to the $150 million legal settlement, several sections of the Compact authorized ex gratia compensation, primarily through the capitalization of trust funds for the rehabilitation and resettlement of contaminated lands in three of the affected atolls (Enewetak, Bikini, and Rongelap), and by providing program assistance through existing Federal programs such as USDA Agricultural and Food programs, the DOE Marshall Islands program, and extension of the Section 177 Health Care Program, also known as the ''4-Atoll Health Care program''. The rough estimate of this additional ex gratia compensation to date totals at least $220 million.

It is important to note that while the administration opposed additional financial compensation based on the CCP, the administration's report noted that some of the RMI's requests for additional program assistance, while not qualifying as changed circumstances, ''might be desirable''.

The legislation being re-introduced today includes four of the RMI's requests for additional program assistance. I agree with President Zedkaia that these requests should be given consideration by the Congress. Briefly, these requests are:

Runit Island monitoring: Between 1977 and 1980, the U.S. conducted a cleanup of some of the contaminated areas of Enewetak Atoll where 43 tests were conducted. Some of the contaminated soil and debris was removed to Runit Island, mixed with concrete, and placed in Cactus crater that had been formed by one of the tests. Under the Compact settlement, the RMI accepted responsibility for, and control over the utilization of lands in the Marshall Islands affected by the testing. The Compact Act (P.L. 99–239) also reaffirmed a 1980 authorization, under P.L. 96–205, for the Marshall Islands Program of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE)

which provides medical care and environmental monitoring relating to the testing program. Since then, the people of Enewetak Atoll have from time to time asked DOE to include monitoring of conditions at Runit within their environmental monitoring program in order to assure the people living on other islands in Enewetak Atoll that there is no health risk from the cleanup spoils stored at Runit.

Section 2 of this Act would direct the Secretary of Energy, as a part of the existing program, to periodically survey radiological conditions on Runit and report their findings to the Congress.

Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program, EEOICPA, eligibility: This program was enacted in 2001 to provide compensation for DOE and contractor employees associated with the nation's nuclear weapons program. During Senate debate, I submitted a list of facilities intended to be covered which included ''Marshall Islands Test Sites, but only for the period after December 31, 1958.'' However, the RMI citizens who applied to the program were denied eligibility on the basis that Congress did not intend the law to cover non-U.S. citizens. I believe that this was an incorrect reading of Congressional intent. It is important to recognize that during the testing and cleanup period the Marshall Islands were a District of the U.S.-administered U.N. Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and that the U.S. and its contractors employed workers from the Marshall Islands and from other districts in the Trust Territory.

Section 3 of this act would clarify that former Trust Territory citizens are eligible for the program, and it would coordinate benefits with the Compact of Free Association so that if a person received compensation under the Compact, then that amount would be deducted from any award received under EEOICPA.

4-Atoll Health Care Program funding: Section 177 of the Compact approved the $150 million legal settlement, established the Settlement Trust Fund, and allocated $2 million annually for 15 years to provide supplemental health care to the affected communities: Enewetak, Bikini, Rongelap and Utrik. The 15-year period ended in 2001, and with depletion of the Fund, the $2 million annual payment was terminated in 2003. To continue some level of service under the program, the RMI and the U.S. Congress continued to contribute funds on a discretionary basis until a longer-term solution could be enacted.

Section 4 of the bill would authorize $2 million annually through 2023 for the continuation of this program. I believe that this proposal offers an opportunity to discuss with the RMI and U.S. officials how supplemental healthcare assistance to the RMI can most effectively be used.

National Academy of Sciences Assessment: Underlying the debate between the U.S. and the RMI regarding compensation for injuries resulting from the testing program is a dispute over the extent of the area affected by the testing program. The U.S. believes that the health affects were limited to the four northern atolls of Rongelap, Utrik, Bikini, and Enewetak. However, the RMI and the Claims Tribunal took the position that all of the 1958 residents of the RMI should be eligible for compensation.

Section 5 of the bill is intended to help resolve this dispute by having the National Academy of Sciences conduct an assessment of the health impacts of the testing program.

I look forward to continuing to work with President Zedkaia, my colleagues, and the Administration on these proposals and to continue to respond to the tragic legacy of our nation's nuclear testing program in the Pacific.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2941

*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 ''Republic of the Marshall Islands Supplemental Nuclear Compensation Act of 2010''.

**SEC. 2. CONTINUED MONITORING ON RUNIT ISLAND.**

Section 103(f)(1) of the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003 (48 U.S.C. 1921b(f)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Notwithstanding'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) CONTINUED MONITORING ON RUNIT ISLAND.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Effective beginning January 1, 2010, the Secretary of Energy shall, as a part of the Marshall Islands program conducted under subparagraph (A), periodically (but not less frequently than every 4 years) survey radiological conditions on Runit Island.

''(ii) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, a report that describes the results of each survey conducted under clause (i), including any significant changes in conditions on Runit Island.''.

**SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY UNDER ENERGY EMPLOYEES OCCUPATIONAL ILLNESS COMPENSATION PROGRAM ACT OF 2000.**

(a) DEFINITIONS FOR PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.—Section 3621 of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 7384*l*) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(18) The terms 'covered employee', 'atomic weapons employee', and 'Department of Energy contractor employee' (as defined in paragraphs (1), (3), and (11), respectively) include a citizen of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who is otherwise covered by that paragraph.''.

(b) DEFINITION OF COVERED DOE CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEE.—Section 3671(1) of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 7385s(1)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', including a citizen of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who is otherwise covered by this paragraph''.

(c) COORDINATION OF BENEFITS WITH RESPECT TO THE COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION.—Subtitle E of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 7385s et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 3682 (42 U.S.C. 7385s–11) the following:

**''SEC. 3682a. COORDINATION OF BENEFITS WITH RESPECT TO THE COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION.**

''(a) DEFINITION OF COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION.—In this section, the term 'Compact of Free Association' means—

''(1) the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States of America and the Governments of the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia (48 U.S.C. 1901 note); and

''(2) the Compact of Free Association between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Palau (48 U.S.C. 1931 note).

''(b) COORDINATION.—Subject to subsection (c), an individual who has been awarded compensation under this subtitle, and who has also received compensation benefits under the Compact of Free Association by reason of the same covered illness, shall receive the compensation awarded under this subtitle reduced by the amount of any compensation benefits received under the Compact of Free Association, other than medical benefits and benefits for vocational rehabilitation that the individual received by reason of the covered illness, after deducting the reasonable costs (as determined by the Secretary) of obtaining those benefits under the Compact of Free Association.

''(c) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the application of subsection (b) if the Secretary determines that the administrative costs and burdens of applying subsection (b) to a particular case or class of cases justifies the waiver.''.

**SEC. 4. FOUR ATOLL HEALTH CARE PROGRAM.**

Section 103(h) of the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003 (48 U.S.C. 1921b(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) SUPPLEMENTAL HEALTH CARE FUNDING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to amounts provided under section 211 of the U.S.–RMI Compact (48 U.S.C. 1921 note), the Secretary of the Interior shall annually use the amounts made available under subparagraph (B) to supplement health care in the communities affected by the nuclear testing program of the United States, including capital and operational support of outer island primary healthcare facilities of the Ministry of Health of the Republic of the Marshall Islands in the communities of—

''(i) Enewetak Atoll,

''(ii) Kili (until the resettlement of Bikini);

''(iii) Majetto Island in Kwajalein Atoll (until the resettlement of Rongelap Atoll); and

''(iv) Utrik Atoll.

''(B) FUNDING.—As authorized by section 105(c), there is appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior, out of funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry out this paragraph $2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2028, as adjusted for inflation in accordance with section 218 of the U.S.–FSM Compact and the U.S.–RMI Compact, to remain available until expended.''.

**SEC. 5. ASSESSMENT OF HEALTH CARE NEEDS OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior shall enter into an agreement with the

National Academy of Sciences under which the National Academy of Sciences shall conduct an assessment of the health impacts of the United States nuclear testing program conducted in the Republic of the Marshall Islands on the residents of the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

(b) REPORT.—On completion of the assessment under subsection (a), the National Academy of Sciences shall submit to Congress, the Secretary, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, a report on the results of the assessment.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

---

REPUBLIC OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS,
*November 13, 2009.*

Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN,
*Chairman, Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Dirksen Senate Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN BINGAMAN: I am writing you on behalf of the Marshallese people to renew our mutual efforts to address the continuing consequences of the U.S. Nuclear Testing Program in the Marshall Islands.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank you for your efforts in introducing the ''Republic of the Marshall Islands Supplemental Nuclear Compensation Act of 2007'' formerly known as Senate Bill No. 1756. Your understanding and efforts over the past several years to move these difficult issues forward and address them in a substantive and meaningful manner is most appreciated by my Government and the Marshallese people. In this respect, I strongly believe that the substituted version of S. 1756 constituted real and substantive progress in addressing outstanding nuclear related issues.

Understanding that S. 1756 expired without action at the close of 2008, I would respectfully request that legislation again be introduced in the United States Senate to deal with the enduring consequences of the nuclear testing program in the Marshall Islands.

My Government submitted a Petition to the United States Congress in respect to Article IX of the Section 177 Agreement concerning ''Changed Circumstances'' in September, 2000. While my Government believes that we have firmly established that ''changed circumstances'' exist within the meaning of Article IX, we wish to focus our efforts on coming to a resolution and implementing measures that produce results in addressing the health, safety and damages caused by the nuclear testing program.

Senate Bill No. 1756, in its substituted version, represented the first serious and substantive attempt to deal with the consequences of the nuclear testing program since the Section 177 Agreement went into effect 23 years ago. Therefore, I would like to now discuss some specific measures for inclusion in legislation, which I believe will address outstanding concerns and issues.

1. The provisions contained in Section 4 of the substituted version of S. 1756 that provided the sum of $4.5 million annually plus adjustment for inflation as a continuing appropriation through FY 2023 to address radiogenic illnesses and the nuclear related health care needs of Bikini, Enewetak, Rongelap, Utrik, Ailuk, Mejit, Likiep, Wotho, and Wotje, is acceptable to my Government. We would, however, request that the legislation include provision for the National Academy of Sciences to conduct an assessment of the health impacts of the nuclear testing program on the residents of the RMI. Inclusion of such an assessment, as contained in the original S. 1756 will provide important information on these issues to both governments.

2. We support the addition of persons who were citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for inclusion for eligibility in the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000. There are many Marshallese who worked at Department of Energy sites in the RMI in the same manner as their U.S. citizen co-workers, yet have never received the health care and other benefits of this program.

3. We also support provision in the legislation for the proactive and ongoing monitoring of the integrity of the Runit Dome at Enewetak Atoll. This is an issue that has long been of concern to the people of Enewetak who live, fish and harvest food in the immediate area.

4. Any legislation addressing the consequences of the nuclear testing program would not be complete without consideration of the awards made by the Marshall Islands Nuclear Claims Tribunal. Absent from S. 1756 was any reference to the decisions and awards made by the Tribunal. The administrative and adjudicative processes of the Tribunal over the past 20 years are an important mutually agreed to component of the Section 177 Agreement and its implementation to resolve claims for damage to person and property arising as a result of the nuclear testing program. We cannot simply ignore the Tribunal's work and awards that it has made. The RMI has presented a report on this subject prepared by former United States Attorney General Richard Thornburgh in January, 2003, however, issues and concerns apparently continue. We should move forward and resolve any remaining issues and concerns regarding the Tribunal and its work.

We look forward to working with you and your staff to address the issues I have raised in this letter and to move forward on finally addressing the consequences of the nuclear testing program.

Thank you very much for all of your help.

Sincerely,

JURELANG ZEDKAIA,
*President.*

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

### SENATE RESOLUTION 388—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING UNFAIR AND DISCRIMINATORY MEASURES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN IN FAILING TO APPLY THE ECO-FRIENDLY VEHICLE PURCHASE PROGRAM TO VEHICLES MADE BY UNITED STATES AUTOMAKERS

Ms. STABENOW submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 388

Whereas the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act of 2009 (49 U.S.C. 32901 note) established the CARS Program to jumpstart automobile sales and increase fuel efficiency nationwide by providing incentives to purchase new fuel efficient automobiles;

Whereas on August 25, 2009, a total of 677,842 new vehicles had been purchased through the CARS Program;

Whereas according to the United States Department of Transportation, over 319,000 Japanese made automobiles were purchased through the CARS Program;

Whereas the CARS Program was open to automobiles manufactured in countries other than the United States, the rebate associated with the current and planned extension of the Eco-Friendly Vehicle Purchase Program in Japan does not apply to automobiles made by United States automobile manufacturers; and

Whereas the Senate finds that by maintaining and extending the Eco-Friendly Vehicle Purchase Program, the Government of Japan is engaging in unfair and discriminatory measures contrary to Japan's obligations under the agreements of the World Trade Organization Agreement: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the President should direct the United States Trade Representative to continue to negotiate with the Government of Japan to eliminate the unfair and discriminatory measures relating to Japan's Eco-Friendly Vehicle Purchase Program; and

(2) if the United States Trade Representative is not able to obtain a satisfactory agreement with the Government of Japan, the United States Trade Representative shall initiate consultations under the framework of the World Trade Organization.

### SENATE RESOLUTION 389—COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA CRIMSON TIDE FOR BEING UNANIMOUSLY DECLARED THE 2009 NCAA FOOTBALL BOWL SUBDIVISION NATIONAL CHAMPIONS

Mr. SHELBY (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 389

Whereas on January 7, 2010, The University of Alabama Crimson Tide marched into the historic Rose Bowl and defeated the University of Texas Longhorns 37–21, to win The 2010 Bowl Championship Series (referred to in this preamble as the ''BCS'') National Championship Game;

Whereas the Crimson Tide earned a berth in the 2010 BCS National Championship Game by defeating the then-unbeaten Florida Gators 32-13 in the 2009 Southeastern Conference Championship Game;

Whereas the Crimson Tide finished the 2009 season with a perfect record of 14 victories and 0 losses;

Whereas the Crimson Tide defeated 3 teams ranked in the Associated Press (referred to in this preamble as the ''AP'') Postseason Top 10 Poll and 5 teams ranked in the AP Postseason Top 25 poll;

Whereas the Crimson Tide finished the 2009 season ranked first by all 60 AP voters and all 58 USA Today Coaches' Poll voters;

Whereas the first of 5 victories for the Crimson Tide in the Rose Bowl on January 1, 1926, earned the first football national championship for The University of Alabama and served as one of the first great achievements in the storied winning tradition of the Crimson Tide;

Whereas the 2010 BCS National Championship Game victory was the 32nd bowl victory and, a NCAA record, 57th bowl appearance for the Crimson Tide;

Whereas the Crimson Tide previously won a total of 12 National Championships, winning in 1925, 1926, 1930, 1934, 1941, 1961, 1964, 1965, 1973, 1978, 1979, and 1992;

Whereas Head Coach Nick Saban has led the Crimson Tide back atop the elite of College Football while instilling discipline, character, and integrity in the young men he coaches;

Whereas the leadership and devotion of Crimson Tide Athletics Director Mal Moore to The University of Alabama have been crucial for the National Championship teams for which he has played, coached, and served as Athletic Director;

Whereas Javier Arenas, Terrence Cody, Michael Johnson, Mark Ingram, Rolando McClain, Leigh Tiffin, and Mark Barron earned AP All-America honors for their accomplishments during the 2009 season;

Whereas the 2009 Crimson Tide had a record number of 6 AP First Team All-Americans;

Whereas in 2009, running back Mark Ingram, Jr. won the first Heisman Trophy in the long and accomplished history of the Crimson Tide football program;

Whereas in 2009, Rolando McClain was recognized as the top collegiate linebacker in the Nation with the Butkus Award and the Jack Lambert Award, the first to be awarded to a Crimson Tide player;

Whereas Crimson Tide Defensive Coordinator Kirby Smart was honored as the best Assistant Coach in the Nation in 2009, with the prestigious Broyles Award;

Whereas 13 players on the 2009 Crimson Tide roster had earned their degrees from The University of Alabama before the season began;

Whereas President Robert Witt has been instrumental to the remarkable academic and athletic success that The University of Alabama has experienced since his arrival at the Capstone;

Whereas The University of Alabama is devoted to educating young persons and providing them with the tools to excel throughout their lives;

Whereas the excellence on the field of the Crimson Tide brought pride to The University of Alabama, the Crimson Tide faithful, and the whole of the great State of Alabama: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the Senate—

(1) congratulates The University of Alabama Crimson Tide for being unanimously declared the 2009 NCAA Football Bowl Subdivision National Champions;

(2) recognizes the achievements of the players, coaches, students, and staff whose hard work and dedication helped the Crimson Tide win the National Championship; and

(3) respectfully requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) President of The University of Alabama, Dr. Robert Witt;

(B) Athletic Director of The University of Alabama, Mal Moore; and

(C) Head Coach of The University of Alabama Crimson Tide, Nick Saban.

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3299. Mr. BAUCUS (for Mr. REID) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 45, increasing the statutory limit on the public debt.

SA 3300. Mr. BAUCUS proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3299 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for Mr. REID) to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 45, supra.

SA 3301. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHANNS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. LEMIEUX, Mr. BURR, Mr. ENZI, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNETT, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. CORNYN) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3299 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for Mr. REID) to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 45, supra.

### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 3299.** Mr. BAUCUS (for Mr. REID) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 45, increasing the statutory limit on the public debt; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following: ''That subsection (b) of section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking out the dollar limitation contained in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof $14,294,000,000,000.''.

---

**SA 3300.** Mr. BAUCUS proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3299 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for Mr. REID) to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 45, increasing the statutory limit on the public debt; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

(____) (a) LIMITATION ON CHANGES TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, it shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any bill or resolution pursuant to any expedited procedure to consider the recommendations of a Task Force for Responsible Fiscal Action or other commission that contains recommendations with respect to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program established under title II of the Social Security Act.

(b) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(c) APPEALS.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

---

**SA 3301.** Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHANNS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. LEMIEUX, Mr. BURR, Mr. ENZI, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNETT, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. CORNYN) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3299 proposed by Mr. BAUCUS (for Mr. REID) to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 45, increasing the statutory limit on the public debt; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. ___. REPEAL OF THE TROUBLED ASSET RELIEF PROGRAM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorities provided under section 101(a) of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (excluding section 101(a)(3)) and under section 102 of such Act shall terminate on the date of enactment of this resolution.

(b) LOWERING OF NATIONAL DEBT LIMIT TO CORRESPOND TO TARP REPAYMENTS.—Section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by inserting after the dollar limitation contained in such subsection the following: '', as such amount is reduced by the amount described under subsection (d)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) The amount described under this subsection is the amount that equals the amount of all assistance received under title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 that is repaid on or after the date of enactment of this subsection, along with any dividends, profits, or other funds paid to the Government based on such assistance on or after the date of enactment of this subsection.''.

---

## NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Thursday, January 21, 2010, at 10 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the research, development, priorities and imperatives needed to meet the medium and long term challenges associated with climate change.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510–6150, or by e-mail to rosemarie_calabro@energy.senate.gov

For further information, please contact Jonathan Epstein at (202) 224–3357 or Rosemarie Calabro at (202) 224–5039.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Tuesday, February 2, 2010 at 10 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to consider the nominations of Larry Persily, to be Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects, and Patricia A. Hoffman, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability).

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510–6150, or by e-mail to amanda_kelly@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at (202) 224–7571 or Amanda Kelly at (202) 224–6836.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will be held on Wednesday, February 10, 2010, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of this hearing is to consider the President's Proposed Budget for fiscal year 2011 for the Department of the Interior.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, 304 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510–6150, or by email to allison_seyferth@energy.senate.gov.

For further information, please contact David Brooks at (202) 224–9863 or Allison Seyferth at (202) 224–4905.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a business meeting has been scheduled before Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The business meeting will be held on Thursday, February 11, 2010, at 11:30 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office.

The purpose of the business meeting is to consider pending nominations.

For further information, please contact Sam Fowler at (202) 224–7571 or Amanda Kelly at (202) 224–6836.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The hearing will be held on Thursday, February 4, 2010, at 10 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the U.S. Department of Energy's budget for fiscal year 2011.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record may do so by sending it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510–6150, or by e-mail to rosemarie_calabro@energy.senate.gov

For further information, please contact Jonathan Epstein at (202) 224–3357 or Rosemarie Calabro at (202) 224–5039.

## AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 20, 2010, at 10 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled ''Yemen: Confronting Al-Qaeda, Preventing State Failure.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Hearing on the Nomination of Joshua Gotbaum for Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation'' on January 20, 2010. The hearing will commence at 10 a.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 20, 2010, at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Intelligence Reform: The Lessons and Implications of the Christmas Day Attack.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 20, 2010, at 10 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Securing America's Safety: Improving the Effectiveness of Anti-Terrorism Tools and Inter-Agency Communication.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 20, 2010, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Nominations.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AVIATION OPERATIONS, SAFETY, AND SECURITY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 20, 2010, at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff of mine be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of the debt limit legislation: Aislinn Baker, Ian Clements, Brittany Durell, Ivie English, Zach Person, Greg Sullivan, and Ashley Zuelke.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## NOTICE: REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for 2010 fourth quarter Mass Mailings is Monday, January 25, 2010. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states ''none.''

Mass mailing registrations, or negative reports, should be submitted to the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510–7116.

The Public Records office will be open from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on the filing date to accept these filings. For further information, please contact the Public Records office at (202) 224–0322.

## PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 228 at the desk and just received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 228) providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BAUCUS. I ask unanimous consent the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 228) was agreed to.

## DISCHARGE AND REFERRAL—H.R. 1854

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 1854 be discharged from the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and then be referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2939

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk. I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2939) to amend title 31, United States Code to require an audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes.

Mr. BAUCUS. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

## AUTHORIZATION TO APPOINT ESCORT COMMITTEE

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Presiding Officer of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort the President of the United States to the House Chamber for the joint session to be held at 9 p.m. on Wednesday, January 27, 2010.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 21, 2010

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. Thursday, January 21; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate proceed to a period of morning business for 1 hour equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Republicans controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half; that following morning business the Senate resume consideration of H.J. Res. 45, the debt limit bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PROGRAM

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, there are three amendments pending to the joint resolution. We hope to reach time agreements on those amendments and, therefore, votes are expected tomorrow. Senators will be notified when these votes are scheduled.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:50 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 21, 2010, at 9:30 a.m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

### MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

MICHAEL F. TILLMAN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 13, 2011, VICE JOHN ELLIOTT REYNOLDS, III, TERM EXPIRED.

DARYL J. BONESS, OF MAINE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 13, 2010, VICE PAUL K. DAYTON, TERM EXPIRED.

### NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

EARL F. WEENER, OF OREGON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2010, VICE MARK V. ROSENKER, RESIGNED.

### AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

JEFFREY R. MORELAND, OF TEXAS, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE DAVID MCQUEEN LANEY, TERM EXPIRED.

### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

THEODORE SEDGWICK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SLOVAK REPUBLIC.

### NATIONAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD

ROBERT WEDGEWORTH, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 6, 2013, VICE AMY OWEN, TERM EXPIRED.

### NATIONAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICE BOARD

CARLA D. HAYDEN, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 6, 2014, VICE KEVIN OWEN STARR, TERM EXPIRED.

### NATIONAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD

JOHN COPPOLA, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 6, 2013, VICE GAIL DALY, RESIGNED.

WINSTON TABB, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 6, 2013, VICE BEVERLY ALLEN, TERM EXPIRED.

### NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

CRAIG BECKER, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2014, VICE DENNIS P. WALSH.

### THE JUDICIARY

MILTON C. LEE, JR., OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE JERRY STEWART BYRD, RETIRED.

### FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD

DANA KATHERINE BILYEU, OF NEVADA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 11, 2011, VICE THOMAS A. FINK, TERM EXPIRED.

MICHAEL D. KENNEDY, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 25, 2010, VICE GORDON WHITING, TERM EXPIRED.

MICHAEL D. KENNEDY, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 25, 2014. (REAPPOINTMENT)

### SPECIAL PANEL ON APPEALS

DENNIS P. WALSH, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE SPECIAL PANEL ON APPEALS FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE JOHN L. HOWARD, TERM EXPIRED.

### INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

CYNTHIA CHAVEZ LAMAR, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 19, 2010, VICE ALLEN E. CARRIER.

JOANN LYNN BALZER, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 19, 2012, VICE LETITIA CHAMBERS, TERM EXPIRED.

### THE JUDICIARY

LOUIS B. BUTLER, JR., OF WISCONSIN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN, VICE JOHN C. SHABAZ, RETIRED.

EDWARD MILTON CHEN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE MARTIN J. JENKINS, RESIGNED.

JON E. DEGUILIO, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA, VICE ALLEN SHARP, RETIRED.

AUDREY GOLDSTEIN FLEISSIG, OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, VICE E. RICHARD WEBBER, RETIRED.

LUCY HAERAN KOH, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE RONALD M. WHYTE, RETIRED.

TANYA WALTON PRATT, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA, VICE DAVID F. HAMILTON, ELEVATED.

JANE E. MAGNUS-STINSON, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA, VICE LARRY J. MCKINNEY, RETIRED.

### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LORETTA E. LYNCH, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ROSLYNN R. MAUSKOPF, RESIGNED.

DAVID J. HALE, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE DAVID L. HUBER, RESIGNED.

KERRY B. HARVEY, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE AMUL R. THAPAR, RESIGNED.

R. BOOTH GOODWIN II, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE KARL K. WARNER II.

STEPHANIE A. FINLEY, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE DONALD W. WASHINGTON.

GERVIN KAZUMI MIYAMOTO, OF HAWAII, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE MARK MOKI HANOHANO.

BRIAN TODD UNDERWOOD, OF IDAHO, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE PATRICK E. MCDONALD.

KELLY MCDADE NESBIT, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE PATRICK CARROLL SMITH, SR.

PETER CHRISTOPHER MUNOZ, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JAMES ROBERT DOUGAN.

CHRISTOPHER TOBIAS HOYE, OF NEVADA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE GARY D. ORTON.

### STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

MARSHA J. RABITEAU, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2010, VICE SANDRA A. O'CONNOR, TERM EXPIRED.

HERNÁN D. VERA, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2012, VICE TERRENCE B. ADAMSON, TERM EXPIRED.

### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MARY L. SMITH, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE NATHAN J. HOCHMAN, RESIGNED.

CHRISTOPHER H. SCHROEDER, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE ELISEBETH C. COOK, RESIGNED.

DAWN ELIZABETH JOHNSEN, OF INDIANA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, VICE JACK LANDMAN GOLDSMITH III, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

KATHERINE HAMMACK, OF ARIZONA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, VICE KEITH E. EASTIN.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS DEPUTY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE AIR FORCE AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 8037:

*To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. STEVEN J. LEPPER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 8081:

*To be major general*

COL. GERARD A. CARON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be admiral*

VICE ADM. JAMES A. WINNEFELD, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be commander*

RICHARD K. DOUGHERTY

## CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, Wednesday, January 20, 2010:

THE JUDICIARY

BEVERLY BALDWIN MARTIN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## RECOGNIZING OFFICER GREG GORDON FOR RECEIVING THE GOLD MEDAL OF VALOR

### HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Officer Greg Gordon of the Pensacola Police Department upon receiving the Gold Medal of Valor, the department's highest honor. Officer Gordon is a dedicated public servant, and I am proud to honor his heroism and commitment.

On July 3, 2009, Officer Gordon was en route to police headquarters when he responded to a call regarding a 9-1-1 hang up. Upon arriving at the scene, he saw smoke coming from the house and was told the resident was likely still inside the burning building. When he did not receive a response from the front door, Officer Gordon kicked in the door and crawled under the smoke to find the home's occupant. Officer Gordon pulled the man through the burning house and safely outside. Although Officer Gordon and the resident were treated for injuries, both came out safely.

For this selfless act of heroism, Officer Gordon is being awarded the Pensacola Police Department's highest award, the Gold Medal of Valor. Officer Gordon is only the 10th police officer to receive the medal since the department was formed in 1821. He was first hired as a cadet in 1996 and was promoted to police officer in 1999. A former SWAT member, Officer Gordon is assigned currently to the Uniform Patrol Division. Part of his patrol jurisdiction includes my Pensacola office, and his service to our office has been outstanding.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize Officer Greg Gordon for going above and beyond the call of duty. He is a true American hero and an invaluable member of our community. My wife Vicki and I wish Officer Gordon and his family all the best for the future.

## HONORING THE LIFE OF BEN KATZ

### HON. RODNEY ALEXANDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January, 20, 2010*

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor and remembrance of the life and achievements of Ben Katz, who passed away on January 13, 2010.

Ben was a dedicated public servant, and it is his connection and involvement in his community for which he will always be remembered.

Survived by his wife, Louisiana State Representative Kay Katz, Ben took over where she left off serving Monroe, La. as City Councilman for District 2 since 2000. In this capacity, he was voted by his peers to serve as City Council vice-chairman from 2007 to 2009.

His commitment to the Monroe community did not end here. Among his impressive list of endeavors, Ben was also a member of the I-20 Economic Development District Board, Ouachita Council of Governments and the City of Monroe Insurance Committee.

Ben was an inspiration to all who knew him. I wish to express my deepest condolences to his family, and may God continue to bless the memory of a man who will truly be missed by his family, his friends and his community.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the late Ben Katz.

## TESTIMONY ON DR. JAIRY C. HUNTER'S 25 YEARS OF SERVICE AS PRESIDENT OF CHARLESTON SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

### HON. HENRY E. BROWN, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Jairy C. Hunter, Jr. for 25 years of service as President of Charleston Southern University. Dr. Hunter assumed his role as President in 1984 during a difficult time in the school's history, but through strong leadership and a clear vision, the new President led the school towards academic greatness.

25 years later, Dr. Hunter's guidance produced record enrollment numbers, significant budget growth, and new degree and athletic programs, to name a few of his many accomplishments. Working with her husband, Sissy Hunter's dedication to the school has improved university relationships and made scholarship programs possible. Throughout the years, Dr. Hunter never lost sight of the school's Christian background and has kept faith at the forefront of Charleston Southern University's mission.

Dr. Jairy and Sissy Hunter are respected leaders not only within the Charleston Southern University community, but throughout the city of Charleston. Dr. Hunter, thank you for your dedication to Charleston Southern University and your commitment to academic excellence in South Carolina's First District.

## HONORING THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA ON THEIR 100TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. J. GRESHAM BARRETT

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor the Boy Scouts of America on their 100th anniversary.

The Boy Scouts of America has been at the forefront of instilling timeless values in youth since its founding in 1910. Throughout its 100-year history, it has helped millions of youth succeed by providing the support, friendship, and mentoring necessary to live a happy and fulfilling life.

Today, the Boy Scouts of America is the largest youth service organization in America, with nearly 3 million members. These members learn responsible citizenship, character development, and self-reliance through participation in a wide range of outdoor activities, educational programs and career-oriented programs in partnership with local community groups.

The Boy Scouts have always held a special place in my heart because in 1951, my father started Boy Scout Troup 108—the first Boy Scout organization in Westminster, South Carolina. As a matter of fact, one of the first service projects of this troop was to raise the American Flag over the Westminster Post Office.

On this momentous anniversary, I would like to thank all of the Scouts for their service to their local communities and to our Nation. I would also like to thank their parents for all of the time and energy they have committed to scouting. It is the values of service, character, and leadership—the core values of scouting—that make our country great.

## H. CON. RES. 226, SUPPORTING THE ''SPIRIT OF '45''

### HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of a resolution that I have introduced: H. Con. Res. 226 which supports the Spirit of '45, a yearlong national campaign to raise public awareness of the 65th anniversary of the end of World War II, and the Spirit of '45 Day, to be observed each year on the second Sunday in August.

1945 was a defining year in the last century. Even after victory in Europe in World War II, our nation still faced many hard fought battles in the Pacific and the decision to use the atomic bomb. In August of that year, Japan surrendered, the war was over, and America joined the world to begin the work of peace. The United States started with the job of rebuilding allies and former enemies alike, leading the effort to form the United Nations, and helping millions of returning veterans begin their civilian lives with the G.I. Bill.

To raise awareness about this 65th anniversary, the Spirit of '45 is encouraging communities to hold commemorative events on the Spirit of '45 Day, the second Sunday in August, to honor the legacy of the World War II generation whose members are rapidly passing into history. Everyone is asked to collect first-hand memories of those who experienced August 14, 1945, memories that will be preserved on a Web site and shared with schools,

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

libraries, museums, memorials and the public as a permanent reminder of a time when people came together to face common challenges as a united country. Many of the memories can also be forwarded to the Veterans History Project of the Library of Congress.

The 2010 Spirit of '45 activities will officially kick off at a reunion of World War II veterans on the USS *Midway* in San Diego, on Monday January 18, 2010. Invited to participate are World War II legends Ernest Borgnine, Tony Curtis, Kirk Douglas, and Hugh O'Brien. Also invited is Edith Shain, the nurse who was photographed being kissed by a joyous sailor in Times Square on August 14, 1945. A presentation will be made to the family of Bob Hope in honor of his legacy of support of our men and women in uniform.

The next major event of the Spirit of '45 will be right here in Washington, D.C. when hundreds of people will gather at the National World War II Memorial and lead the Memorial Day Parade down Constitution Avenue. Moving toward the weekend of August 14–15, public events are to be held across the country to commemorate the 65th anniversary of the end of World War II, including a major event already being planned in New York City's Times Square. Later events are being discussed for October, the 65th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, and on Veterans Day in November.

The events will focus on how to assure that our ''latest generation'' of veterans receives the kind of welcome home as did their forefathers of the World War II generation, through education and training under the newly-passed ''Post 9/11 G.I. Bill,'' employment opportunities, and many other ways of helping in their efforts to reconnect with their communities. I urge my colleagues to join in support of these remembrances of the ending of World War II by co-sponsoring H. Con. Res. 226.

## RECOGNIZING CAPTAIN JOSEPH A. IANNITTI—SCOTTSDALE HEALTHCARE'S ''SALUTE TO MILITARY'' HONOREE

### HON. HARRY E. MITCHELL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a member of the Armed Forces from my home state of Arizona. Each month, Scottsdale Healthcare recognizes service members who perform diligent service to this country. Scottsdale Healthcare has recognized Captain Joseph A. Iannitti for the month of January.

I commend Scottsdale Healthcare for paying tribute to such an exceptional service member for his bravery and service to our country.

Captain Joseph A. Iannitti has served in the Army for nine years and is currently the Executive Officer for the 286th Signal Company, 11th Air Defense Artillery Brigade at Fort Bliss, Texas. Next month, he will deploy to Kuwait as a communications officer.

During his service Joseph has received numerous awards. He was awarded two commendation medals, an achievement medal, Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Reserve Mobilization Medal and a Global War on Terrorism Service Medal.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing this courageous service member for his outstanding contributions while serving our country.

## A TRIBUTE TO AARON AND ASHLEY REDING

### HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Aaron and Ashley Reding of Howardstown, Kentucky as the recipients of the 2010 American Farm Bureau Federation's Young Farmers and Ranchers Achievement Award.

On January 11, 2010, the couple was announced as the winners of the Young Farmers & Ranchers (YF&R) Achievement Award at the American Farm Bureau Federation's 91st annual meeting in Seattle, Washington. The Redings had gone on to win this national title after being named the Kentucky Farm Bureau's Outstanding Young Farm Family in December of 2009.

The award recognizes young farmers and ranchers that have excelled with their respective operations and that have demonstrated a sense of commitment to promoting the agriculture industry. This honor is a well-deserved recognition of the rapid growth and financial progress of the Reding family's farm as well as a testament to years of hard work and dedication.

The Reding family operates a large-scale row crop operation and this year they grew 1,500 acres of both corn and soybeans in addition to 450 acres of wheat. Aaron bought two farms in the early 2000s and was later granted ownership of his family's farm in 2003. Ashley has also dedicated her life to agriculture, retiring from teaching to stay home and tend to the human resource and technological aspects of the farm, as well as to raise their three children.

The Redings have assumed a leadership role within their community, promoting not just their farm but the agriculture industry as a whole. They regularly host school tours and county leadership groups and often work with chemical and seed companies in conducting research. Aaron and Ashley have even combined forces with their local press to draft an informative story about GPS and farming.

Among other organizations, both Aaron and Ashley are members of the American Soybean Association. Aaron is president of the Kentucky Soybean Association, a member of the county extension council and is a regional officer for the State Young Farmer Association. He is also currently the vice president and chairman of the policy development committee while Ashley is an active member on the women's committee.

I want to thank Aaron and Ashley, along with their children, for serving as a role model for all Kentucky families, especially those within the rapidly changing farming industry. I hope their success continues for many years to come.

## PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE 1270 FIFTH AVENUE RESIDENTS AS THEIR COOPERATIVE MARKS ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, this year marks the 50th Anniversary of the 1270 Fifth Avenue Cooperative in my Congressional District. 1270 has the distinction of being the first middle-income co-op in my and surrounding Congressional Districts and the only residential co-op in Manhattan that is a cooperative nonprofit corporation.

Incorporated on August 8, 1957, under the New York State Cooperative Corporations Law, the building was constructed with a stream of funding from Section 213 of Title II of the National Housing Act. The $4.5 million dollar mortgage held by the Federal Housing Administration has since matured in November of 1999.

Despite the neighborhood's initial negative reaction to 1270s construction, there was a tremendous demand for the apartments. At a time when segregated housing in Manhattan was still the norm, 1270, which was unrestricted regardless of race, gender, or creed, and priced for middle-income residents, was seen by minorities and liberal-minded folks as a desirable place to live. By November 1959 when the building first opened for occupancy, 194 of the 201 available units had been sold. The remaining seven apartments were sold and occupied by July 1961.

Making history for 1270 had its difficult moments. A board of directors was quickly elected in order to tackle problems as they surfaced. Throughout the years of struggle to establish and maintain a viable middle-income cooperative in East Harlem, the families and individuals at 1270 held together through a tremendous sense of home and community. Men and women who arrived as young adults lived and raised their children, and grew old here. Neighbors became lifelong friends and took care of each other.

There is no better measure of 1270's success than the fact that people who move there, stay there. Of the 201 shareholders, 69 percent have been there for more than 10 years; 44 percent for more than 20 years; 35 percent for more than 30 years; and 17 percent for more than 40 years. The average length of residency is 21.6 years.

1270 was and continues to be called home by multiple celebrities and other notables, including: Odetta, internationally celebrated folk singer; James Dumpson, former commissioner of the New York City Department of Health and Welfare; Elaine Jones, former executive director of the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund; Verne Oliver, former headmaster of New Lincoln School; Debbie Allen, television and stage actress; Phylicia Rashad, television and stage actress; Charles Henry Alston, internationally acclaimed artist; Ruth Slenczynska, internationally acclaimed concert pianist; Gus Trowbridge, founder of Manhattan Country School; Lois Small, founder of senior dance group, ''The Steppers''; the family of Ralph Bunche, Nobel Peace Prize Laureate; the family of Harry Belafonte, singer; and the family of Johnny Mathis, singer.

1270 has not only survived, but it has thrived through the years. Current neighborhood beautification projects have magnificently transformed the setting of the building's home. 1270 faces the Harlem Meer section of New York City's Central Park and the Conservatory Gardens, which have been restored and maintained with an endowment. The on-site Museum of African Art adds a part of the building to New York's Museum Mile. Sightseeing buses now regularly stop in the neighborhood for tours.

Madam Speaker, on the occasion of 1270's 50th anniversary, as we look back on the successes of the National Housing Act, we can all feel a sense of pride. For many long-time residents, the soul of this section 213 building can never be separated from its historic roots.

## HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

SPEECH OF

### HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 19, 2010*

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1008, to honor the contributions of Catholic schools and recognize Catholic Schools Week 2010.

Catholic schools have played an important role in the American education system. Catholic schools across our country have an excellent reputation for providing a strong academic and moral education, as well as teaching social responsibility, to the more than 2 million American students currently enrolled in Catholic schools.

The Catholic schools in my district work hard to create an environment where academic excellence and value driven pride can be fostered and embraced.

Catholic schools produce students strongly dedicated to their faith, values, families, and communities by providing an intellectually stimulating environment rich in spiritual, character and moral development.

My wife, Laurie, and I as well as our two sons, Ken and B.J., attended Northern Michigan's Catholic schools and realize the benefits of the Catholic education system.

The week of January 31 through February 6, 2010, has been designated as Catholic Schools Week by the Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

This week let us pause, reflect and congratulate administrators, faculty, staff, students and parents as we celebrate the dedicated tradition of promoting education through our Catholic faith.

Catholic schools remain possible because Catholics come together through their parishes and dioceses to make a financial commitment to see this strong tradition continue.

H. Res. 1008 acknowledges the hard work and dedication that Catholic schools have contributed to building our local communities and our nation.

I am proud to co-sponsor H. Res. 1008 and support the many Catholic schools in my district and across our nation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

## OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

### HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Madam Speaker, today our national debt is $12,319,326,469,724.43.

On January 6th, 2009, the start of the 111th Congress, the national debt was $10,638,425,746,293.80.

This means the national debt has increased by $1,680,900,723,430.63 so far this Congress.

This debt and its interest payments we are passing to our children and all future Americans.

## IN RECOGNITION OF REELTOWN HIGH SCHOOL WINNING THE ALABAMA 2A STATE FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

### HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I would like to request the House's attention today to pay recognition to the Reeltown High School football team in Notasulga, Alabama, which recently won the 2009 Alabama 2A State Football Championship.

On December 4th, the Reeltown Rebels defeated Clay County High School by a score of 16–8 at Bryant-Denny Stadium in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. The Rebels finished the season with a record of 14–1.

The Reeltown Rebels are coached by Jackie O'Neal, and the school's principal is Tom Cochran. I'd like to congratulate the football team, coaches and high school students and staff on this outstanding achievement. All of us across Tallapoosa County and East Alabama are deeply proud of these talented young Alabamians.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. J. GRESHAM BARRETT

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, I missed the following recorded votes on the House floor on Tuesday, January 19, 2010.

Had I been present I would have voted "Aye" on Rollcall vote No. 6 (on motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 1004), "Aye" on Rollcall vote No. 7 (on motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 1015), "Aye" on Rollcall vote No. 8 (on motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 991).

## A TRIBUTE TO AN AMERICAN HERO

### HON. GEOFF DAVIS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Army SPC Bryan C. Florence of Louisville, Kentucky, who nearly lost his life on September 2, 2007 during an IED explosion in Baghdad. Specialist Florence is a true American hero and an exceptional Kentuckian who inspires us all with his strength and sacrifice. I ask that a poem penned by Albert Caswell in honor of Specialist Florence and his family be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

BRYAN'S SONG

Bryan's Song . . .
Bryan's heart, beating loud! Beating long! Beating strong!
A hero's heart, which to him now so belongs!
Army Tough! Army Strong!
To him, that heart of a hero which so beats on . . .
Belongs, to such a fine young man . . .
Kentucky Strong . . . Bryan's Life . . . Bryan's Song . . .
A Thoroughbred . . .
Finishing first, across that finish line of life . . . let it now be said!
An Army man, who so proudly wears the uniform . . . who so can!
All for God and Country, and Family, he went off to war . . .
Into that the darkest face of death, but were his great burdens bore . . .
Leaving all that he so loved . . .
Ready to die if necessary, is that but not true love . . . and Heaven is for?
All for us, while into the face of death he left!
When, on battlefields of honor seen . . .
Dashing there so in uniform, such a heroic figure convened . . .
As the hand of death would so intervene . . .
Reaching down, beckoning him . . .
With one leg gone, somehow he held on . . .
All for his fine wife, and future child to be born . . .
As he now must move on, as we so see his courage full . . . courage strong . . .
Within his heart beating so loud, beating strong . . .
Listen and learn, from this sonnet . . . his Bryan's Song . . .
A song of full hope and courage . . . who would not be discouraged . . .
The words, of a hero . . . all of our souls words has nourished . . .
As day by day, while all of that pain and heartache comes his way . . .
As we so glean, what it so takes . . . to be a fine human being . . .
As against all odds, in life and death's . . . in all his heartbreak left . . .
In death and war . . . he writes his score . . .
To rebuild . . . to so instill . . . trusting In God's Will!
As his fine heart will not dismay . . .
As he so shows us all the way still . . .
A Florence of Arabia . . .
Who went off to the Mideast . . .
All on his most valiant crusade, to fight for peace . . .
What, words in our lives have we so written?
Heard all here in our living!
And, if I ever have a son . . . I but hope and pray!
What songs have we so sung as to this our world so given?
He could but be like this one, this day . . .
As Bryan's sung!

## TRIBUTE TO DARRELL CORTEZ

### HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor Darrell Cortez, a 30-year veteran of the San José Police Department on the occasion of his retirement.

Darrell Cortez began his tenure with the SJPD shortly after receiving his degree in Administration of Justice from San José State University in 1978. In his capacity as a Peace Officer, Darrell has worked the Field Training Officer Unit, Narcotics Covert Investigations Unit, and Drug Enforcement Administration Task Force. Darrell also served on the Sexual Assaults Unit, Sexual Assault Felony Enforcement, SAFE, the Red Car Rapist Task Force, and the School Liaison Unit, and was additionally assigned to State Bureau of Narcotics Enforcement.

Officer Cortez's commitment to serve and protect has remained constant throughout his career. Just last week he responded to a call regarding an apparent suicide. With days left before his retirement, Darrell came upon a woman who had stopped breathing as the result of the suicide attempt. Despite her initial unresponsiveness, Darrell was able to resuscitate the woman, saving her life.

In addition to his official duties, Darrell volunteers for a better world.

Darrell Cortez is the California State Chapter president of the National Latino Peace Officers' Association having served this organization, both in the founding Santa Clara County Chapter and Statewide, in several capacities on the executive board. Either under his leadership or with his involvement, the NLPOA has raised more than $100,000 to fund their scholarship program. These funds support not only undergraduate students but also graduate students seeking an advanced degree in professional schools. Scholarship recipients have gone on to serve this nation in many capacities. In fact, a member of my staff is a grateful past beneficiary of one such scholarship.

When Darrell was assigned to the Community Services Division of the San José Police Department, he took this opportunity to not only protect and serve the residents of San José, but to protect and serve their future by working closely with youth in local schools. Of particular focus were the children of Horace Mann Elementary School. He had, all too often, seen acts of violence or threats in the schools.

Darrell feels strongly that if some kind of positive intervention is made at an early age during the lives of these children, then they would be able to contribute to the future of our society.

Darrell Cortez's efforts to bridge the divide between law enforcement and communities of color were a natural result of profound pride in both his Mexican heritage and in being a peace officer. He always strives to be the best in both his work and his community service.

In recognition of his good work, Darrell Cortez has received numerous commendations and resolutions. But perhaps most importantly, he has earned the respect and high regard of a grateful community.

Great acts of service often require great sources of inspiration. Fortunately for Silicon Valley, Darrell finds such inspiration in his family. His father, Tomás Cortez, served this Country honorably in the U.S. Armed Forces during World War II. Darrell's mother, the late Aurelia Quihuis Cortez, is remembered by Darrell as a steadfast matriarch and one of the original "Rosie the Riveters."

Darrell is devoted to his wife of almost 30 years, Alicia Cortez, and is the proud father of Ricardo, Emilio, and Lorena.

It is a great honor to thank Officer Darrell Cortez for his service and congratulate him as he begins this new and well deserved chapter in his life. I am proud to call him friend.

## HONORING THE 3RD BRIGADE COMBAT TEAM

### HON. WILLIAM L. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay homage to the soldiers, family members, friends, USO supporters and the entire North Country community as they welcome home the 3rd Brigade Combat Team. Tomorrow the Spartans will celebrate their homecoming among those who tirelessly supported them while in Afghanistan. It is that greater community that I tribute today.

No effort by our service men and women is conducted in a vacuum; behind every soldier departing U.S. soil stands a dedicated team of family, friends and civilian volunteers who tirelessly work behind the scenes. Their efforts are seldom recognized for what they really are—absolutely vital to the achievements of soldiers in harm's way and essential to ensure a smooth transition when they return home.

The community surrounding Fort Drum has shown an amazing capacity to support our soldiers in every possible way. From providing shipments of care packages to volunteering at USO events and the support of the Fort Drum Regional Liaison Organization, the North Country has provided outstanding assistance to the 3rd BCT.

One particular event that wouldn't have happened without the community's support is the "Spartan Spectacular." This celebration of the brigade has been driven by the USO, and funded by generous donations from devotees of the 10th Mountain Division like Mr. Alfred Weissman. To Mr. Weissman, the soldiers and families of the 3rd Brigade Combat Team, and the greater Fort Drum community, I express my sincere thank you for all you do in support of the defense of our country.

## RECOGNIZING THE GENEROSITY OF DR. VICTOR GUZMAN

### HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Victor Guzman, whose great generosity in creating a scholarship fund for the Palm Beach Community College Foundation will increase access to higher education for young people in the Belle Glade community.

Dr. Guzman was motivated to establish the Lake Okeechobee Muck Rat Nation Scholarship Fund after reading an article last year in the Palm Beach Post. The article reported on the low graduation rates among black males in Belle Glade and detailed the low wages, high incarceration rates, insufficient job prospects, and lack of hope felt by so many young black men in the western Palm Beach County community. Living in the Glades for almost 60 years, Dr. Guzman realized that there were too many young people who did not have the economic means to go to school.

The Lake Okeechobee Muck Rat Nation Scholarship Fund, named after those people who make their living working in the fields within the Everglades Agricultural Area, will enable more Belle Glade students to enroll in Palm Beach Community College. Dr. Guzman donated $100,000, most of his life savings, to establish the fund. Two $500 scholarships will be available for students who are accepted by the school, enrolled for at least 12 credits per term, live in Palm Beach County, attend the Belle Glade campus, and demonstrate financial need.

Education has always been a priority for Dr. Victor Guzman, a 95-year-old retired agricultural research scientist who worked for the University of Florida. A native of Peru, the University of Florida hired him in 1951 to help improve local farmers' crop production. He spent his career developing chemicals for weed control as well as virus-resistant strains of lettuce that thrive in the rich, organic soil surrounding Lake Okeechobee. These contributions have benefited the health and nutrition of the people in his community and around the world.

Madam Speaker, Dr. Victor Guzman is an excellent role model for us all. He has invested in the future of his community by making higher education accessible to more young people. Generations of students in the Glades area will be forever indebted to him for his compassion and concern.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, on January 19, 2010, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to record my vote for rollcall No. 6. Had I been present I would have voted:

Rollcall No. 6: "yes"—Congratulating the Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine for its 150 years of commitment to advancing science and improving health.

## HONORING CORPORAL CHRISTOPHER MILITO

### HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor one of the finest people I have ever known, Christopher Milito.

Cpl. Milito was tragically taken from us on January 16, 2010. He died in the line of duty protecting civilians as a member of the Delaware River Port Authority Police Department.

He joined the department on January 31, 1994, and quickly became one of its most popular and respected officers.

Christopher grew up in my neighborhood, the Overbrook section of Philadelphia. I've known him and his family for years. He was that rare person that everyone loved. He never had a bad thing to say about anyone. He was kind, unselfish, and had a heart as big as all outdoors. He loved his community, he loved his country, and he loved being a police officer. But more than anything, he loved his family.

Cpl. Milito never took anything for granted and always gave his best at whatever he was doing. Over the course of his career, he received 28 letters of commendation, most notably for his participation in crime prevention presentations to youth. Cpl. Milito wasn't satisfied with only doing a great job; he also pushed to educate himself. A 1988 graduate of Lamberton High School, he attended Community College of Philadelphia and earned a certificate in police training from Camden County College in 1994.

He attended Temple University at night to earn his Bachelor's Degree in criminal justice. And, he was just a few hours away from earning his Master's Degree in criminal justice at West Chester University when he was so tragically taken from us.

Madam Speaker, I know that my colleagues will join me in expressing our deepest condolences to his family, as well as thanking them for letting him brighten all of our lives.

## HONORING RICHARD E. LINDNER

### HON. JEAN SCHMIDT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Madam Speaker, I rise to the honor the life of Richard E. Lindner—a Cincinnati business and philanthropic icon. The youngest son of Carl H. Lindner Sr. and Clara Ann Serrer, Richard was born on September 14, 1921 in Dayton, Ohio.

Growing up during the Depression, Richard learned the value of hard work. Together the Lindner Family created a successful chain of dairy stores. They opened their first United Dairy Farmers in 1940. Richard's first job was hauling milk from the surrounding country farms to the family dairy.

Richard left the family business to serve his country in World War II as a Navy noncommissioned officer in the Pacific Theater, where he was decorated for his service to his country.

He married Helen Victoria Gill of Lynn, Massachusetts in 1942. Together they had one son, Richard Jr., and three daughters, Charlene, Suzanne, and Carol.

In 1959, the Lindner family purchased Thriftway, a four-store grocery chain. Richard became Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of Thriftway Inc. Before selling the company in 1995, Thriftway had become the second-largest privately owned company in the Greater Cincinnati region.

Richard Lindner had an untiring passion for the people of Cincinnati. He is fondly remembered for his generosity, charity and for his amazing business acumen. His charitable giving is most notable around the University of Cincinnati, but the list of those that benefited from his generosity reached nearly every corner of our community.

Madam Speaker, Cincinnati will dearly miss Richard Lindner. Fortunately, his legacy will live on through his children and grandchildren and the many institutions he endowed.

Please join me in sending condolences to his family.

## HONORING PAUL BALES

### HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a newspaper legend in my district and recognize his lifelong commitment to one of the greatest communities in the Nation.

Paul Bales recently retired as advertising major accounts executive at The Daily Times in Maryville, Tennessee. For the last 125 years, the people of Maryville and Blount County have turned to The Daily Times for news coverage that focuses on their community. Paul has been a part of this tradition for more than 50 years.

He began at The Daily Times as a paper carrier in the early 1950s, and through his determination, hard work, and devotion, he quickly rose through the ranks. Despite his challenging work, Paul devoted many hours to charity, including the Empty Pantry Fund which he headed. The Daily Times Publisher Max Croster said, ''He's probably the most wonderful person I've ever known.''

Madam Speaker, I urge my Colleagues and other readers of the RECORD to join me in congratulating Paul Bales on his retirement and contributions to The Daily Times and Blount County, Tennessee, community. I see no better way to honor Paul than to bring attention to a tribute that appeared in the The Daily Times on December 13, 2009, which is reprinted below.

BALES TO RETIRE

(By Linda Braden Albert)

Paul Bales, advertising major accounts executive at The Daily Times, has announced that he will retire from the newspaper as of Dec. 31. His duties will then be assumed by Quentin Anthony, who has been with the advertising department for more than 30 years.

Bales will continue to fill the role of Empty Pantry Fund chairman, however, and plans to stay actively involved in other community projects.

Bales began his career at The Daily Times as a paper carrier in the early 1950s when he was a high school student. Even at that young age, the irrepressible Bales showed his work ethic and expertise in sales.

''I started out with 17 customers on my route, and the circulation manager told me he wanted it to grow,'' Bales recalled recently at his office. ''In no time flat, I had 73 customers. I did. I poured it on.''

SEVERAL JOBS

Soon afterward, Bales was told the newspaper wanted to hire someone to roll papers, do general tasks and ''plate the press,'' which involved attaching 30- to 35-pound plates to the press and clamping them down so they wouldn't come off during the printing process. The circulation manager asked Bales to come in and give it a try.

''At that time, I only weighed about 137 pounds, and I couldn't hardly pick it up much less clamp it down on the press,'' Bales said. ''I started walking out. If I couldn't do what they wanted me to do, they wouldn't hire me, of course. And he said, 'They told me to hire you regardless of what you could do or couldn't do,' because of all those customers I got, and it was a kind of a reward for that.''

Bales might not have been able to plate the press, but he could do other jobs at the newspaper, and did, at the same time attending high school and working several other jobs. His schedule was school from 8:30 to 11 a.m., newspaper from 12 to 5 p.m., Luke's Pool Room from 6 to 12 p.m., bagging groceries on Sundays at a local corner store, and selling concessions at University of Tennessee ball games during home games.

LIKES TO DRAW

Bales said he wanted to be a cartoonist, and when he saw an advertisement for an art course through Art Instruction of Minnesota, he saved his money and paid the $175 to take the mail-in cartoonist course. He was still in high school at that time.

''I could draw the bottom of characters real good, but I could never get the head in perspective the way it ought to be,'' he said. ''There was another course in there in advertising, so I took that course.''

When he graduated from that course, the publisher of The Daily Times asked Bales to create an advertisement using several components he would be given.

''I did that and he looked at me and said 'Congratulations. You are now a member of the advertising department,' '' Bales said.

He has been in the advertising department ever since.

COMPASSION FOR OTHERS

Bales is well-known for his compassion for others. His parents, Fred and Gladys Bales, inspired him, but he always looked to his Grandmother Bales as the example he wanted to follow.

''She lived in Bales 'Holler' in Friendsville, and she was always, always, doing things for people,'' Bales said. ''She had no money but she could do things for other people. She had a heart of gold.''

At Christmastime, she would barter chickens and eggs for apples, oranges and nuts from the ''rolling store,'' which brought supplies to the neighborhood, and give them to Bales and his siblings for Christmas.

''To make sure we were all divided equally, she would give us for each year of our age that number of walnuts, and apples and oranges,'' Bales recalled. ''We always looked forward to that, and she also had orange slices. That was our Christmas.''

Bales started his community service at the age of 6. He lived in the Alnwick community of Blount County and would take his dog to visit the residents of the Blount County Poor Farm, where William Blount High School stands today.

''I've always had compassion for other people,'' Bales said. ''I wanted them to be able to pet the dog but I also wanted little knick-knacks for them. I'd pick strawberries at this man's farm, and what little I got paid, I'd take to the little store there at Alnwick and buy cookies and take them over there to the Poor Farm. They really loved that.''

Unfortunately, the strawberry picking didn't last too long. The farmer told Bales he was eating more than he was picking and let him go.

MARYVILLE/ALCOA JAYCEES

A turning point in Bales' life came when he was invited to attend a meeting of the Maryville/Alcoa Jaycees by one of the members.

''I told him that I didn't want to join anything,'' Bales said. ''Then I asked him a

question, and I'm glad I did—I asked him, 'What do the Jaycees do?' He said, 'Well, they help people.' ''

That convinced Bales to attend a meeting, and he was soon taken under the wings of the older men. They watched over Bales and encouraged him.

''They gave me an application to fill out, and all of a sudden I was chairman of the Empty Pantry Fund,'' Bales said with a laugh. ''That was in 1954. I think they found out they had a turkey to take over that project, and I was the one! Those were a bunch of good, nice businesspeople that I needed.''

COMMUNITY SERVICE

Max Crotser, publisher of The Daily Times, said words can't explain Paul Bales.

He's probably the most wonderful person I've ever known,'' Crotser said, then related a story that happened several years ago in the dead of winter. ''Paul and I were in the car going someplace and saw a man walking down the road with no coat. He was cold, and Paul stopped and bought him a warm coat. He went back and gave the man the coat, and the man went on his way. But that's Paul. He would do anything for a person in need.''

Crotser attributes the wide community support for the Empty Pantry Fund to Bales.

''Because of the trust people have in Paul Bales, the Empty Pantry Fund is one of the most successful charities around,'' he said.

Daily Times Editor Dean Stone has known Bales for a long time: Stone has been with The Daily Times for 62 years and Bales for about 55, he said. Stone also mentioned how valuable Bales has been to the Empty Pantry Fund, which began as a project of the Maryville/Alcoa Jaycees and The Daily Times in 1952.

''We went from that first year having about 120 homes, and now we have over 1,400 a year,'' Stone said via telephone from his room at Blount Memorial Hospital, where he is recovering from surgery.

He said Bales' reputation is not limited to Blount County. A Louisiana couple has supported the project for several years, and this year, an anonymous donation from a visitor from California was made to the Empty Pantry Fund.

''He said he had been around town and asked everybody he saw what was the best, most worthwhile charity he could give to, and every answer he got was 'Empty Pantry Fund' '' Stone said.

'PURE DETERMINATION'

Larry Aldridge, executive editor at The Daily Times, said he is most impressed with Bales' dedication to the community.

''Since I've been here he's probably been responsible for more community service projects in Blount County than anyone I know,'' Aldridge said. ''I worked with him on several projects, including the new Blount County Library. I have always admired his pure determination to find a way whenever there's a need.''

Evelyn Sandlin, advertising director, said she had heard of Bales throughout her career and was pleased to work with someone of his experience and dedication.

''It will be sad and exciting, and I will be calling him,'' she said of Bales' retirement. ''We'll all miss him, not just for his work, but his fun.''

Crotser described Bales as a great guy and a great employee.

''There are very few people in this world like Paul Bales,'' he said. ''I have the utmost respect for him and wish him all the best in his retirement. We're going to miss him, but we won't let him go away.''

Bales is planning to spend time traveling with his wife, Anita, and visiting his son and daughter-in-law, Brian and Bridget Bales, who now live in Scottsdale, Ariz., with their daughters, Brooke and Brittany. Bales will continue to be involved in community projects, especially the Empty Pantry Fund.

''I've always been involved knee-deep and overhead in doing for others and I'll continue that forever,'' Bales said. ''There are always people to be helped, and I want to be right in the middle of it.''

## JEWISH CEMETERY IN IOANNINA

### HON. SHELLEY BERKLEY

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call my colleagues' attention to some extraordinary news from Ioannina, Greece. Last month, a group of citizens called the Citizens Initiative for the Defense of the Jewish Cemetery of Ioannina held a public rally against anti-Semitism, bringing Jews and Christians together to combat racism and hatred.

The Jewish cemetery of Ioannina, which was vandalized four times in 2009, is a cultural monument of one of the oldest Jewish communities in the world—dating back almost 3,000 years to the time of the Babylonian exile. The Jewish community of Ioannina believes the cemetery vandals are members of a neo-Nazi group.

Therefore, the Citizens Initiative came together—Jews and Christians alike—to create ''a human chain against racism'' surrounding the cemetery, showing support for the Jewish community and demonstrating their outrage at the recent desecrations. Additionally, a public exhibition highlighted the historic Jewish community there and the cemetery's significance in that history.

Madam Speaker, I applaud the good citizens of Ioannina who organized and participated in this remarkable event. I hope their good will and unity will compel the political leaders of Ioannina to act against the vandals in their city. This kind of citizen action should also serve as a beacon to people everywhere who seek to put an end to racism and anti-Semitism: it proves Margaret Mead's theory yet again that ''a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has.''

## HONORING THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI DURING ITS 206TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the first Black republic in the New World, as it celebrates its 206th anniversary as a nation, and for serving as an inspiration to all who support democracy.

On January 1, 1804, General Jean-Jacques Dessalines, leader of the Haitian Revolution and the first ruler of an independent Haiti (Ayiti), declared Haiti's independence after years of war against the French colonizers. This historical rebellion, in which an army of former slaves defeated one of the world's greatest powers, was the only successful slave revolt in the New World and a clear example of the human race's universal thirst for freedom.

Haiti's legacy of courage and triumph over oppression led indirectly to America's western expansion. The defeat of the French Napoleon Army by the Haitians, albeit indirectly, helped America expand its territories towards the West with the Louisiana Purchase. The loss of its most profitable colony forced France to sell others, including what was then called Louisiana, which represents around 23 percent of United States territory today.

As we take this time to honor the second free nation in the history of the Western Hemisphere, second only to the United States, let us recommit our friendship and support to the people of Haiti as it moves toward economic and political stability. Although problems remain, Haiti is on target to recapture its legacy of resilience and valor. It is this same valor that was used when supporting the United States with additional troops during the American Revolution and we thank them for their support and sacrifice.

This past year, Haiti has received unprecedented diplomatic attention which has resulted in political stability, economic growth, greater access to education, and success in the fight against the AIDS/HIV epidemic in the country. These reports bring a sense of pride to all those who know Haiti's history and its significance to all freedom-loving people.

We call to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding direction of President René Préval and Haiti's diplomatic representatives, Ambassador Raymond Joseph and Consul General Felix Augustin. I thank them for their leadership and service to the country of Haiti, even during the most challenging of times. They are champions of democracy, and I salute them for their dedication to fulfilling Haiti's legacy. I would also like to recognize former President Bill Clinton in his capacity as United Nations special envoy to Haiti, for rallying new international and corporate support.

Madam Speaker, I invite you and our colleagues in joining me to celebrate Haiti's independence and committing ourselves to supporting them in the future.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, on January 19, 2010, I missed rollcall votes Nos. 6, 7, and 8.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall votes No. 6, congratulating the Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine for its 150 years of commitment to advancing science and improving health, No. 7, congratulating the Penn State women's volleyball team on winning the 2009 NCAA Division I national championship, and No. 8, commending the University of Virginia men's soccer team for winning the 2009 Division I NCAA National Championship.

## HONORING THE LIFE AND WORK OF REV. SAMUEL WESLEY DIXON, JR.

### HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rev. Samuel Wesley Dixon, Jr., who died tragically last week while on a humanitarian mission in Haiti. Reverend Dixon was deeply dedicated to improving the lives of the people in the greatest need of assistance, and I am proud to honor his lifetime of commitment and service.

Reverend Dixon grew up in North Carolina, the son of Samuel Wesley Dixon, Sr., and Mildred Dixon. He graduated from Statesville High and attended college at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He earned a doctoral degree in ministry from the Chicago Theological Seminary.

He began his ministry in 1975, serving as pastor of rural, urban, and small town congregations, including churches in Sneads Ferry, Durham, Swepsonville and Swansboro. In 1996, Rev. Dixon became pastor of the First United Methodist Church of Roanoke Rapids.

In 1998, he joined the staff of United Methodist Committee on Relief (UMCOR), a prominent disaster relief and assistance agency which assists people around the globe. He assumed leadership of the organization in 2007.

Writing in New World Outlook, Global Ministries' mission magazine, he described UMCOR as serving ''God's creation on behalf of The United Methodist Church'' and ''providing help and hope to people in serious situations.'' The work, he said, ''hearts and hands with others in building a sustainable future for an amazing multitude of people.''

Reverend Dixon and two colleagues were at the Hotel Montana to work with other agencies in developing plans for improving health services in Haiti, the poorest country in the western hemisphere. The three were trapped in the rubble of the hotel following the earthquake. Reverend Clint Rabb and Reverend James Gulley were rescued, but Reverend Rabb later died from his injuries. Reverend Gulley survived and was able to return to his home in Denver.

Reverend Dixon and his wife, Cindy, are the parents of four grown children and grandparents of two children. His mother and three sisters also survive him.

Reverend Dixon was a gifted minister who was known for his selflessness and commitment to ensuring love and care for the sick, hungry and poor around the world. He died doing what he loved, and he will be greatly missed by many people.

Madam Speaker, Reverend Dixon was a tireless and inspirational servant of God, and I ask that you join me in offering our prayers and deepest condolences to the community and his wife and family during these difficult times.

## HONORING MR. JAMES REGINALD LEWIS, JR.

### HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. James Reginald Lewis, Jr., a U.S. Navy Veteran of World War II.

Born in Clifton Forge, VA, Mr. Lewis served on the U.S.S. *Canfield* in the Pacific theatre. During his service, Mr. Lewis suffered injuries as a result of a bombing on the U.S.S. *Canfield*.

After returning from war, he graduated from Benjamin Franklin University in Washington, DC where he worked for an accounting firm.

In 1949, Mr. Lewis suffered a brain hemorrhage related to his injuries from World War II and became paralyzed. Even with his handicap he lived a full life and raised seven children. He was active in Holy Family Parish in Washington, DC and the Knights of Columbus. Mr. Lewis moved to Morehead City with his family in 1981, where he continued an active life with St. Egbert's Parish and Knights of Columbus Operation Lamb.

In reading of Mr. Lewis' life, he was a truly inspirational man, who even during the last few years when he was confined to a wheelchair, was always cheerful and friendly. Mr. Lewis possessed courage and a strong character that inspired many in Eastern North Carolina.

He died on December 23, 2009 at the age of 84. He is survived by his loving wife, Mrs. Jean Davis Lewis, six children, twelve grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

Mr. Lewis will be missed every day; however, the bravery and strength he showed during his service to the U.S. Navy and afterwards will forever be remembered.

## RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF MAJOR WILLIAM W. MA, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

### HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. MURTHA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding officer who will shortly be leaving active duty. Major William W. Ma will be retiring from the United States Marine Corps on March 31, 2010, after more than 21 years of active military service, culminating as Director, Marine Corps Appropriations Matters in the Secretary of the Navy's Appropriations Matters office.

Major Ma enlisted in the Marine Corps in 1988 and in 1993 was accepted into the Marine Corps Enlisted Commissioning and Education Program. In 1996 he graduated Summa Cum Laude from the University of Arizona and received his commission in the Marine Corps. Throughout his career Major Ma has held numerous high level financial management, leadership and staff positions, including tours with the Force Service Support Group at Camp Pendleton, California; Company Commander Headquarters Support Battalion at Camp Pendleton, California; Head of the Programs and Resources Congressional Branch at Headquarters Marine Corps Washington, DC; Comptroller, Marine Corps University at Quantico, Virginia; Director, Marine Corps Appropriations Matters at Headquarters Marine Corps Washington, DC. Over his distinguished career he has been awarded two Meritorious Services Medals, two Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medals, the Navy Unit Commendation, and various campaign and theatre specific awards. Major Ma's civilian education includes an undergraduate degree in finance and Master of Business Administration from the Naval Postgraduate School as a Conrad Scholar Awardee.

It was during his last assignment that I first came to know Major Ma. In this capacity, he has proved to be an invaluable link between the United States Marine Corps and the Appropriations Committee. Major Ma has escorted me, other Members of Congress, and staff on several occasions as the committee conducted inspection trips to review military operations and confirm the health and welfare of our troops.

On every occasion, Major Ma performed his duties in an exacting and precise manner. But far more important to me was his thorough knowledge of the Marine Corps and the appropriations and budget process. He could always be depended on to know the status of funds and the impact they were having on our Marines and their families.

Madam Speaker, I also want to recognize the Ma family: his wife Julie Kay, daughter Alysson, and his son Andrew. We can ill afford to forget that it is the strength of family, and indeed their love and support, that make it possible to honorably serve in uniform.

In closing, I want to express my thanks and appreciation for the special contribution Major Bill Ma has made to the Department of the Navy and the United States Marine Corps. I wish Major Ma and his family continued success. Semper Fidelis.

## TRIBUTE TO OPERATION BLUE RIDGE THUNDER, SAFE SURFIN' FOUNDATION, AND MOOSE INTERNATIONAL

### HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I am delighted today to recognize two organizations in Virginia's Sixth District and a major international organization for a cooperative effort that is protecting our most innocent citizens—our children. Founded in Bedford County, Virginia Operation Blue Ridge Thunder has been led from its inception by Sheriff Mike Brown. It is recognized around the United States and internationally as an Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force. In 1998, Sheriff Brown started the Safe Surfin' Foundation to focus on Internet safety training for boys and girls through schools, law enforcement agencies, and civic groups. From day one, I have watched and supported their efforts closely. Today, I wish to extend thanks to Moose International for stepping forward through the Moose Lodge in Bedford to offer assistance in the ongoing battle to protect young people as they use the Internet. Moose International

went to its 1.3 million members and explained the need to support the special work of Sheriff Brown and his dedicated assistants. As a result, Moose International has generously donated $150,000 to enable the Safe Surfin' Foundation to continue its outreach. In addition, Moose International has joined in a Safe Surfin' ''train the trainers'' program. This assistance is permitting even more children and their parents to learn the benefits of Internet safety. I highly commend Moose International for recognizing the benefits of the Safe Surfin' Foundation. Their generosity will permit the battle to continue nationwide against those who would prey on our children through the use of technology.

## HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF KENT MUNDELL, DEPUTY SHERIFF, PIERCE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

### HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Deputy Walter Kent Mundell of the Pierce County Sheriff's Department, who was shot in the line of duty on December 21, 2009 and succumbed to his wounds on December 28, 2009. Deputy Mundell was a selfless police officer who dedicated himself to serving his neighbors and community. He will truly be missed by his colleagues and all who he served and protected.

Drawn to law enforcement service as a second career, Deputy Mundell joined the Pierce County Sheriff's Department in early 2000. He worked as a patrol deputy in South Hill and the Mountain detachment, and during his tenure with the Sheriff's Department, was a member of the Clandestine Lab Team, Air Operations, and a Safety Committee Representative.

Sheriff's Deputy Mundell and his partner, Sergeant Nick Hausner, responded to a domestic disturbance call at a home near Eatonville, Washington on the evening of December 21, 2009. Shortly after their arrival at the scene, Deputy Mundell and Sergeant Hausner found themselves ambushed by a suspect who drew a previously-concealed handgun and opened fire on the officers. Mundell and Hausner, who were wounded, were able to return fire, killing the suspect.

Deputy Kent Mundell is survived by his wife Lisa, 16-year-old daughter, and 10-year-old son. I ask my colleagues to join me in affirming our support for the law enforcement community at large, and extending our heartfelt condolences to Deputy Mundell's family and the Pierce County Sherriff's Department, who are grieving this devastating loss.

## IN TRIBUTE TO THE INSPIRED LIFE OF PUBLIC SERVANT BUD HARRISON

### HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, our Nation, and specifically, the San Francisco Peninsula, lost a true leader and dedicated public servant with the passing of A.C. ''Bud'' Harrison. Bud served his community in many ways. He was an appointed member of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors and served twelve years on the Burlingame City Council, including three terms as Mayor.

But Bud's greatest influence was as an educator. He was a favorite American Government teacher at both Capuchino and Burlingame High Schools before moving on to teach Political Science at the College of San Mateo. Over his 33-year career in the classroom, he not only taught government, but encouraged his students and fellow faculty to get involved. He even helped run the campaign of fellow Capuchino teacher Leo J. Ryan when he ran for the State Assembly. In fact, I remember then-Congressman Ryan telling the story of how he and Bud were responsible for getting the Capuchino marching band to perform at John F. Kennedy's Presidential Inauguration in Washington, DC in 1961. The story went, the two teachers flipped a coin to see who got to accompany the band and Leo won.

Madam Speaker, Bud is a native son of San Francisco, a graduate of the University of San Francisco and a 48-year resident of Burlingame. With his loving wife of 56 years, Dolores, they raised four children—Chuck, Mary, Terry and Cheri. And anyone who knew Bud was well aware of how proud he was of his six grandchildren and one great-grandson. The entire Harrison family deserves our gratitude for graciously sharing their husband, father, grandfather and great-grandfather with so many others who benefited from his wisdom, good humor and generous spirit.

Bud Harrison was no stranger to awards, having been honored by the Burlingame Lions Club as its 1997 Citizen of the Year, awarded the President's Award by the Burlingame Chamber of Commerce, named San Mateo County Citizen of the Year and received the Outstanding Citizen Award from Shinnyo-en USA.

But awards and personal acclaim were never what Bud Harrison was about. First and foremost, he cared about the betterment of his community for his family, his students, and everyone who chose to make the Peninsula their home.

Madam Speaker, not all of us leave an indelible mark on our community when our time on earth is done. There is no doubt that A.C. ''Bud'' Harrison did just that. We are all fortunate that Bud Harrison lived here and chose to give back so much to his community. I was privileged to call him a friend and confidant for nearly 30 years.

## CONGRESSMAN KILDEE SAYS FAREWELL TO THE HOUSE PAGES

### HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, as chairman of the House Page Board, I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal gratitude to all the pages for all they have done to serve so diligently in the House of Representatives during the 111th Congress. I am joined in this endeavor by my good friend and vice chair of the Board, ROB BISHOP.

We all recognize the important role that congressional pages play in helping the U.S. House of Representatives operate. These groups of young people, who come from all across our Nation, represent what is good about our country.

To become a page, Madam Speaker, these young people have proven themselves to be academically qualified. They have ventured away from the security of their homes and families to spend time in an unfamiliar city. Through this experience, they have witnessed a new culture, made new friends, and learned the details of how our government operates.

As we all know, the job of a congressional page is not an easy one. Along with being away from home, the pages must possess the maturity to balance competing demands for their time and their energy. In addition, they must have the dedication to work long hours and the ability to interact with people at a personal level. At the same time, they face a challenging academic schedule of classes in the House Page School.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me and Mr. BISHOP in honoring this group of distinguished young Americans listed below. They certainly will be missed.

FALL 2009 SESSION PAGES

1. Adolfo Abreu
2. Rachel Aguirre
3. Jacquelyn Andrews
4. Paris Bess
5. Zakariya Binshaieg
6. Addison Blair
7. Martin Boyle
8. Alejandro Bunag
9. John Cannafax
10. Allan Cheng
11. Sarah Coyle
12. Raquel Cruz
13. Vanessa Cuppett
14. Spencer Davenport
15. Elizabeth Dixon
16. Rachel Ferguson
17. Jacob Fessler
18. Andrew Franklin
19. Melissa Goitia
20. Blair Gremillion
21. Kristina Griffith
22. Samantha Guarneros
23. Stephanie Henry
24. Abigail Herzberg
25. Daniel Herzstein
26. Brandon Hill
27. Megan Howe
28. Henry Huang
29. Dalayna Jackson
30. Rachel Janik
31. Alejandro Jimenez-Jaramillo
32. Jamal Johnson
33. Ryan Lang
34. Mikita Lee
35. Claire Mars
36. Catherine Martlin
37. Emily Matlak
38. Junia McKenzie
39. Kathleena Morgan
40. Joshua Nawrocki
41. Jake O'Connor
42. Andrew Olson
43. Grace Olson
44. Molly Pace
45. Stephen Pettyjohn
46. Seth Ratcliff
47. Abigail Reese
48. Claire Rengenstreif
49. Nicholas Rudnik

50. Charles Steiner
51. Michael Swain
52. Joseph Tantillo
53. Abbey Thiel
54. Elijah Umek
55. Ryan Van Antwerp
56. Jordan Villa
57. Kagan S. Walsh
58. Andrew Warner
59. Daa'iyah White
60. Olivia Wisecup
61. Bethany Woodley
62. Jacob Young
63. Sara Zimmerman

## IS THAT ALL THERE IS TO A RECESSION?

**HON. RON PAUL**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, as we start the new year 2010, the establishment politicians, economists and Wall Street are trying to convince themselves that we have turned the corner and economic growth has once again begun. The predictions that conditions are getting back to normal come from those who never saw the crisis coming and don't have the vaguest notion what caused it. Some of them concede that it could be a jobless recovery. That will establish a new definition for a recovery.

Official unemployment is at 10 percent but even the government knows that if everyone is counted, including those individuals that are too discouraged to even be looking for work, the unemployment rate is 17 percent. Free-market economists claim the actual unemployment rate is closer to 22 percent.

There's reason to believe that the correction is just barely started and has a long way to run. If the financial bubble came from excess credit created by the Federal Reserve, doubling the money supply can hardly be a solution. It wouldn't make much sense for a doctor taking care of a very sick patient from severe infection to deliberately give the patient another infection. Yet that's what the PhD doctors are doing to our very sick economy. It can't work. It will make the economy much sicker. If our leaders don't wake up soon, the economy will be brought to its knees. Great danger lies ahead.

In foreign policy, it's always crucial that the motives of those who would do us harm are understood. Denial of the truth and accepting more politically palatable excuses will guarantee that threats to our safety will continue as we pursue a seriously flawed involvement overseas.

It's the same in economic policy. If there's denial or ignorance of the real cause of financial bubbles and the inevitable corrections that must follow, the economy cannot be reenergized.

We should have learned the lesson from the Depression of the 1930s that it was a predictable result from the Federal Reserves orchestrated excesses of the 1920s. Instead, the new-born Keynesian economists who took charge made certain that the correction would not be a one or two year affair as were the previous corrections in our history. The aggressive intervention by Hoover and Roosevelt, the Republicans and the Democrats, turned a short recession into the Great Depression, which lasted until the end of World War II.

The real tragedy was that the interpretation of the 1930s institutionalized bad economic theories. Unfortunately, and erroneously, the Depression was blamed on the gold standard, free markets and a lack of regulations. Though monetary policy was analyzed, its importance was 100 percent misinterpreted. The low interest rates and excess credit of the 1920s, driven by Federal Reserve policy, was not considered a factor in producing the stock market bubble and the mal-investment.

Instead, the 1930s analysts and even later analysis by Milton Freidman and the monetarists, along with academic ''scholars'' like Bernanke, came to an opposite conclusion: the Fed was at fault but only because it was too tight, arguing that massive monetary inflation was the only answer to the slumping economy.

And now we are witnessing a grand experiment by the very person who for years claimed special knowledge regarding the Depression. Chairman Bernanke is in the midst of trying to solve the problem of massive monetary inflation and excessively low interest rates instituted by his predecessor, Alan Greenspan, by implementing even more inflation at historic rates. The sad part is the answer to his very risky experiment with the wealth of our country and the health of our economy will take years to analyze. The conclusions will be just as flawed as they were in the aftermath of the Great Depression by an intellectual and political community that had totally rejected commodity money and the principle of free market with the current understanding in Washington.

One hope, though, is that free-market thinking and Austrian economic theories will have greater influence in the next decade or two, since their influence is now on a dramatic upswing. But there are a lot of hurdles to overcome.

In the 1930s, in an effort to find the true cause of the crisis, Congress ordered an official investigation. It became known as the ''Pecora Investigation'' named after Ferdinand Pecora, the aggressive chief council of the hearings. It received a lot of public attention and brought about many major changes but, tragically, every conclusion made and new policies implemented caused the depression to worsen and legitimized bad economic theories that continue to haunt us to this day.

The Federal Reserve was not blamed except for not printing enough money fast enough. Artificially low interest rates and mal-investment, the main source of the grossly distorted economy and bubble of the 1920s were exonerated. Not enough regulations were blamed, thus the Glass-Stiegall Act and the Securities Act of 1933 were passed and deepened the depression. Separating commercial and investment banking and the newly created SEC were to have solved all future problems—as long as the Fed was free from any restraint in its money creation operation to serve big-government spenders and members of the banking cartel.

Since the flaws in the monetary and economic system were not corrected but made worse after the Depression, it was to be expected that periodic booms and busts would persist. The longer these cycles could be papered over with new money and credit, the greater would be the distortions and debt that would one day have to undergo a major correction.

That correction is now in its early stages. Since the dollar was the reserve currency of the world and totally fiat since 1971, without any linkage to gold, the financial bubble became worldwide. This bubble that burst in 2008 was the largest in history. During the formation of the bubble, the U.S. as the issuer of the world currency received undeserved benefits. We essentially became the counterfeiter of the world and no one called us on it. Even today, the trust in the dollar that persists has buffeted the pain of the correction for us. This unique setup was a prime cause for our balance of payment deficits and the huge foreign debt we owe—the largest in the history of the world. The discord in the world financial system is telling us that it's time for us to pay for our profligate spending and massive foreign indebtedness. We have lived, as a nation, far beyond our means and the message is, for the foreseeable future, that we will be forced to live beneath our means as this debt is paid.

The inflation optimists are excited about current signs of economic growth and have even announced the end of the recession. It is conceivable that a reprieve can be achieved and the penalty that our economy must endure delayed. A reprieve must not be confused with a pardon; one is a temporary delay, the other an exemption. The payback for our excesses is certain to come.

Massively increasing debt and monetary inflation can slow the crash and change some government statistics encouraging the optimists. But real job growth and return of prosperity will remain elusive. The odds of us once again becoming an exporter of manufactured goods, like steel, cars, and textiles, are remote.

Ironically, a reprieve may well restore some confidence and motivate some spending and investment. But instead of restoring long-term growth, it may well act perversely by precipitating price inflation and higher interest rates. Since today's interest rates are artificially set, much of our investing is unproductively misdirected.

Current enthusiasm in the stock market is once again a reflection of the message that low interest rates send. Thus too, the government's stimulus package has helped to sustain the bond bubble, which in time must be deflated in order to get back to sound economic growth. All of this activity poses a threat to the dollar.

Governments are very powerful, and when in partnership with the monetary authorities that can inflate the currency at will, big government thrives. Welfare demands and senseless wars can be financed for long period of time through inflation, as long as trust in the currency lasts. Trust, though ultimately controlled by facts, can be misleading, since currency values can gain benefit from a country that has a strong military and wealth and a reasonably healthy economy. Eventually, markets and reality overwhelm, and illusions about a currency's worth become a reality.

Today, reality is setting in and the first of three major events has begun. The worldwide financial system, built on a foundation of paper, has received the shock waves of an impending collapse.

The wild speculation and the derivatives market, the stock market bubble, the insurmountable debt—public and private—and the massive mal-investments have been shattered.

The only solution so far offered worldwide, but led by the United States has been to ''print money'' faster, keep interest rates low at practically zero percent, and remove all stops for controlling deficits. These are the very policies that caused the disequilibrium, and doing more of the same, but only faster, can hardly help our economy. The addiction to easy credit and deficit defies a wise political solution. Politicians are incapable of delivering the message of frugality, common sense, and sound money.

We can expect that the course we are on to continue and accelerate, since the first event, the collapse of the financial system, is still in its early stage.

The housing crisis is far from over; the commercial property crisis has not yet gotten much attention, and the financial obligations of the government are growing exponentially. And none of this forces the slightest pause in the expanding of welfare growth. The number of regulations, which are indeed a tax, are exploding though the market was already suffering from regulatory excesses. There's a consensus in Washington that ''wise'' regulations can compensate for all the mistakes made by the Federal Reserve, the Executive Branch, and Congress. This fallacy has been around a long time and will be difficult to overcome.

The pessimism of the middle class continues to get worse despite the prognostication of Wall Street and the Administration. Most Americans know that the standard of living and real wages have not gone up for the past 10 years. If you're not a shrewd stock trader and instead invested in stocks 10 years ago and held on, in real terms you would have lost 20 percent of your savings. The middle class is poorer also because house prices have crashed and many have lost their homes. On top of this, all we hear about is the trillions of dollars of debt and entitlement obligations that have been racked up for future taxpayers to pay. When it is revealed that the insider friends of the Fed and Congress get billions of dollars in bailout at the expense of the middle class, it's no wonder the people are taking to the streets and directing their hostilities toward both Republicans and Democrats in Washington. Many would agree it's well-earned anger and properly directed.

This anger and frustration will certainly grow as the consequences of the collapse of the financial system become more severe. The concerted effort to prevent the correction the market demands, guarantees a prolonged agonizing crisis. Every effort to reverse the tide will depend on spending, higher deficits, increased taxes and money creation. This effort is now providing another grand bubble: the dollar/bond bubble.

The next event will be a dollar crisis. A full-blown dollar crisis will be worse than our current financial crisis. The extent of a dollar crisis depends on whether or not the Washington politicians wake up and change their ways—a dubious hope.

More likely, the insanity will continue until some not yet known event will undermine the confidence of the dollar worldwide. Signs of less desire by foreigners to hold our dollars are already present. I'm certain our Treasury and Federal Reserve are pulling out all stops to prevent a massive run on the dollar. At present the ''orderly'' retreat from the dollar is working. But it won't last.

China is quite active in investing in national resources around the world, and including in Iran. While we live in the dark ages and believe only our military presence and military threats can protect our access to oil, China is actually spending some of their savings investing in their future access to energy and other precious metals and minerals.

But the orderly retreat from the dollar won't last forever. Since 1973, shortly after the breakdown of the Bretton Woods Agreement, the dollar has lost 32 percent of its value against a Federal Reserve basket of currencies. But that doesn't tell the real story, since that is a measurement against all other currencies, and they are fiat currencies as well. This gave the dollar an artificial benefit from its position of power in great wealth and military prowess. The dollar in relationship to gold, however, is down 97 percent since 1971, and 82 percent as measured by the CPI. The dollar, mismanaged by the Fed, has not been a benefit to the savers who sought to responsibly take care of themselves. They've been cheated by a rotten system and are just beginning to understand exactly how the Federal Reserve has been responsible for the swindle.

It is impossible to predict the time when confidence will be lost, but it can come quickly. Resorting to buying other paper currencies will not be of much help. When the dollar crashes, most likely the purchasing power of all currencies—since all countries hold dollars as a reserve—will go down as well.

This means that dollars and other currencies will go into buying consumer items, precious metals and other physical properties. Consumer prices will soar, as well as interest rates. The central bank will lose control; and the more they inflate, the worse the confidence becomes. The interest rates will respond to these efforts by rising sharply.

If the Fed tries to reverse the run on the dollar, interest rates will also soar, and the pain on the American citizens will be of such proportion that political chaos will result. Either scenario leads to political and social chaos—the third event, and the most dangerous.

With no ability of the federal government to fund its commitments, international or domestic, major changes will occur in our system. The social unrest will elicit cries for government to exert unusual force to head off a complete breakdown of law and order. The ultimate trap will be set for a system of government claiming to protect a free society. If more power and police authority are not given to the federal government, it will be argued that only anarchy will result. If more government policing power is given, it will mean a lethal threat to civil liberties. Already we have permitted the notion that a single person, the Attorney General or President, can decide who is an ''enemy combatant'', thus denying that individual the right to habeas corpus, permitting indefinite detentions without charges made. This attitude toward civil liberties has changed significantly since the fear built around 9/11.

Yes, I know declaring one an ''enemy combatant'' is reserved for the radical Muslims engaged in terrorism against the United States. To be reassured by this reasoning is quite dangerous and naive. Logic should not lead us to equate suspects with terrorists, and include American citizens, and yet this has already been set by precedent. Under difficult circumstances, our political leaders will not be hesitant to use these powers to maintain order. Tragically, the people may even demand it.

We are rapidly moving toward a dangerous time in our history. Society as we know it is vulnerable to political and social chaos.

This impending crisis comes as a consequence of our flawed foreign and domestic economic policies, a silly notion about money, ignorance about Central Banking, ignoring the onerous power and mischief of our out-of-control intelligence agencies, our unsustainable welfare state, and a willingness to sacrifice privacy and civil liberties in an attempt to achieve safety and security from an inept government. Dangerous times indeed!

What can be done about it? Must we wait for the inevitable and expect to restore our liberties in a street fight against the overwhelming power of the state? Not a good option!

The only way that we can prevent blood from running in the streets is to offer a better idea of the proper role of government in a society that desires first and foremost—liberty.

And that is impossible without a firm commitment by our thought leaders to the ideas of freedom, the source of all creative energy and prosperity. An all-powerful state is the threat to that ideal.

The prevailing attitude of the people—as it once was in early America—must be that of liberty and self reliance, rather than the nanny state and dependency relying on government force to mold all private choices.

If this is understood, a smooth—although not painless—transition to a free society is achievable. Ignoring this option will be very destructive to everything that is dear to the hearts of most Americans.

What is it that we must do? We must immediately embark on:

Balance the budget by reducing spending;

Change our foreign policy to that of non-intervention;

A full audit and more supervision of the Federal Reserve leading to abolishing the Federal Reserve;

Legalize competition to the Federal Reserve with competing currencies;

Regain respect for civil liberties and privacy while reigning in the CIA;

Wean ourselves off the dependence of wealth transfers by government;

Abolish crony capitalism—no subsidies, no bailouts, no regulatory or tax privileges to protect the powerful elite especially the military industrial complex; and

Eliminate the income tax, inheritance tax and taxes on savings and dividends.

None of this can happen without the restoration of Congress to its dominant position of the three Branches of Government as was originally intended by the Constitution. The Executive and Judicial must be reined in, and Congress must assert its prerogatives over all legislation curtailing all unconstitutional agendae through budgetary controls.

Signs abound that angry Americans are now more ready than ever before for a change in direction that is indeed real. If this program were improvised—even suddenly and dramatically—the adjustment, though significant and to a degree somewhat painful, would be much

shorter and of minor consequence compared to the chaos and poverty that will result if we refuse to change our gluttonous appetite for a free lunch.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

## HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 20, 2010*

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I missed several roll call votes on January 19, 2010. Had I been present I would have voted:

On #6, on passage of H. Res. 1004, Congratulating the Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine for its 150 years of commitment to advancing science and improving health, I would have voted "yea."

On #7, on passage of H. Res. 1015, Congratulating the Penn State women's volleyball team on winning the 2009 NCAA Division I national championship, I would have voted "yea."

On #8, on passage of H. Res. 991, Commending the University of Virginia men's soccer team for winning the 2009 Division I NCAA National Championship, I would have voted "yea."

## SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 21, 2010 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

## MEETINGS SCHEDULED

### JANUARY 26

10 a.m.
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To continue hearings to examine intelligence reform, focusing on the lessons and implications of the attack on flight 253 on December 25, 2009.
SD–342

2:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael Peter Huerta, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, and David T. Matsuda, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Maritime Administration, both of the Department of Transportation, and Timothy McGee, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce.
SR–253

### JANUARY 27

Time to be announced
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to consider any pending nominations.
Room to be announced

2:30 p.m.
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Federal Financial Management, Government Information, Federal Services, and International Security Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine cutting the Federal government's energy bill, focusing on an examination of the sustainable Federal government executive order.
SD–342

### JANUARY 28

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting to consider the nomination of Raul Perea-Henze, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Policy and Planning, and any pending calendar business.
SR–418

2:15 p.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine unemployment on Indian reservations at 50%, focusing on the need to create jobs in Indian Country.
SD–628

### FEBRUARY 2

10 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Larry Persily, of Alaska, to be Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Projects, and Patricia A. Hoffman, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Energy for Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability.
SD–366

### FEBRUARY 4

10 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2011 for the Department of Energy.
SD–366

2:30 p.m.
Judiciary
Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the Comcast/NBC Universal Merger, focusing on the future of competition and consumers.
SD–226

### FEBRUARY 10

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2011 for the Department of the Interior.
SD–366

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2011 for the Department of Veterans Affairs.
SR–418

### FEBRUARY 11

11:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider any pending nominations.
SD–366

### FEBRUARY 23

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine proposed defense authorization request for fiscal year 2011 for the Future Years Defense Program.
SDG–50

### MARCH 2

2 p.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine a legislative presentation from Disabled Veterans of America.
345, Cannon Building

### MARCH 4

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine legislative presentations from the Paralyzed Veterans of America, Jewish War Veterans, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Ex-Prisoners of War, Blinded Veterans Association, Military Officers Association of America, Air Force Sergeants Association, and the Wounded Warrior Project.
345, Cannon Building

### MARCH 9

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine a legislative presentation from Veterans of Foreign Wars.
SDG–50

### MARCH 18

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine legislative presentations from AMVETS, National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs, Non Commissioned Officers Association, Gold Star Wives, The Retired Enlisted Association, Fleet Reserve Association, Vietnam Veterans of America, and Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America.
SDG–50

# *Daily Digest*

# Senate

## *Chamber Action*

***Routine Proceedings, pages S5–S59***

**Measures Introduced:** Eleven bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2931–2941, and S. Res. 388. **Pages S51–52**

**Measures Reported:**

S. 2778, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to reauthorize that Act, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 111–114)

S. 1105, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, to develop water infrastructure in the Rio Grande Basin, and to approve the settlement of the water rights claims of the Pueblos of Nambe, Pojoaque, San Ildefonso, and Tesuque, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 111–115)

S. 1735, to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina. (S. Rept. No. 111–116) **Page S51**

**Measures Passed:**

***Joint Session of Congress:*** Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 228, providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President. **Page S58**

**Measures Considered:**

**Increasing the Statutory Limit on the Public Debt—Agreement:** Senate began consideration of H.J. Res. 45, increasing the statutory limit on the public debt, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S23–35**

Pending:

Baucus (for Reid) Amendment No. 3299, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S23**

Baucus Amendment No. 3300 (to Amendment No. 3299), to protect Social Security. **Pages S23–28**

Thune Amendment No. 3301 (to Amendment No. 3299), to terminate authority under the Troubled Asset Relief Program. **Page S28**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the resolution at approximately 10:30 a.m., on Thursday, January 21, 2010. **Page S59**

**Water Resources Development Act—Referral Agreement:** A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1854, to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 to modify an environmental infrastructure project for Big Bear Lake, California, and the bill then be referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works. **Page S49**

**Escort Committee—Agreement:** A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Presiding Officer of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber for the joint session to be held at 9 p.m. on Wednesday, January 27, 2010. **Page S59**

**Message from the President:** Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared on January 23, 1995, with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–40) **Page S48**

**Nomination Confirmed:** Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By unanimous vote of 97 yeas (Vote No. EX. 1), Beverly Baldwin Martin, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit. **Pages S13–18**

**Nominations Received:** Senate received the following nominations:

Michael F. Tillman, of California, to be a Member of the Marine Mammal Commission for a term expiring May 13, 2011.

Daryl J. Boness, of Maine, to be a Member of the Marine Mammal Commission for a term expiring May 13, 2010.

Earl F. Weener, of Oregon, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 2010.

Jeffrey R. Moreland, of Texas, to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors for a term of five years.

Theodore Sedgwick, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Slovak Republic.

Robert Wedgeworth, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 2013.

Carla D. Hayden, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 2014.

John Coppola, of Florida, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 2013.

Winston Tabb, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 2013.

Craig Becker, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring December 16, 2014.

Milton C. Lee, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Dana Katherine Bilyeu, of Nevada, to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring October 11, 2011.

Michael D. Kennedy, of Georgia, to be a Member of Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring September 25, 2010.

Michael D. Kennedy, of Georgia, to be a Member of Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board for a term expiring September 25, 2014.

Dennis P. Walsh, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the Special Panel on Appeals for a term of six years.

Cynthia Chavez Lamar, of New Mexico, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development for a term expiring May 19, 2010.

JoAnn Lynn Balzer, of New Mexico, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development for a term expiring May 19, 2012.

Louis B. Butler, Jr., of Wisconsin, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Wisconsin.

Edward Milton Chen, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California.

Jon E. DeGuilio, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

Audrey Goldstein Fleissig, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

Lucy Haeran Koh, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California.

Tanya Walton Pratt, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Indiana.

Jane E. Magnus-Stinson, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Indiana.

Loretta E. Lynch, of New York, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of New York for the term of four years.

David J. Hale, of Kentucky, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Kentucky for the term of four years.

Kerry B. Harvey, of Kentucky, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Kentucky for the term of four years.

R. Booth Goodwin II, of West Virginia, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of West Virginia for the term of four years.

Stephanie A. Finley, of Louisiana, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Louisiana for the term of four years.

Gervin Kazumi Miyamoto, of Hawaii, to be United States Marshal for the District of Hawaii for the term of four years.

Brian Todd Underwood, of Idaho, to be United States Marshal for the District of Idaho for the term of four years.

Kelly McDade Nesbit, of North Carolina, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of North Carolina for the term of four years.

Peter Christopher Munoz, of Michigan, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Michigan for the term of four years.

Christopher Tobias Hoye, of Nevada, to be United States Marshal for the District of Nevada for the term of four years.

Marsha J. Rabiteau, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2010.

Hernán D. Vera, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2012.

Mary L. Smith, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Christopher H. Schroeder, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Dawn Elizabeth Johnsen, of Indiana, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Katherine Hammack, of Arizona, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

2 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.
1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.
A routine list in the Navy. **Page S59**

**Messages from the House:** **Pages S48–49**

**Measures Referred:** **Page S49**

**Measures Placed on the Calendar:** **Pages S5, S49**

**Measures Read the First Time:** **Pages S49, S58–59**

**Executive Communications:** **Pages S49–51**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages S52–54**

**Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:** **Pages S54–57**

**Additional Statements:** **Pages S42–48**

**Amendments Submitted:** **Page S57**

**Notices of Hearings/Meetings:** **Page S57**

**Authorities for Committees to Meet:** **Page S58**

**Privileges of the Floor:** **Page S58**

**Record Votes:** One record vote was taken today. (Total—1) **Page S18**

**Adjournment:** Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:50 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, January 21, 2010. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S59.)

# *Committee Meetings*

*(Committees not listed did not meet)*

## AVIATION SECURITY

*Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the state of aviation security, focusing on current system capabilities of meeting threats, after receiving testimony from Janet A. Napolitano, Secretary of Homeland Security; Michael E. Leiter, Director, National Counterterrorism Center; and former Representative Lee Hamilton, and former Governor Tom Kean, both of the Bipartisan Policy Center National Security Preparedness Group, Washington, D.C.

## YEMEN

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine Yemen, focusing on confronting Al-Qaeda, preventing state failure, after receiving testimony from Jeffrey D. Feltman, Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern Affairs, and Daniel Benjamin, Coordinator for Counterterrorism, both of the Department of State; Emile Nakhleh, former Senior Intelligence Service Officer, Central Intelligence Agency; Barbara K. Bodine, Princeton University Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, and Gregory Johnsen, Princeton University, both of Princeton, New Jersey; and Frederick W. Kagan, American Enterprise Institute, Washington, D.C.

## INTELLIGENCE REFORM

*Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine intelligence reform, focusing on the lessons and implications of the attack on flight 253 on December 25, 2009, after receiving testimony from Michael E. Leiter, Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, and Dennis C. Blair, Director of National Intelligence, both of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence; and Janet A. Napolitano, Secretary of Homeland Security.

## NOMINATION

*Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Joshua Gotbaum, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

## IMPROVING EFFECTIVE ANTI–TERRORISM TOOLS

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine securing America's safety, focusing on improving the effectiveness of anti-terrorism tools and inter-agency communication, after receiving testimony from Robert S. Mueller, III, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice; Patrick F. Kennedy, Under Secretary of State for Management; and David Heyman, Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for Policy.

## NOMINATIONS

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Nancy D. Freudenthal, to be United States District Judge for the District of Wyoming, who was introduced by Senators Enzi and Barrasso, Denzil Price Marshall Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, who was introduced by Senators Pryor and Lincoln, Benita Y. Pearson, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio, who was introduced by Senator Brown, Timothy S. Black, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio, who was introduced by Senator Brown, and James P. Lynch, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

# House of Representatives

## Chamber Action

**Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced:** 13 public bills, H.R. 4471–4483; and 7 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 229; and H. Res. 1019–1024 were introduced. **Pages H265–66**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages H266–67**

**Reports Filed:** There were no reports filed today.

**Speaker:** Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Salazar to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H195**

**Suspensions:** The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

***Congratulating Nancy Goodman Brinker for receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom:*** H. Res. 708, amended, to congratulate Nancy Goodman Brinker for receiving the Presidential Medal of Freedom; **Pages H200–02**

***Congresswoman Jan Meyers Post Office Building Designation Act:*** H.R. 4095, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9727 Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, as the ''Congresswoman Jan Meyers Post Office Building''; **Pages H202–04**

***Accelerating the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the earthquake in Haiti:*** H.R. 4462, amended, to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the earthquake in Haiti; **Pages H211–14**

***Celebrating the life and work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. during the 30th anniversary of the Stevie Wonder song tribute to Dr. King, "Happy Birthday":*** H. Res. 1010, to celebrate the life and work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. during the 30th anniversary of the Stevie Wonder song tribute to Dr. King, ''Happy Birthday''; **Pages H214–20**

***Honoring the seven Americans killed in Khost, Afghanistan, on December 30, 2009, for their service to the United States:*** H. Res. 1009, to honor the seven Americans killed in Khost, Afghanistan, on December 30, 2009, for their service to the United States; **Pages H220–25**

***Amending the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Securing the Cities Initiative of the Department of Homeland Security:*** H.R. 2611, amended, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Securing the Cities Initiative of the Department of Homeland Security; and **Pages H225–26**

***Condemning the violent suppression of legitimate political dissent and gross human rights abuses in the Republic of Guinea:*** H. Res. 1013, amended, to condemn the violent suppression of legitimate political dissent and gross human rights abuses in the Republic of Guinea. **Pages H241–43**

**Providing for consideration of the bills H.R. 3254, H.R. 3342, and H.R. 1065—Rule for Consideration:** The House agreed to the rule that is providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3254) to approve the Taos Pueblo Indian Water Rights Settlement Agreement, and for other purposes; for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3342) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, to develop water infrastructure in the Rio Grande Basin, and to approve the settlement of the water rights claims of the Pueblos of Nambe, Pojoaque, San Ildefonso, and Tesuque; and for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1065) to resolve water rights claims of the White Mountain Apache Tribe in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, by voice vote after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 239 yeas to 175 nays, Roll No. 9. **Pages H206–11, H229–30**

**Moment of Silence:** The House observed a moment of silence in honor of the men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our nation in Iraq and Afghanistan, their families, and all who serve in the armed forces and their families. **Page H230**

**Suspensions—Failed:** The House failed to agree to suspend the rules and pass the following measures which were debated on Tuesday, January 19th:

***Castle Nugent National Historic Site Establishment Act of 2010:*** H.R. 3726, amended, to establish the Castle Nugent National Historic Site at St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 241 yeas to 173 nays, Roll No. 10 and **Page H230**

***Idaho Wilderness Water Resources Protection Act:*** H.R. 3538, amended, to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 225 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 11. **Page H231**

**Suspensions—Proceedings Postponed:** The House debated the following measures under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed:

***Private First Class Garfield M. Langhorn Post Office Building Designation Act:*** H.R. 3250, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1210 West Main Street in Riverhead, New York, as the ''Private First Class Garfield M. Langhorn Post Office Building'';

**Pages H198–H200**

***Expressing support for the designation of an Early Detection Month for breast cancer and all forms of cancer:*** H. Con. Res. 158, amended, to express support for the designation of an Early Detection Month for breast cancer and all forms of cancer;

**Pages H204–06**

***Nuclear Forensics and Attribution Act:*** Concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 730, to strengthen efforts in the Department of Homeland Security to develop nuclear forensics capabilities to permit attribution of the source of nuclear material; and

**Pages H226–29**

***Expressing condolences to and solidarity with the people of Haiti:*** H. Res. 1021, to express condolences to and solidarity with the people of Haiti in the aftermath of the devastating earthquake of January 12, 2010. **Pages H231–41**

**Presidential Message:** Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process is to continue in effect beyond January 23, 2010—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed (H. Doc. 111–88). **Page H263**

**Quorum Calls—Votes:** Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H229–30, H230, H231. There were no quorum calls.

**Adjournment:** The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

# *Committee Meetings*

## ACQUISITION CONTRACTING

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Defense met in executive session to hold a hearing on Acquisition Contracting. Testimony was head from the following officials of the GAO: Paul Francis, Managing Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management Team; Michael Golden, Managing Associate General Counsel for Procurement; and Bill Woods, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management Team.

## DOD INDEPENDENT REVIEW RELATING TO FORT HOOD

*Committee on Armed Services:* Held a hearing on the findings of the Department of Defense Independent Review Relating to Fort Hood. Testimony was heard from Togo West, former Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and former Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense; and ADM Vern Clark, USN (ret.); former Chief of Naval Operations, Department of Defense.

## ISSUES AFFECTING NAVAL FORCE STRUCTURE

*Committee on Armed Services:* Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces held a hearing on issues affecting Naval force structure. Testimony was heard from Eric Labs, Senior Analyst, CBO; Ronald O'Rourke, Specialist in Naval Affairs, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; and a public witness.

## AL QA'IDA IN THE ARABIAN PENINSULA

*Committee on Armed Services:* Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities held a hearing on the threat posed by al Qa'ida in the Arabian Peninsula and other regions. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Garry Reid, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Special Operations and Combating Terrorism; and ADM Eric T. Olson, USN, Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, Department of the Navy; and Ambassador Daniel Benjamin, Counterterrorism Coordinator, Department of State.

## EXXON MOBIL-XTO MERGER

*Committee on Energy and Commerce:* Subcommittee on Energy and Environment held a hearing on The Exxon Mobil-XTO Merger: Impacts on U.S. Energy Markets. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

## HOUSING FAIRNESS ACT OF 2009

*Committee on Financial Services:* Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity held a hearing on H.R. 476, Housing Fairness Act of 2009. Testimony was heard from John Trasvina, Assistant Secretary, Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, Department of Housing and Urban Development; and public witnesses.

## TSA AVIATION SECURITY SCREENING; U.S. SECRET SERVICE AND PRESIDENTIAL PROTECTION

*Committee on Homeland Security:* Ordered adversely reported H. Res. 980, Of inquiry directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of the Transportation Security Administration's Aviation Security Screening Management Standard Operating Procedures manual in effect on December 5, 2009, and

any subsequent revisions of such manual in effect prior to the adoption of this resolution.

The Committee also continued hearings entitled "The United States Secret Service and Presidential Protection: An Examination of a System Failure." In failing to respond to Committee questions, Mr. Tareq Salahi and Mrs. Michaele Salahi invoked constitutional privileges.

### NFL APPAREL LICENSING EXCLUSIVITY

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee on Courts and Competition Policy held a hearing on the Antitrust Implications of American Needle v. NFL. Testimony was heard from Gary Gertzog, Senior Vice President, National Football League; Kevin James Mawae, President, National Football League Players Association; William L. Daly III, Deputy Commissioner, National Hockey League; and a public witness.

### NATURAL HAZARDS RISK REDUCTION ACT OF 2009

*Committee on Natural Resources:* Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing on H.R. 3820, Natural Hazards Risk Reduction Act of 2009. Testimony was heard from David Applegate, Senior Science Advisor, Earthquakes and Geologic Hazards, U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior; and a public witness.

### U.S. INNOVATION/EDUCATION INVESTMENT

*Committee on Science and Technology:* Held a hearing on America COMPETES: Big Picture Perspectives on the Need for Innovation, Investments in R&D and a Commitment to STEM Education. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

### FORT HUNT SHOOTING

*Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:* Ordered adversely reported H. Res. 978, Requesting the President to transmit to the House of Representatives all documents in the possession of the President relating to the inventory and review of intelligence related to the shooting at Fort Hood, Texas, described by the President in a memorandum dated November 10, 2009.

### BRIEFING—CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATIONS

*Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:* Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations met in executive session to receive a briefing on Congressional Notifications. Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

## *Joint Meetings*

No joint committee meetings were held.

## NEW PUBLIC LAWS

*(For last listing of Public Laws, see* DAILY DIGEST, *p. D1517)*

H.R. 4165, to extend through December 31, 2010, the authority of the Secretary of the Army to accept and expend funds contributed by non-Federal public entities to expedite the processing of permits. Signed on December 22, 2009. (Public Law 111–120)

H.J. Res. 62, appointing the day for the convening of the second session of the One Hundred Eleventh Congress. Signed on December 22, 2009. (Public Law 111–121)

S. 1472, to establish a section within the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice to enforce human rights laws, to make technical and conforming amendments to criminal and immigration laws pertaining to human rights violations, and for other purposes. Signed on December 22, 2009. (Public Law 111–122)

H.R. 4314, to permit continued financing of Government operations. Signed on December 28, 2009. (Public Law 111–123)

H.R. 4284, to extend the Generalized System of Preferences and the Andean Trade Preference Act, and for other purposes. Signed on December 28, 2009. (Public Law 111–124)

H.R. 3819, to extend the commercial space transportation liability regime. Signed on December 28, 2009. (Public Law 111–125)

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 21, 2010

*(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)*

### Senate

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine how to save and create jobs, 9:30 a.m., SD–192.

*Committee on Armed Services:* to hold hearings to examine findings and recommendations of the Department of Defense Independent Review Relating to Fort Hood; with the possibility of a closed session in SR–222 following the open session, 9:30 a.m., SDG–50.

*Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:* to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Kevin Wolf, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Suresh Kumar, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service, and David W. Mills, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Export Enforcement,

all of the Department of Commerce, Douglas A. Criscitello, of Virginia, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Theodore W. Tozer, of Ohio, to be President, Government National Mortgage Association, and Orlan Johnson, of Maryland, and Sharon Y. Bowen, of New York, both to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation, 9:30 a.m., SD–538.

*Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:* to hold hearings to examine the research and development priorities and imperatives needed to meet the medium and long term challenges associated with climate change, 10 a.m., SD–366.

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs, to hold hearings to examine principles of United States engagement in Asia, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine civilian strategy for Afghanistan, focusing on a status report in advance of the London conference, 3 p.m., SD–419.

*Committee on the Judiciary:* business meeting to consider S. 2924, to reauthorize the Boys & Girls Clubs of America, in the wake of its Centennial, and its programs and activities, S. 714, to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission, S. 1624, to amend title 11 of the United States Code, to provide protection for medical debt homeowners, to restore bankruptcy protections for individuals experiencing economic distress as caregivers to ill, injured, or disabled family members, and to exempt from means testing debtors whose financial problems were caused by serious medical problems, S. 1765, to amend the Hate Crime Statistics Act to include crimes against the homeless, S. 1554, to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to prevent later delinquency and improve the health and well-being of maltreated infants and toddlers through the development of local Court Teams for Maltreated Infants and Toddlers and the creation of a National Court Teams Resource Center to assist such Court Teams, S. 1789, to restore fairness to Federal cocaine sentencing, H.R. 1741, to require the Attorney General to make competitive grants to eligible State, tribal, and local governments to establish and maintain certain protection and witness assistance programs, and the nominations of O. Rogeriee Thompson, of Rhode Island, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit, James A. Wynn, Jr., of North Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, Albert Diaz, of North Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, and Robert William Heun, of Alaska, to be United States Marshal for the District of Alaska, 10 a.m., SD–226.

*Select Committee on Intelligence:* to hold closed hearings to consider certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

## House

*Committee on Armed Services,* Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing on the status of the Air Force nuclear security roadmap, 10 a.m., 210 HVC.

*Committee on the Budget,* hearing on Perspectives on Long-Term Deficits, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

*Committee on Energy and Commerce,* Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 3125, Radio Spectrum Inventory Act; and H.R. 3019, Spectrum Relocation Improvement Act of 2009, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled "Crib Safety: Assessing the Need for Better Oversight," 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

*Committee on Financial Services,* Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled "The Condition of Financial Institutions: Examining the Failure and Seizure of an American Bank," 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

*Committee on the Judiciary,* Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, hearing on H.R. 3695, Billy's Law, 11 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

*Committee on Natural Resources,* Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 2788, Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial Act; H.R. 2944, Southern Arizona Public Lands Protection Act of 2009; H.R. 3914, San Juan Mountains Wilderness Act of 2009; H.R. 4003, Hudson River Valley Special Resource Study Act; H.R. 4192, Stornetta Public Lands Outstanding Natural Area Act of 2009; and H.R. 4395, To revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station, and for other purposes, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

*Committee on Science and Technology,* Subcommittee on Technology and Innovation, hearing on Commerce Department Programs to Support Job Creation and Innovation at Small- and Medium-Sized Manufacturers, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

*Committee on Veterans' Affairs,* Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, hearing on Long-Term Solution for Post-9/11 G.I. Bill, 1 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Transitioning Heroes: New Era Same Problems? 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

*Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,* executive, briefing on Cybersecurity Threats, 9 a.m., 304 HVC.

## Joint Meetings

*Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe:* to hold hearings to examine democratic change and challenges in Moldova, 4:30 p.m., SR–485.

*Next Meeting of the* **SENATE**

**9:30 a.m., Thursday, January 21**

**Senate Chamber**

**Program for Thursday:** After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond one hour), Senate will continue consideration of H.J. Res. 45, increasing the statutory limit on the public debt.

*Next Meeting of the* **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**10 a.m., Thursday, January 21**

**House Chamber**

**Program for Thursday:** Consideration of H.R. 1065—White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act (Subject to a Rule); H.R. 3254—Taos Pueblo Indian Water Rights Settlement Act (Subject to a Rule); and H.R. 3342—Aamodt Litigation Settlement Act (Subject to a Rule).

## Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Alexander, Rodney, La., E45
Barrett, J. Gresham, S.C., E45, E47
Berkley, Shelley, Nev., E50
Brady, Robert A., Pa., E48
Brown, Henry E., Jr., S.C., E45
Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E51
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E47
Davis, Geoff, Ky., E47
Duncan, John J., Jr., Tenn., E49
Filner, Bob, Calif., E45
Goodlatte, Bob, Va., E51
Guthrie, Brett, Ky., E46
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E48
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E55
Jones, Walter B., N.C., E51
Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E52
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E48
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E50
Miller, Jeff, Fla., E45
Mitchell, Harry E., Ariz., E46
Murtha, John P., Pa., E51
Owens, William L., N.Y., E48
Paul, Ron, Tex., E53
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E46, E50
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E47
Schmidt, Jean, Ohio, E49
Smith, Adam, Wash., E52
Speier, Jackie, Calif., E52
Stupak, Bart, Mich., E47
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E48

**Congressional Record** The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

**POSTMASTER:** Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.