United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 2010 *No. 60*

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 27, 2010.

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

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

SBA EXTENSIONS

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this legislation to extend the important programs of the Small Business Administration.

Small businesses are the backbone of our economy, having created 65 percent of all new jobs in the last decade. However, over the course of the last 18 months, small business owners have had trouble accessing the capital they need to grow their business and to create jobs. The SBA's lending programs are a critical piece of helping small businesses access this credit and create jobs, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Now, according to the Northwest Business Development Agency in Washington State, for every $1 lent under the SBA 504 program, $94 is generated in tax revenue for our communities. Congress has made important steps to encourage increased lending for small businesses, including allowing SBA 504 loans to be used for debt relief, reducing fees in the SBA's 7(a) and 504 loan guaranty programs, and increasing the maximum percentage of the loan guaranty for 7(a) loans to 90 percent.

And credit is starting to move. In my district alone, between October 2009 and the end of February 2010, 58 SBA 7(a) loans worth nearly $18 million and 15 504 loans worth nearly $6 million were provided to small businesses in the Second Congressional District of Washington State, allowing them to expand and to modernize. However, at the end of this month, authorization for these important SBA programs will expire.

As Congress stays laser-focused on creating jobs, extending these important programs and ensuring small businesses can access credit is critical. So I strongly urge a ''yes'' vote on this bill.

FREE TRADE

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, we are all encouraged by the positive news that we have been receiving about the economic recovery which appears to be underway. I think it's very clear that with the report that came from the CMS at the end of last week, the dramatic increase in spending and the regulatory vision that is proposed, that the economic recovery that we're going through at this moment is in spite of, not because of, policies emanating from here in Washington, D.C.

Madam Speaker, when we were privileged to have the President of the United States stand in this Chamber and deliver his State of the Union message, one of the things that he talked about was the goal of job creation. We of course have seen signs of economic recovery, but the unemployment rate is still just below 10 percent nationwide. In my State of California, it is in excess of 12 percent, and there are people who are hurting.

When the President stood here right behind where I am now, Madam Speaker, ÷just in front of you and delivered his State of the Union message, he talked about the importance of opening up new markets around the world. He talked about the fact that 95 percent of the world's consumers are outside of our borders, and we could create good jobs for American workers if we were to proceed with the plan for free trade agreements that have been pending.

Well, Madam Speaker, 1,253 days ago, an agreement was signed between the United States of America and the Government of Colombia to open up the market so that we could see jobs created for workers at Caterpillar, John Deere, Whirlpool, and other very important industries right here in the United States. It is 1,253 days since that measure has been signed, and in that same period of time we have seen $2.7 billion in tariffs imposed on products made by U.S. workers going to Colombia.

Madam Speaker, if we want to create good private sector jobs, we need to unleash the potential, reducing the constraints that have been imposed on U.S. workers.

Two hundred and eleven years ago this month, the author of the U.S. Constitution became a Member of Congress, James Madison. Representative Madison, on April 9 of 1789 stood

Printed on recycled paper.

in the House of Representatives and said the following. He said, I own myself to be a friend of a free system of commerce and hold it as truth that commercial shackles are generally unjust, oppressive, and impolitic. Madison went on to say, Madam Speaker, that this is more true than the wisdom of the most enlightened legislature.

Now, as it comes to job creation and economic growth in 2010, it seems to me that looking back to what was said 211 years ago by Representative James Madison about unleashing the shackles that exist to the free flow of commerce could create great opportunities for U.S. workers.

And so, Madam Speaker, while I congratulate the President for the words that he provided to us in his State of the Union message about the benefits of opening up new markets around the world, after 1,253 days since it has been signed, I urge the President to send to the United States Congress that measure because I believe that, in this election year especially, people want to focus on job creation and economic growth, and I am convinced that we would have a strong bipartisan vote in support of that very important measure.

HONORING THE AIDS FOUNDATION OF CHICAGO FOR 25 YEARS OF SERVICE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the AIDS Foundation of Chicago for 25 years of service to the people of Chicago, Cook County, and the State of Illinois.

The foundation has served as the center of AIDS and HIV services in the Chicago metropolitan area and has been a leading advocate of sound policies and legislation in Illinois and Washington. The foundation has raised and disseminated millions of dollars in grants for prevention, care, and advocacy in underserved communities.

Praised as a national model of coordinated case management and supportive housing services, many look to the foundation as a way to do business. The AIDS Foundation is the kind of community-based, people-oriented organization that makes America great. Thanks to CEO Mark Ishaug and to all the staff, volunteers, and board for being a beacon of hope in the fight against AIDS and HIV.

FIX THE HEALTH CARE BILL

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

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, last week, the chief actuary for the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS, issued a troubling report, but it is not at all surprising to many of us who debated the health care bill. The report said that the Obamacare health care bill will increase national health expenditures by $311 billion. That is a deficit.

During the debate, many of us said on the House floor that this bill will increase the deficit and expand Federal powers. I would like to take a few minutes to outline some of the problems with the bill by government officials pointing out these problems.

First of all, it obviously increases the deficit. CBO projected the cost of the health care bill to be $940 billion and it would reduce the deficit by $138 billion. However, that has been proven to be wrong. There are budget gimmicks in place and it is unlikely that Congress will keep those gimmicks in place. For example, the bill assumes that a 21 percent cut to Medicare's physician reimbursement rate will stay in place. This won't happen.

New taxes and mandates will create economic hardship. Businesses will be forced to buy health insurance for their employees or pay a tax for every employee. This will place businesses into a very difficult position, cutting workers, reducing wages, or preventing companies from growing larger if they wish to avoid these costly penalties. With 10 percent unemployment nationwide, is this the right time to create a disincentive for a company to hire more workers?

Expanding a broken entitlement creates more problems, not real solutions. For example, in 2014, Medicaid will be expanded to all individuals making less than 133 percent of the Federal poverty level. Half the people covered under the health care bill will be covered because of Medicaid. Unfortunately, most doctors do not participate in Medicaid because the reimbursement rate is far less than the private sector and less than Medicare. So where are these 16 million people going to go to get health care?

It bankrupts State budgets through Medicaid expansion. With 16 million new individuals enrolled in Medicaid, States will be on the hook for more Medicaid spending. In the short term, the Federal Government will pay for the expansion of Medicaid, but after 2017, States will have to pick up about 10 percent of the cost. Many States do not have the ability to do this; it will make it more difficult for them.

Medicare cuts jeopardize the care of our seniors. Medicare's costs continue to grow and the Medicare Trust Fund continues to be insolvent. So, to fix this problem, the majority cut over $500 billion from Medicare, but rather than using the savings to extend the program, they immediately spent it on expanding Medicaid and creating subsidies for the health insurance exchange. CMS reports 15 percent of hospitals will be unprofitable within 10 years just because of these cuts.

It creates an inequity against low-income workers. The employer mandate requires businesses to offer a health plan that meets with the approval of HHS. This will drive up the cost of health plans, and small businesses may not be able to afford a robust insurance plan. CMS' report further points out how many small businesses may cancel their plans because it is cheaper to pay the tax than to provide health insurance.

New regulations increase government control over health care. HHS gains an incredible amount of power under this bill. They will now have the power to dictate insurance policies, insurance prices, regulate the insurance market, and control benefits offered in your health care plan.

This bill obviously violates the Constitution in the fact that the Federal Government now is mandating that all U.S. citizens purchase a health care plan from a private company as a requirement for lawful residency in this country. This is an unprecedented extension of Federal power, and this is only the beginning. The health care bill was so big and so complex that now we are only learning about the problems and flaws in the law, such as its treatment of veteran health plans or weakening the Medicaid program for new lawsuits from trial lawyers.

We need to fix this bill and rein in all the controls and power that have been provided through this bill here in Washington.

IT'S TIME TO CUT WALL STREET DOWN TO SIZE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, as I speak here on the floor of the House, the Republicans on the Senate side of the Hill are still blocking meaningful financial reform, protecting their patrons on Wall Street as they always do, and the lords of Goldman Sachs are before a committee protesting their innocence.

Now, we all know that Goldman and these other firms on Wall Street were too big to fail, or at least some think they were—I think we should have let a few more of them fail, personally, and I opposed the bailout of Wall Street. But let's just say they were too big to fail or at least they were deemed too big to fail and they were bailed out by the United States Government and the taxpayers of the United States, but something else was going on at the same time.

Not only were they too big to fail, they had created wonderful, new financial products that were enriching them in unbelievable ways, making millions of dollars a day for the lords of Goldman and elsewhere on Wall Street. They had designed products that were designed to fail. Then they sold them after they went to the all-too-willing ratings firms, so-called ''impartial'' ratings firms.

Goldman would pay Moody's to rate garbage as caviar, AAA. Then they would go out and sell it to sophisticated investors who should have known

better. I mean, come on, they should have looked at it more carefully. I mean, well, yes, they did kind of mess around with it and they did get the people at Moody's by threatening to take away their business, to rate the garbage as caviar, but those other people should have smelled it and known really it was garbage. And, I mean, what's wrong with that?

And then of course, Goldman just did happen to place some bets of its own against the garbage—which they had created and knew was garbage, and they bet it was garbage—and they won, making billions of dollars for themselves and others who were in on the know here. This is a pretty rotten system.

Now, you could say, well, gee, but aren't they doing things like investing in capital? Aren't they building a great America? No. The financial services industry has gone from 19 percent of the profits in this country to 41 percent, and for the most part—outside of community banks and some people who still actually do banking, unlike most of those companies on Wall Street—they produced no value. They created a heck of a lot of wealth for themselves and others, and occasionally they caused the economy to explode and cost us millions of jobs.

But they're still doing very well for themselves and now they're back to business as usual. And the Republicans in the Senate are defending ''business as usual'' under the guise of wanting to have a better bill that won't encourage bailouts. I mean, this is all such a laughable farce. It would be funny except for the unbelievable pain it has caused to the real economy of this country who have been suffering for years.

It's time to cut these people down to size, cut them down to size by prosecuting them. I have been joined by 59 of my colleagues, and ELIJAH CUMMINGS and I have sent a letter to the SEC saying, look, you've uncovered one case of alleged fraud by the Securities and Exchange Commission where they knowingly sold a bad product to investors and then they bet against it themselves. There were a number of others that went through something called AIG, which the Federal Government also bailed out at the cost of $180 billion to taxpayers. We want every transaction between Goldman and AIG scrutinized to see whether or not any of those were similarly fraudulent transactions, in which case we could get a few billion dollars back from the lords of finance to the taxpayers on Main Street, USA.

It is long past time to begin these kinds of investigations and hopefully, ultimately—like with Enron, because this is worse than Enron—prosecutions. And we will let some of them enjoy some Federal hospitality for a few years.

This is absolutely outrageous. They're creating products designed to fail, that have no useful product, in fact robbing capital from companies who want to invest, who actually want to make things, who actually would employ Americans and who would enhance our economy, all for them to gamble on Wall Street. It's time for the gambling to stop.

You know, in a regular casino, if the casino goes broke, it's only the gamblers and the casino that have a problem. In the casino of Wall Street, when they mess up, they destroy the real economy of the United States and people's livelihoods. It's time to cut them down to size.

RESTORING JOB GROWTH IN AMERICA

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, the United States is on an unsustainable path right now, an unsustainable course with massive debt, trillion dollar deficits going into the out-years, unemployment approaching 10 percent, and this administration, since January of 2009, has enacted $670 billion in gross tax increases with more tax increases planned by this administration and the Democratic leadership of Congress. It's no wonder we have high unemployment and uncertainty all throughout this country with regard to the business climate.

So what can we do? How can we correct this course? How can we restore American competitiveness for the 21st century? Well, I think there are three things we can do. First, let's cut wasteful, massive government spending. Let's give the American public confidence that we can get our fiscal house in order. Let's send a signal to the bond markets and to our foreign allies and competitors that we can act responsibly. Let's lay out a path for entitlement reform, which is causing severe strain on the Federal budget and leading to this deficit spending. Just laying out a corrective path will send a positive signal.

Secondly, we can lower the corporate tax rate to make U.S. companies more competitive globally with regard to our trading competitors. Let's unleash American innovation. Let's get the American companies out there creating jobs again by lowering the tax rate for our corporations. Right now we have the second highest corporate tax rate in the world among industrialized countries. This makes us less competitive. This also means that companies that want to come to the United States and invest to create jobs here also have a high tax burden. So, therefore, if we want to create jobs, let's make this country competitive for investment coming in and for our companies going out to do investment. That's how we will restore job growth in this country.

Also, one of the things we need to do with regard to tax policy is to make sure that we don't doubly tax our companies who are trying to compete against foreign competitors abroad because our companies competing all over the globe also create American jobs. If we doubly tax ours on top of having the second highest corporate tax rate in the world, well, it's no wonder we're not seeing the kind of job growth that is necessary. We're not going to see U.S. companies and the U.S. be competitive in this global market.

And finally, the third thing: let's promote exports. Exports create jobs, good high-paying jobs. Now, the President has announced that his goal, his stated goal during the State of the Union, was to double exports by the U.S. over the next 5 years. Well, let's look at a little bit of history here for a moment. It took us 10 years previously to double exports. It required the completion of a round of negotiations at the WTO. It took implementation of NAFTA and 10 free trade agreements to be implemented to double exports. This administration has offered none of that so far.

We have, currently, three free trade agreements pending that have been negotiated in good faith, and yet this administration and this Democratic Congress has failed to implement these free trade agreements. These are a win for the United States because those countries are already bringing goods into our country; we just have barriers in exporting to theirs. Why not lift those barriers? Implementing these free trade agreements will create good high-paying U.S. jobs.

These three countries—Colombia, Panama, and South Korea—are markets that are ready for U.S. goods and services. So all we have to do is implement these agreements which have been negotiated in good faith. By failure to do this, what we're doing is sending a signal to our competitors and to other countries that the United States does not negotiate in good faith. That's a poor signal to send if we want to be competitive in this global market.

Meanwhile, those three countries I just mentioned, Colombia, Panama—let's just take Colombia, for instance. The European Union and Canada are both in the stages of implementing free trade agreements with Colombia. And what's happened? We've seen U.S. exports of agriculture products plummet just over the past year. At the same time, the European Union and Canada have also increased their exports to fill that gap. We are losing out. We are losing out on being able to export to Colombia simply because we won't keep our good faith negotiation and implement this agreement.

The President has announced a national export initiative, but yet there have been no substantive steps to move this forward. Why not implement a small business initiative to help our small businesses export to Colombia? That's an immediate way to create jobs.

IT'S TIME FOR MAIN STREET VALUES TO COME TO WASHINGTON

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

Mr. PERRIELLO. Madam Speaker, the time for backroom deals is over. The time for the Washington-Wall Street collusion that has put Main Street at risk and risked the pension funds and hard-earned retirement accounts of so many Americans, it is time for this to end.

How many loopholes is enough for the Republican Caucus in the Senate? We've had the entire Republican Senate Caucus join with the king of the Corn Husker Kickback to say, no, not enough loopholes, we need to water it down more, we need less accountability for Wall Street. That's not what the American people are saying. The American people are saying it's time to bring Main Street values of accountability, decency, and transparency to Washington and to Wall Street.

People want the banks to bank and let those who want to use risky, speculative gambling schemes to keep their hands off of the hard-earned retirement of those who have worked their entire lives to be able to settle in their later years. People have worked hard to do this, and yet we now see from the e-mail streams and the memos from Wall Street that they were all too giddy to risk all that people had earned to make a few more bucks on these schemes.

It's time to get back to an economic system built on building things and growing things that create jobs back on Main Street, living wage jobs that help people move from the working class up to the middle class at the core of the American dream. Yet standing in the way is a set of rules that seem to encourage the riskiest of behavior by the richest among us at the expense of those who are just trying to make it.

People aren't asking for punitive damages—except where people broke the law, in which case we need more, not less, of the kind of investigations that we've seen from the SEC. People are just saying, Why shouldn't Wall Street and Washington have to play by the same rules that all of us do back on Main Street? Yet that basic principle seems to be too much to ask of those on the other side of this building who will stop at nothing, stop at no mechanism to ensure that they continue to protect the backroom deals and the carve-outs and the loopholes for Wall Street.

We have a system that is based on the idea that if you work hard and play by the rules, you will be able to make it in this country. Well, people who worked hard and played by the rules had everything that they had saved for put at risk by tactics that never should have been allowed, but in the tight relationship between this town and Wall Street, we see too often that those basic principles, those Main Street values of decency, accountability, and fairness, are apparently too much to ask of too many in this town.

But we have a chance this week, we have a chance in the weeks ahead to finally draw a line in the sand and say, no, we've had too much of that erosion of values, we've had too much of that culture of instant gratification—I want it for me right now, regardless of the consequences to my country or the economy. It's time for that to end.

We have basic rules being offered that simply say decency, fairness, accountability say that you shouldn't be able to sell a product to people based on one thing and then bet against it so that you're taking their money through the back door, that the most powerful among us are able to exploit and take advantage of the everyday folks who have just worked hard and played by the rules to try to secure retirement.

How many loopholes is enough for Republicans and the king of the Corn Husker Kickback at the other side of this building? How many loopholes do they need before they're ready to proceed with debate? It is far past time to end the Wall Street-Washington collusion. It is far past time to bring those Main Street values back to the way we do business in this country because we can still build things and grow things in this country. We can build and grow our energy future. We can build and grow the great universities of broadband technology, the electric grid of the future. We can still out-innovate any country in the world.

But we need a system that rewards innovation and rewards following the rules instead of bailing out failure and collusion. That's the line in the sand we're trying to draw now. Those days are over of rewarding failure, of rewarding the backroom deals. It is time to reward innovation. It's time to reward that hard work of the farmer and the small business owner, where two out of every three new jobs in America will come from that small business owner.

So, instead of a system that's tilted entirely towards the biggest players, what about giving everyday Americans a chance, working class, middle class Americans, small business owners who have great ideas and understand the principle of following the rules? We have for too long had a system that has rewarded all the worst behaviors in Washington and Wall Street together. Now we have a chance. We have a moment to say rules of decency, accountability, and fairness.

But there are those in this building who say they will stop at nothing and use all means necessary to make sure that that debate never happens because they know that the more the American people understand about the derivative schemes and mortgage-backed securities and exotic mechanisms they came up with, the more they realize that it was just simply rich and powerful people gambling with their money and their retirement security.

That time is done. It is time for Main Street values to come to Washington.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

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

Lord God, by Your almighty power uphold our commitment to live according to Your revealed truths and the constitutional law of this great country. Let freedom flourish in the lives of Your people who seek justice and prove themselves trustworthy. Shape virtuous leadership in government of the people. Remove fear from their minds and depression from their spirits. May this body prove creative in facing our problems, be decisive in seeking the whole truth; as it leads Your people to greater security and peace both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MCNERNEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

HONORING WESLEY RAYMOND STUART

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Wesley Raymond Stuart, a true American patriot who made the ultimate sacrifice in service to our great Nation.

In 1943, Wesley joined the United States Navy as an aviation ordnanceman second class, and was trained on Avenger bombers. On September 13, 1944, an Avenger took off from the USS Enterprise with a three-

man crew aboard, including Petty Officer Stuart. The crew was bound for battle over the Japanese-occupied South Pacific island of Peleliu. Shortly after takeoff, the aircraft was shot down by enemy fire, leaving no survivors. Although the wreckage of Petty Officer Stuart's aircraft was later recovered, he is still considered missing in action.

After 60 years, the family of Petty Officer Stuart continues its commitment to keeping his memory alive. I join their efforts by recognizing the bravery and sacrifice of this American hero.

CREDIBILITY GAP

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, we are seeing a growing credibility gap here in Washington. Democrats are saying one thing and doing something else. It started with the trillion dollar stimulus plan that was rushed through with promises that it would create jobs immediately and keep unemployment below 8 percent. Today unemployment is near 10 percent, and Americans are still asking, ''Where are the jobs?'' Americans were also promised a war on deficits, but all that's happened is we have piled more debt on the backs of our kids and grandkids.

Then we have the trillion dollar government takeover of health care that was forced through with promises that it would lower costs. But it turns out the new law will actually increase costs for taxpayers and patients. This comes from an analysis by the Obama administration's Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. CMS determined that the new law will increase what the Nation spends on health care over the next 10 years by $311 billion. The President claimed that this government takeover of health care was the single most important thing that we can do to address our deficits. But now it turns out it is just going to make matters worse.

Just think about that credibility gap when you see the majority insist on rushing through a job-killing regulatory bill with promises that it will end Wall Street bailouts. The bill doesn't end Wall Street bailouts; it makes them permanent and institutionalizes ''too big to fail.'' This bill doesn't get the government out of the private sector; it creates a Politburo-style council of regulators who can seize any business and do almost anything they want to do with it. And the bill doesn't address the real reasons for the financial meltdown. It gives a free ride to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the government mortgage companies that started this crisis.

Americans were promised a new Washington. Instead, it's just more of the same: more spending, more government, and more empty promises. I think it's time we start listening to the American people. Let's work together on commonsense solutions to end the bailouts, reform Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and hold Wall Street accountable. Let's work together to repeal this government takeover of health care and replace it with commonsense reforms that will lower the cost of health care. Let's work to ban earmarks and stop out-of-control spending. And most importantly, let's work on commonsense solutions that will help small businesses create the kind of jobs that Americans are looking for.

SUPPORT THE SUMMITVILLE PROCUREMENT PROTECTION ACT OF 2010

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

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this week I introduced the Summitville Procurement Protection Act of 2010. This legislation will improve the Federal subcontracting process.

Here is the problem: Federal Acquisition Regulation holds the government to transparent reporting standards as it hires prime contractors, but it does not hold those prime contractors to the same standards when they hire subs. This is a complete lack of oversight.

A company in my district, Summitville Tiles, was denied the opportunity to present a formal bid precisely because of this problem. My legislation would level the playing field and require that prime contractors meet five sections of the Federal Acquisition Regulation as they hire subs. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

CMS REPORT

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

Mr. CANTOR. At the start of the health care debate last year, President Obama made two critical promises. He assured the American people that his bill would, number one, lower costs, and that if they liked the coverage they had they could keep it. On the first count, an independent CMS report released last week states that health care costs will skyrocket under this bill by an astounding $311 billion over the next 10 years. That's more than the previous estimate for each individual bill passed in the House and Senate.

And if you like what you have, you truly may not be able to keep it. Even care for our seniors is jeopardized. The CMS report warns that Medicare cuts may trigger a flight of hospitals and other health care providers from participation in Medicare. It also states that 50 percent of the seniors participating in Medicare Advantage are set to lose their coverage.

The American people deserve better, Mr. Speaker, and that's why we need to repeal the $1 trillion government overhaul of health care and replace it with a bill that makes lowering costs the first priority.

FEDERAL ACTION NEEDED ON IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an important issue facing our country, and that's the issue of immigration. The lack of Federal action and the failure of the Federal Government to establish the rule of law has completely and utterly failed so severely that States are trying to take Federal law into their own hands.

On the right you have States like Arizona, which has passed a law that allows for racial and ethnic profiling. On the left you have States contending with whether they issue driver's licenses or in-state tuition to our growing undocumented population.

This is a Federal failure. It is our failure. Congress needs to act now. We should not have 10 million, 15 million, 20 million undocumented immigrants in our country. It strains law enforcement, undermines wages for our working families, and is a very real security threat.

I am a proud cosponsor of comprehensive immigration reform in the House. Bipartisan efforts are also underway in the Senate. I urge my colleagues to join me in demanding comprehensive immigration reform now.

REPEAL OBAMACARE

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

Mr. PENCE. Well, after months of debate and assurances that their government takeover of health care would actually result in lowering the cost of health care for Americans, the truth landed with a thud last Thursday. A new report from the Obama administration's own Medicare agency confirms what we have known all along: the President and congressional Democrats passed a health care law without any idea how to pay for it.

They promised to lower the cost of health care, but instead ObamaCare will send those costs soaring by $311 billion. Again, this is from their own analysts within the administration. The same report says some of the ways Democrats set out to pay for the bill are unsustainable, and some of the methods they used to control costs are, quote, ''negligible''.

The reality is that we need to repeal ObamaCare and replace it with the kind of health care reform that will lower the cost of health care without growing the size of government. And House Republicans are determined to be on the side of the American people until we do just that.

UNIVERSAL ACCREDITATION

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month we witnessed the tragedy of an inter-country adoption gone wrong when a 7-year-old boy was forced back, alone, to Russia. Last year over 12,000 children from around the world were adopted by American families, yet only a fraction of these adoptions were processed by accredited adoption agencies. The others occurred under an unregulated process that may not have the best interests of the families or the child in mind.

Just over 2 years ago, the United States became a full member of the Hague Convention on Inter-Country Adoption. Under the Convention, the United States requires that inter-country adoption service providers be accredited to improve transparency and accountability. Unfortunately, these rules only apply to adoptions from countries that have signed the Convention. Adoption agencies who work for non-Convention countries do not need to meet the accreditation requirements, and these agencies continue to conduct unregulated adoptions, creating a double standard for the treatment of children and families.

We must strengthen the adoption practices by requiring accreditation for all countries' adoption service providers. Universal accreditation will create an adoption process that is lawful, safe for the child, and respectful to the families involved.

CMS CHIEF ACTUARY'S ANALYSIS ON EFFECTS OF THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of the House told the National Association of Counties a while back that Congress needed to pass the health care bill so we could find out what's in it. Well, we are finding out now.

The Chief Actuary for the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services is the independent scorekeeper of legislation like this. Their report that they just issued said half of all seniors in America who are on Medicare Advantage plans, half, are going to lose that coverage under the bill that was signed into law.

Well, that's a big problem for seniors in Oregon. Oregon has had one of the highest penetration rates in the United States of seniors who wanted Medicare Advantage and signed up for it. I was out in Ontario, Oregon, not long ago, and the seniors there raised their hands and said, ''Why are they taking away the Medicare Advantage I have?'' We now know under this independent evaluation half of them will lose that care, 38,000 seniors in my district alone.

We need to repeal and replace this law that was jammed through this Congress, Mr. Speaker.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. BACA. Yesterday I urged all Americans to boycott the State of Arizona until this law is appealed. This law is unjust. It will only lead to the increase of racial profiling and hate crimes in the State, especially towards Hispanics.

This is a violation of the fourth and 14th amendment in the United States Constitution. It does not require local police officers to have a warrant. This new law will create a divide between people who are asked for legal documents and those who are not. This law will create distrust between police and the communities they protect. This law is backwards, and sets us back in time.

I urge Americans show their support of the boycott and wear a red, yellow, and blue wristband. This is an unjust law and must be overturned, and an example of why we need comprehensive immigration reform.

□ 1215

THE DEBATE OVER HEALTH CARE REFORM IS ALIVE AND WELL

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, while some may believe that the debate over health care is behind us, the report that we received last week, which stated very clearly that this administration had determined that we would see a $311 billion increase—increase—in health care costs over the next decade, was completely counter to what we and the American people were promised. We were promised that there would, in fact, be savings. So I think that, with this report, it is very clear that the debate continues to be alive and well.

Mr. Speaker, we need to take a step-by-step approach, ensuring that people can have access to insurance products across State lines and ensuring that meaningful lawsuit abuse reform takes place. Small businesses should be able to come together to buy at lower rates. We should have pooling to deal with preexisting conditions, and we should expand medical savings accounts.

Those five things, Mr. Speaker, will go a long way towards decreasing costs to ensure that every American will have access to quality, affordable health insurance.

SUPPORT WALL STREET REFORM

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, we need Wall Street reform. The collapse in the value of securities as a result of Wall Street's conduct caused our Nation's economic crisis. While Americans struggle to find work and to pay their mortgages, Wall Street continues to pay huge bonuses and to focus only on their profits.

Janet Orcutt of Kailua, Oahu, shared her story with me recently. Last August, Janet's son-in-law lost his job in this bad economy. This led to her daughter and son-in-law losing their home. Now her daughter, son-in-law, and 5-year-old grandson live with Janet and her two teenage children. With everyone living with them, Janet and her husband have had additional costs, which they charge to their credit cards. Each month, they fall farther behind.

Janet said, ''We middle-income Americans are suffering while powerful Wall Street financial companies lobby against financial reform.''

I share Janet's anger. Without reform, the current system will continue to harm the well-being of families like Janet's. The House has passed Wall Street reform. It is high time that the Senate does likewise.

THE NEW HEALTH CARE LAW FAILS ON ALL COUNTS

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, remember when we were told the whole point of the new health care bill was to lower health care costs and to insure all Americans? Well, the CMS, under the control of the Obama administration, estimates that the law fails on all counts.

Twenty million Americans who currently can't afford health care will be forced under duress to buy a product or will face fines in IRS action. Four million Americans still will not be able to buy health insurance, and they will pay $33 billion in fines. Fourteen million will lose their employer-sponsored health care insurance. Twenty-three million Americans will still have no health care coverage in 2019. Twenty-one percent of the gross domestic product will be spent on health care after this law is implemented, which is much higher than if the Congress had done nothing.

You have to wonder: When did we know all of this, and why didn't we know about it before the vote was taken?

THE CONE OF SILENCE

(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, after the collapse on Wall Street and after the multiple abuses, the American people are very disappointed that one party in the Senate is filibustering so that we can't move forward to have a bipartisan Wall Street reform bill.

The Republicans' filibuster kind of reminds me of the old ''Get Smart'' show where they had the Cone of Silence. When they wanted to keep a secret so that nobody knew about the secret, they brought down the Cone of Silence. That's what the Republicans want to do about Wall Street reform. They want a Cone of Silence over the Senate so that nobody knows whose side everybody is on.

We are on the side of the American people to have aggressive Wall Street reform. The people who are over there who are filibustering are on the side of Wall Street. They want the Cone of Silence so that people won't know that they're standing up for their friends on Wall Street. That is wrong.

You know, maybe the answer ''no'' is the right answer to some things, but it isn't the right answer to Wall Street reform. End the filibuster. Get a vote. Let's tame Wall Street the way it ought to be regulated.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we are being told today by our friends, the Democrats, to trust Washington and to trust them. Yet the Obama-Pelosi legislation which passed this House earlier last year promised that, if Congress passed the $787 billion stimulus package, national unemployment would never rise above 8 percent. Today, the national unemployment is 9.7 percent and is hovering near a 25-year high.

I think it is time for the American people to recognize that the answers do not all reside here in Washington, D.C., but that we need to take care of our business. Our business should not be about trying to do a lot of things to a lot of other people but to focus on jobs for this country. Jobs are the number one issue. Jobs are the things which will spur the American entrepreneurship and the creativity that will allow us to be competitive with the world.

Where are the jobs?

SUPPORT 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 strong support of Wall Street reform.

Wall Street shenanigans led us to this recession, and if not for having the taxpayers bail them out, these shenanigans would have melted down our entire financial system, all while Wall Street made hundreds of billions of dollars for themselves.

Last December, the House of Representatives responded by passing commonsense Wall Street reform. It would protect families and small businesses from predatory loans, from indecipherable fine print, and from other industry gimmicks. It would end taxpayer-funded bailouts and too-big-to-fail banks. It would impose tough new laws on the riskiest Wall Street practices that got us into this mess in the first place.

House Democrats voted ''yes'' on Wall Street reform, but unfortunately, Republicans all voted ''no.'' Yesterday, their Senate colleagues again voted ''no,'' this time even to start an open and honest debate.

It is time to stop the obstructionism and to let the debate begin. If Senate Republicans have problems with the bill, make them known in public. Offer amendments. Take votes. Show us where you stand—with Main Street or with Wall Street.

HEALTH CARE TAKEOVER INCREASES COSTS

(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, last week, the administration's own report released by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services confirmed that the government health care takeover will increase costs, will hurt seniors, and will put employers in a position to drop employee coverage. This is not what the American people wanted when it came to health care reform.

According to the CMS report, national health care costs will increase by $311 billion over the next 10 years, and this increase will force millions of seniors off of their current Medicare coverage. This information was released over a month after the health care takeover was rushed through Congress. Clearly, Congress needed to wait to vote on this legislation after the report was released.

It is time for us to come together to repeal the government health care takeover and to swap it for patient-centered, affordable health insurance reform that expands access and that continues to cover preexisting conditions.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

WHOSE SIDE ARE YOU ON?

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

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, everyone in Wisconsin wants to know the answer to the question: Whose side are you on?

Yesterday, the partisans in the United States Senate voted to return to the good old days—to the good old days of unregulated financial markets, of voodoo economics on Wall Street, and of the continuing deregulation of big banks on Wall Street.

We cannot afford to go back to the losing policies of the Bush administration when Wall Street was allowed to consume the wealth of an entire generation. People in Wisconsin believe if you're too big to fail, then you should not exist. People in Wisconsin know that we are on their side and that, when Wall Street innovates, Main Street pays the price.

We have got to work hard together to catch all of the crooks and to follow their trails wherever they may lead. We have to make certain that we balance our budgets, that we live within our means, and that we rewrite our financial regulations to make things fair for people on Main Street. That's what we have to do together.

ARIZONA ACTS BECAUSE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REFUSES TO ACT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, because the Federal Government refuses to secure the border, States like Arizona have become desperate to solve the crisis. Arizona has a new illegal immigration law that is causing some heartburn for the open borders crowd. The new law makes being in Arizona without proof of legal status a crime. The consequences range from a misdemeanor to a felony depending on whether one is a repeat offender, is trafficking drugs, or is smuggling human beings.

The open borders lobby doesn't want the laws they don't like enforced, so they protested outside the Arizona State capitol building when the Governor signed the bill into law. They were caught on video pelting police with rocks and bottles. One even assaulted a cameraman. The inconsistent national media calls the peaceful TEA Party people fringe terrorists, but the violent pro-illegal immigration rock throwers get a pass.

No matter how the open borders media crowd spins these rowdy demonstrations, entering this country illegally is still against the law. The Federal Government should do its job and secure the border. That is what they are supposed to do.

And that's just the way it is.

THE CMS REPORT IS GOOD NEWS FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that our Republican colleagues have brought up the CMS report because, while they try to proclaim that this is some kind of revelation, what it actually verifies is what we've been saying all along, which is that we will expand the coverage in this country, not by the 30 million people, which was originally projected, but now by 34 million people. For a 1 percent increase in our total health care costs, which is something that we always said we were going to do, we are going to insure 11 percent more of the population. That's a pretty good deal.

Yet there was another big surprise in that CMS report, not just that we are going to insure more people than we thought, but that we will extend the life of Medicare's trust fund, not just by 9 years as we thought, but now by 12 years—all the way to 2029.

Yes, there was some news in the CMS report. It is good news for the American people; it is good news for Medicare, and it is good news for the Democratic Congress, which did this great service for the American people.

A NEW REPORT SHEDS LIGHT ON EFFECTS OF HEALTH CARE TAKEOVER

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we got some interesting news from the Obama administration's own number crunchers last week. Though it comes as no surprise to those who opposed the government takeover of health care, which became law last month, we learned that this takeover increases national health care spending by $311 billion. Plus, the Federal actuaries reported that 18 million taxpayers will be socked with $33 billion in fines for not purchasing government-approved health care.

In direct contradiction to President Obama's promise of, if you like your plan, you can keep it, the report stated that half of the 14.8 million seniors who enjoy Medicare Advantage will be forced to leave the program due to lower benefits. That means about 20,000 in my district alone will likely lose their plans.

Too bad we didn't have this detailed report before the government takeover became law, but as the saying goes: Better late than never.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL VA RESEARCH WEEK

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

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, this week is National VA Research Week, recognizing 85 years of VA medical research. Since 1925, the VA has led the way in cutting-edge medical research, turning ideas into discoveries and into innovations which have improved the quality of life for generations of our military veterans.

Many Americans may not realize that some of medical science's greatest achievements have been as the result of research conducted at the VA. The CAT scan and the cardiac pacemaker are but two of the trailblazing innovations made possible through VA-funded research.

Today, the VA is the worldwide leader in important medical research, such as in the diagnosis and treatment of traumatic brain injuries and of neuroprosthetic technologies related to amputations and to spinal cord injuries of our brave wounded warriors.

So, this week, as we celebrate the pioneers of the past 85 years, let us also recognize today's VA researchers, who are leading the way to finding the medical breakthroughs of tomorrow.

□ 1230

DAY OF PRAYER

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

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, Governor Haley Barbour has proclaimed today as a Day of Prayer in my home State of Mississippi to remember Mississippians who suffered devastating losses of life and property in Saturday's horrific tornadoes and for those families who lost loved ones in last week's oil rig explosion.

One of the tornadoes was an EF4 that left a path of destruction across Mississippi. Communities have come together to comfort families, clear debris, and accumulate what personal possessions could be found.

Equally, Mississippians are experiencing grief in reaction to the drilling incident in the Gulf of Mexico. As neighbors and families mourn, we are reminded of the character of Mississippians in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina.

Today I join folks from across Mississippi in praying for those families affected. I commend Governor Haley Barbour for his leadership and for appropriately designating today as the Day of Prayer.

Though tragic, neither of these events will break the spirit of Mississippi and her people. Our people will persevere.

IN SUPPORT OF ELIMINATION OF PAY RAISE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS DURING FISCAL YEAR 2011

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, later today the House will consider legislation to stop the automatic pay raise for Members of Congress during this fiscal year. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill because I believe strongly that Members of Congress should not receive a pay raise when so many families in Nevada are struggling with job loss, homes that are under water, and uncertainty about their economic future.

Unemployment in my district has reached record levels, the highest in 25 years. Families are tightening their belts and too many hardworking Nevadans are desperate to find a job. It would be unconscionable during this time of economic hardship for Members of Congress to receive an automatic pay raise. Our action today will send a message to the American people that we are changing the way that business is done in Washington and we are serious about putting our economy on the path to recovery and restoring economic security for all Americans.

THE DEMOCRATS' HEALTH CARE BILL

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, in case there's any doubt about the new report released by CMS this week, the report says it all. The Democrats' health care bill fails to provide the reform taxpayers deserve and expected. In fact, the report clearly states that the health care spending will go up by $310 billion over the next 10 years and that the new long-term care CLASS Program poses serious risk of being unsustainable.

This is just another example of the Federal Government's creating yet another unsustainable program and failing to empower the American people. We have set ourselves up for more spending, more burdens that we simply cannot afford, while taking away benefits from seniors and disabled Americans who need them most.

While Republicans offered positive solutions to tackle the spending, Democrats created a massive new government-run health care plan that hurts the economy, interferes with patient choices, and does nothing to bring down the cost of health care.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better than that.

PASS FINANCIAL REGULATORY REFORM

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, it's not even 3 years since Bear Stearns landed flat on its back, that Lehman Brothers landed flat on its back, that AIG contributed to a destruction of our economy which resulted in the destruction of $17 trillion of the household wealth of the American people.

We have spent the last year assembling a commonsense, market-oriented

package of reforms, bringing derivatives onto exchanges, creating an agency which prevents mortgage brokers from selling mortgages to American families that that broker knows can't possibly be repaid.

Yet the other side is saying ''no,'' saying ''no'' to the kind of commonsense reform that will restore Americans' faith in their system, make them comfortable investing in America. Yesterday in the other body, a big step back was taken.

The time is now if we are to be serious about addressing the crisis that this country is only now emerging from for this House to set aside partisanship and pass financial regulatory reform.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my deep concern over the rising tide of unemployment across America and particularly in my home State of West Virginia. In my State, the unemployment rate has risen now to over 10 percent with some counties reaching well over 12 percent.

Beyond these staggering figures, we must take a moment to pause and ask ourselves, are the policies we're pushing through this Congress creating real job growth? Absolutely not.

Sadly, we all know a family member, a friend, a colleague who has lost their job and is struggling to get back on their feet. The so-called stimulus bill, along with numerous so-called jobs bills, has failed to produce the jobs that the administration and the Democrats in this Congress promised. And worse yet, the policies of this administration are actually causing job loss in my State.

Instead we should be enacting policies that get Americans back to work and awaken Main Street across our country.

Mr. Speaker, at a time of increasing unemployment for American families, we must keep repeating, where are the jobs?

WE NEED TO PASS FINANCIAL REFORM

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, we need to pass financial reform, and it's time for Republicans to stop standing in the way.

When I'm home in Connecticut and talk to my neighbors and constituents, I never hear anybody disagree with me about the need to reform Wall Street. Their retirement account statements are all the proof that they need that Wall Street played a hand that was too dangerous for their own good.

We need to make sure that our financial system does what it does best: help get money from investors to businesses so that they can innovate and expand. When Wall Street sticks to this mission, we all win.

But over the last decade, much of Wall Street became a Las Vegas casino, with our money—our mortgages, our investments, and pensions—being used as casino chips in trading schemes that added no value to our economy.

Wall Street needs to get back to what it's good at, and it's time for Republicans to stop standing in the way and join us so that we can lock the door together.

RECOGNIZING AUTISM AWARENESS MONTH

(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, April is Autism Awareness Month, and I call for increased research into and treatment for this leading developmental disorder.

Autism impacts more of our children every day, and it is becoming exceptionally prevalent in our American society. The number of American families who must learn to cope with autism is growing every day. An estimated one out of every 110 children born in the United States are now diagnosed with autism.

We have got to invest in the research that will allow us to better understand and to treat this serious disorder. For individuals already living with autism and those children who will be diagnosed this year, we must make this a priority. Autism's hold on our families, our children, and our country must be broken.

I look forward to the day when children diagnosed with this developmental disorder can live full and healthy lives. Let's pass this bill before us today.

CONGRATULATING NORTHWEST PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGIATE ACADEMY

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

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer congratulations to the Northwest Pennsylvania Collegiate Academy of Erie, Pennsylvania, on their second straight victory at the United States Academic Decathlon.

On Saturday, Collegiate Academy's nine-member Academic Decathlon team won the Division II small school title and placed sixth out of 40 schools overall at the competition in Omaha.

The students showcased their knowledge in 10 subjects: music, art, language and literature, science, history, economics, essay, interview, speech, and math.

Coach Colleen Holmes led these bright students to victory and helped four team members—Rachel Vandevert, Bronte Seath, Stan Tuznik, and Reeve Hunsaker—earn individual medals at the competition. Sean Carney, Ben Engel, John Luke Galla, Cullen Skinner, and Rose Heid rounded out this champion team.

On behalf of the United States House of Representatives, congratulations to Northwest Pennsylvania Collegiate Academy's Academic Decathlon team on this great victory and on your future successes.

HEALTH CARE BILL'S COSTS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, each day I am more convinced that I was right to oppose the health care reform bill that was pushed through this Congress last month.

All along Republicans questioned how it's possible to increase Medicaid enrollees and cut costs at the same time. And lo and behold, we were right. The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, or CMS, recently concluded that implementing this bill means health care will be 21 percent of our GDP in 2019, up from 16 percent today. Taxpayers will be forced to spend $410 billion to expand Medicaid to 20 million new beneficiaries, and that's only at the Federal level. That doesn't count the State level spending, in which my home State of Texas has been estimated to incur a $24 billion unfunded mandate over 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, there's a better way to provide access to quality, affordable health care for all Americans. We should repeal and replace the bloated government plan with one that makes sense. The American people deserve no less.

THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION AGENCY

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, last week I met with a small business owner from Concord, Massachusetts, who showed me several months of his credit card statements. Due to a 1-day late payment after years of on-time payments, his credit card company increased his interest rate by 15 percent, informing him that because of the increase, he will pay off his balance in 2,820 years.

Thanks to the Credit CARD Act, such abuses are now illegal but only after more than a decade of trying to move these bipartisan and commonsense reforms through Congress.

In response to the law, credit card companies are already devising new ways to exploit their customers, trusting in Congress' inability to respond quickly.

The Consumer Financial Protection Agency will give small business owners like my constituent an advocate that can respond to shady practices as they evolve. Groups like the AARP have endorsed the idea of a strong Consumer Financial Protection Agency because it will be able to stand up for the little guy against the giants who have been able to set their own rules.

''SNITCH TAX''

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, the biggest issue on the minds of the American people is jobs. So imagine my surprise when I took another look at the so-called health care reform bill and found a provision which is just another job-killer provision.

Beginning in 2012 under section 9006 of the Obama care bill, any company, large or small, that purchases more than $600 worth of goods or services from any corporation during the previous year will be required now to file a 1099 with the government and with that company. That means you have to keep track of all the food that you buy, the paint that you buy, the secretarial supplies that you buy, and then you have to give this information to the government. Not because of any obligation on your part to pay something but on the part of the other individual.

The assumption is that everybody else cheats, and so what this is, is nothing more than a universal snitch tax. It requires all Americans to give up information on somebody else.

Repeal this nonsense. Get rid of this burden. Save small business, and cosponsor H.R. 5141.

WE MUST PASS FINANCIAL REFORM

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, a little over 2 years ago, our Nation walked to the precipice. Many Americans are perhaps unaware of the fact that we were very, very close not to a major recession but a depression. And for this body to pass financial reform was, I think, one of the better things we have done.

For financial reform to remain on the table over in the Senate is just abominable. Many people were out trying to survive during this crisis and still losing money, still losing homes.

We saw Wall Street playing around with derivatives that many of them didn't even understand. They hired physicists to actually describe what would happen with the derivatives. So if we don't do financial reform, we're going to leave the American public vulnerable.

We have got to do it. We have got to establish a Financial Consumer Protection Agency and we need to do it now.

DEFENDING ISRAEL

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, as a Nation, one of our strongest allies in the Middle East is Israel. For decades we have stood with this free and democratic state as it has been assaulted. We have always respected the right of Israel to defend itself and to build for itself a stronger nation.

But now our President is causing problems for our ally. The President takes offense at the bureaucratic approval of settlements. But these are not settlements deep in the heart of the West Bank. They are in their capital, Jerusalem. East Jerusalem is an area where half the Jewish population of the capital city currently resides. Prime Minister Netanyahu has made clear: This is an area that will be part of Israel in any peace settlement considered.

In just a few weeks, Israel will celebrate its 62nd year as an independent nation. The United States was the first to stand and recognize Israel on the day of their independence, and since that time we have remained close allies. Let's not let this close relationship move apart. The President should stop giving the cold shoulder to our friends in Israel.

THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, April 24 marked the 95th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Last Saturday I participated with the Armenian community in Fresno to commemorate this horrific tragedy.

I, once again, call upon this body to pass the Armenian genocide resolution. In my remarks before the Foreign Affairs Committee markup of House Resolution 252, I indicated that historians have clearly documented this event. Back home, as I grew up, my Armenian friends told me of the stories of the systematic approach to eliminate the Armenian communities from their farms, their homes, and their lives. It was the first genocide of the 20th Century. They believe it and so do I.

Theodore Roosevelt once wrote: ''The Armenian massacre was the greatest crime of World War I, and the failure to act against Turkey is to condone it.''

No one holds modern-day Turkey responsible for the past sins of the Ottoman Empire, but they should recognize their history, apologize, and move on to establish diplomatic relationships with Armenia.

There is never a right time to recognize the genocide. We cannot wait around for a convenient time. I urge we pass this resolution.

□ 1245

JOBS ACT

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it's another 3-day work week for Congress, and there is still nothing on the agenda to spur the economy and to incentivize growth. Job creation remains the top concern of the American people. Shouldn't it be a priority of Congress as well? With 15 million unemployed Americans, it is negligent not to prioritize job creation in the private sector today. Through my JOBS Act, H.R. 4100, we can empower small businesses by reducing their tax burden and provide relief to the lowest two individual income brackets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to seriously consider my legislation or any other bills that put people back to work and provide lasting solutions to the problems facing our economy.

IN MEMORY OF AUTRY LAMONT BATTLES

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

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a life well lived—the life of Autry Lamont Battles, who passed away on April 15 of this year. Mr. Battles was born in Los Angeles, where he was known for his sense of humor, caring for others, his faith in God, and his talent for cooking. This led him to a fulfilling career in the restaurant and catering business, a job that allowed him to share his love for food and for meeting new people. He came into my life when he was caregiving for a lifelong friend of mine. He said, I just love your mother. She just turned 100 years old, and he was going to prepare the meal for 300 guests. However, his illness did not allow him to do it.

So I want to honor Mr. Battles today for living among us—a good and decent American, who will certainly be missed because he reached out to others and was more caring about others than he was of himself. So we lost him, but I just want to pay tribute to him for a life well lived.

PASSAGE OF PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, here in Washington, in these hallowed Halls, we have the power to do many things. At times, it might appear as if there is no riddle so complex that the careful arrangement of words on a paper cannot overcome it. Indeed, the very rationale behind the Patient Protection and Affordable Health Care Act was to

solve forever the Gordian knot of equality in our citizens' access to health care. Yet, for all its words, commands, prescriptions, and boards in the bill, Richard Foster, the chief actuary of CMS, has laid bare an essential truth about these mandates. Mr. Speaker, they have consequences. On page 10 of his recent report, Mr. FOSTER states unequivocally that this bill will make hospitals, long-term care facilities, and other part A providers unprofitable.

It's clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that while we in Washington can pass words on paper that guarantee all Americans health care, that the doctors and hospitals throughout America may not be around long enough to provide them care. More jobs, Mr. Speaker, lost to wrong-headed policies being forced upon the American people by this majority.

MOVE AHEAD ON HEALTH CARE BILL

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

Mr. WELCH. We have a debate on health care, but the fundamental question that we face is whether we were going to stick with the status quo or we were going to put a stake in the ground to have a health care system where all are covered and all help pay. We did this, unfortunately, without bipartisan support. The question we now have is making this work. The status quo was broken. We're spending two, three times the rate of inflation, the rate of wage growth. Our businesses can't afford it. We spend more and get less, with 45 million Americans uninsured. Now, folks want to repeal it. That includes provisions where your child can be on your health care policy until age 26; where the doughnut hole is going to finally be closed so seniors can get the prescription drugs they need; where folks who need preventive care and long-term care are going to have access to the care that they need; where there won't be a lifetime cap on coverage, so that if you get really sick and need that, you're going to be able to get access to it.

So now the debate is: Are we going to improve this health care system and this health care bill, and do it together, or are we going to repeal it? I say: move ahead.

WHAT'S IN THE HEALTH CARE BILL

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, during the recent health debate, the Speaker ominously said, We have to pass the bill so you can find out what is in it. Well, they passed the bill, and now we're finding out what's in it.

They told us it would keep costs down. Well, now they admit health costs will soar $311 billion, increasing to 21 percent of GDP by 2019.

They told us, If you like your plan, you can keep it. Well, now they admit that seniors on Medicare Advantage could lose their plans. Companies that offer health plans to their employees and retirees are now considering dropping them.

They told us it would be good for the economy. Now they admit employers were correct to downgrade their earnings by billions of dollars that ultimately will come out of employees' wages and benefits.

This issue is not going away. It will continue to plague those responsible until they replace it or until they themselves are replaced.

WALL STREET REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. The Republicans always want to dwell on distractions, but I believe that the American people are waiting for the health care reform bill to be implemented—and that it will. And it will save lives. But why are the Republicans standing on the side of big business and big companies too big to fail? Now we need the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to be able to respond to America's cry for honesty and integrity on Wall Street.

Right now, one of the biggest Wall Street casinos, Goldman Sachs, is testifying. And I don't know whether they can find the facts to be able to defend atrocious acts causing millions of Americans to lose money. I personally know of a small business that they literally destroyed because they were unwilling to look at ways of allowing that business to survive. And so the $14 million of net worth loss, $22 million decline in net worth, and 2.2 million in homes lost is because of the lack of integrity on Wall Street.

Pass the legislation that will end bailouts; protect families' retirement funds; college savings; homes and businesses; protect consumers; and, yes, inject transparency. Goldman Sachs, what is your answer to the question?

WITH AMERICA AT A CROSSROADS, IT IS TIME TO LISTEN TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, time and again during health care debate, the American people were told that the health care bill would lower costs, and Republicans continually argued that the big government takeover of our health care would actually increase the cost to taxpayers. Well, who was right? The nonpartisan Office of the Actuary at the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services has released its analysis of the new health care law, and the results are very telling, Mr. Speaker.

The actuaries are reporting that the new law will increase health care costs over the next 10 years by $311 billion, which was much more than the original estimates to both the House and the Senate bills. Published reports have indicated that this report, incredibly, was submitted to the Secretary of Health and Human Services more than a week before the final vote in the House. But that information, of course, was not shared with—at least on the Republican side—Members of Congress or the American people. So much for most open and transparent administration in history and so much for providing the American people with real health care reform that would help lower costs.

America is at a crossroads, Mr. Speaker, in this difficult economy. While the American people spoke out very loudly that they did not want a government health care takeover, Democrats refused to listen.

BUILDING A RECOVERY RIGHT FOR AMERICA

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

Ms. SUTTON. Congressional Republicans threaten to take us back to the failed policies that created the economic crisis, siding with special interest, Wall Street banks, credit card companies, Big Oil, and insurance companies. These Bush economic and fiscal policies created the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression, with job losses of nearly 800,000 a month, and nearly doubled our national debt. Democrats in Congress are working to create American jobs and a strong new foundation for our economy, protecting Main Street and the middle class, not siding with the insurance companies and Wall Street.

This week's news provides evidence that American families are beginning to feel some effects of an economy headed in a better direction. USA Today headlines read: ''Economists say recovery looks stronger than expected.'' Bloomberg says: ''Companies in U.S. plan to increase employment, survey shows.'' The New York Times says: ''From the mall to the docks, signs of rebound.''

No matter how much they try to side with Wall Street, Democrats will side with the American people and build a recovery and an economy that will work for them.

RAIDING MEDICARE HURTS OUR SENIORS

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, last week, the nonpartisan Centers for

Medicare & Medicaid Services released an actuarial report that shows that the President's new health care law will increase health care costs over and above what was expected; premiums for families and small businesses will rise beyond what was expected; and access to a physician will suffer for many, many Americans. They also showed that the $500 billion in indiscriminate cuts to Medicare to pay for a new entitlement is a very deep cut that will hurt access to care for many of our seniors. Half of all seniors in the Medicare Advantage program will lose their current coverage. I have 140,000 seniors in my State of Louisiana who depend on Medicare Advantage in rural areas for access to a doctor. They're going to lose that kind of coverage that gives them that valued access to the physician of their choice.

This bill, this law, fails to lower costs. It creates red tape and bureaucracy, and it really does nothing to enhance quality for most Americans.

FROM HEALTH CARE REFORM TO WALL STREET REFORM

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, you've got to give it to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle. They are incredibly consistent. They have sided with the big pharmaceutical industry and the insurance industry. Sadly, they lost that debate, but they want to revisit it with the changes we made in health care and some of the outrageous health insurance practices we outlawed, like preexisting condition exclusions, rescissions of your policy when you get sick, and nonrenewal when you get sick.

But they're also fighting to change the subject here, because they're also trying to stop the reform on Wall Street. Their biggest patrons are the pharmaceutical industry, the insurance industry, and Wall Street. And they just want to protect the status quo for those folks.

Over on the other side of the Hill, the Republicans in the Senate are blocking financial reform—reform of Wall Street, doing away with the abuses that crashed our economy and put millions out of work. And every single House Republican voted against reforming Wall Street here on the floor of the House. Well, two were absent but all those who voted, voted against it. Now they want to change the subject back to health care, except they lost that debate, too.

AS PREDICTED, HEALTH CARE COSTS WILL RISE

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I have been here for about 30 minutes listening to both sides talk past each other. Mr. Speaker, the American people, they get it. They get it that in fact cap-and-trade will increase the cost of doing business; that health care, which is already too big a piece of the family budget, is going up, not down; that government is increasing spending at a time in which the revenue is far less than what we're spending. In fact, 40 percent of the budget is being borrowed. And now we're having the hubris to call financial reform of something that in fact is a financial bailout guarantee.

Under President Clinton and a Republican Congress, Glass-Steagall was eliminated. Why in the world wouldn't we be talking about simply recreating the separation between real banks that the FDIC does have a fund for, created by the banks, and investment banks, which you recognize if they fail, they fail, and you are only guaranteed on the underlying stock.

Mr. Speaker, I call for real reform.

□ 1300

THE REPEAL REPUBLICANS SIDE WITH THE INSURANCE INDUSTRY TO REPEAL POPULAR BENEFITS OF HEALTH REFORM

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, the Repeal Republicans have sided with the insurance industry from day one, ignoring the need for reform when they controlled Congress and opposing reform at every step as Democrats fought for reforms that serve the needs of the American people. The Repeal Republicans really haven't changed. They now want to repeal the reforms, and they will use every deceit, every piece of misinformation, and even outright lies to oppose reform and, in the process, try to protect the industry's profit margin.

When Democrats fought to close the doughnut hole and strengthen Medicare by extending its solvency, the Repeal Republicans sided with the insurance industry and opposed it. Now they want to repeal it. When Democrats fought to allow children up to the age of 26 stay under their parents' coverage, the Repeal Republicans sided with the insurance industry and opposed it. Now they want to repeal it. And when Democrats fought to ban caps on coverage, the Repeal Republicans sided with the insurance industry and opposed it. Now they want to repeal it.

We really shouldn't be surprised. The Repeal Republicans are the same ones who want to dismantle Medicare as we know it and who want to privatize Social Security.

THE GULF OF MEXICO OIL SPILL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there has been an unfortunate and devastating accident in the Gulf of Mexico that caused the death of 11 workers. Now we must deal with the attendant oil spill estimated at 42,000 gallons a day. To provide a bit of perspective, the gallon capacity of an Olympic-size swimming pool is 648,000. At the current spill rate, it will take 15½ days to spill the equivalent of an Olympic-sized pool.

Historic production of oil from the Gulf is 1.7 million barrels per day. The U.S. consumes about 19.5 million barrels a day. There will be those who will say this spill is reason enough to cut off future offshore oil production. That would be disingenuous.

Until this accident, the industry has had an impeccable record in the Gulf. According to Amy Myers Jaffe, an energy expert at Rice University, in the last 15 years, there was not a single spill of more than 1,000 barrels among the 4,000 active platforms offshore. She said offshore drilling was considerably safer for the environment than the tankers used for importing oil.

We need to clean up the spill, not use it as a political football.

STOP WALL STREET FROM GAMBLING WITH OUR ECONOMIC SECURITY

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for far too long, the executives on Wall Street reaped rewards by bending the rules and dodging financial regulation. Then they turned to the American taxpayer to dig them out. With Wall Street reform, average Americans will never again be on the hook for Wall Street's mistakes. We, quite simply, put an end to the taxpayer-funded bailouts.

Our legislation will make big banks accountable for their own failures and give regulators the tools they need to put the interest of working- and middle-class Americans first. Wall Street reform stands up for working- and middle-class families by putting a stop to the unregulated greed of Wall Street executives who took big bonuses while gambling with our homes, our jobs, and our economy.

Additionally, Democrats are continuing to make investments in small businesses and rebuilding America's infrastructure. Small businesses are the engine of job creation in this country and will be the birthplace of our economic recovery. That's why we are working to partner with small businesses to help them grow and to expand so they can hire more workers.

I encourage the American people to stand strong with Democrats to stop Wall Street from gambling with our economic security.

OUR FUNDAMENTAL HEALTH CARE PROBLEM: RISING COSTS

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, when the health care bill was moving through Congress, I repeatedly made the arguments that the legislation was flawed because it failed to fundamentally address the problem with our current health care system—rising costs. Well, now guess what? A new analysis just put out by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services confirms that disturbing fact. According to CMS, the new health care law will actually increase our Nation's health care costs rather than decrease them.

Here are some of the staggering numbers: Health care spending is projected to increase by $311 billion, and health care will now increase to 21 percent of our gross domestic product by 2019. So costs are going up, not down.

These numbers are alarming, and they're further proof that the health care bill missed the mark. Real reform would have lowered health care costs for individuals, for families, and for small businesses. Unfortunately, the partisan bill that was signed into law has failed to address this great need for our constituents.

HEALTH CARE FOR AMERICANS

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

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Congress should have passed something on health care reform 40 years ago. We can't change what didn't happen for 40 years. But this year we had an opportunity to do something, and Congress finally did it.

When people in our country get sick and they don't have health insurance, they stay home, they stay home, they stay home until they're deathly ill. Then they go to the emergency room where they get the most expensive kind of health care there is in our country, and we all end up paying for it. We can and should do better.

We did better this year by passing health care reform for our people and our country. The Congressional Budget Office, CBO, says this will end up saving money on health care for people in our country. They are a nonpartisan entity that provides reliable information to both sides, Republicans and Democrats, and they're saying we can save money by this. We will do that.

We did the right thing for our people and our country by passing health care reform.

WE JUST BROKE HEALTH CARE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, President Obama stated on February 7, 2010, ''If we can start bending the cost curve on health care, that's the most important thing we can do to deal with the deficits long term.'' Well, we always agreed that he was bending the cost curve. But our position was that it wasn't being bent down; it was being bent up.

The chief actuary of CMS, Mr. Foster's, report supports this and states that health care costs will accelerate by over $300 billion because of this bill. The health reform law will not extend the life of our entitlement programs, because severe cuts to the programs are used not to strengthen Medicare but, rather, to finance other outlays. And Medicare cuts could lead to providers ending their participation in the program.

This is not Republicans. This is the chief actuary of CMS who is saying this bill is a dog, and we'd better redo it because it's going to raise costs and decrease benefits.

There is an old saying, If you broke it, you have to keep it. We just broke health care in America.

MEDICAL CARE FOR WOMEN

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, sometimes it takes a woman speaking up for other women to make unfair and inappropriate health care practices a thing of the past.

Last June, I introduced the Women's Obstetrician and Gynecologist Medical Access Now Act, the WOMAN Act, to ensure that every woman has direct access to her OB/GYN. As a State assembly member, I offered the law allowing women direct access to their OB/GYN in California. Unfortunately, many women have not had that access. But I'm happy to say that similar provisions were included in the final health care package.

Patients, employees, primary care physicians, and health plan providers all save money and time if women are allowed direct access to their OB/GYNs. Across the Nation, women will no longer have to contend with the gatekeeper system that can prevent or delay lifesaving care.

Women should not need a permission slip to receive OB/GYN care, no questions asked.

HEALTH CARE FOR MEDICAID RECIPIENTS

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

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, it's always fun to listen to the debate because clearly both sides are saying the same thing but disagreeing to it. I am actually referencing some of the things we're speaking of.

We are told that the health care bill is going to create jobs in addition to its primary goal of increasing access to quality care at an affordable price. Now, a component of this is Medicaid, insuring 21 million people across the Nation, a combined Federal-State program where the State pays part, the Feds pay part. The problem is that Medicaid is not providing access to quality care at an affordable price.

There were two articles from the New York Times recently. One speaks of how people with Medicaid cannot get in to see a physician. They have to go to the emergency room because physicians don't see Medicaid patients because it pays so little and it has so much hassle. The other is about how a woman with cancer in Michigan cannot find a physician—she also has Medicaid—because the problem is it pays so little, has so much hassle, all the other things we expect in a bureaucracy. And lastly, regarding cost, despite paying less so it doesn't give access to quality care, according to articles in Politico, it's going to increase the deficit by $1 billion for States like California.

GOOD NEWS ABOUT MEDICARE AND HEALTH CARE

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I have some excellent news to share. Just last week, the CMS' independent actuary released an analysis of the health care reform legislation that we passed last month here in this Chamber. Their report shows that we are strengthening Medicare.

Indeed, according to the Office of the Actuary, the Affordable Care Act will help extend the life of the Medicare Trust Fund by an additional 12 years to 2029, compared to 2017 today. It closes the prescription drug doughnut hole by 2020, with an immediate rebate this year of $250 and a 50-percent discount on brand-name drugs next year. It lowers annual premiums by nearly $200 per beneficiary. It lowers annual average coinsurance by over $200 per beneficiary, and it provides preventive wellness care visits for free.

When we passed health care reform, Democrats stood up for seniors by strengthening Medicare and closing the prescription drug doughnut hole that was wide open and would be left wide open under the Republicans' plan. Under their radical plan to repeal health care, we will move in the wrong direction.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, last week the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services confirmed what we

already knew—that health care spending will increase. It violates the pledge made by the President last year, and it leaves the hardworking American taxpayers to pick up the bill. The report estimates a $311 billion increase in total health care spending. And while this may be chump change for this administration, it's a lot of money for the American taxpayer.

There is one area of interest for me, and that is the high-risk pools for the uninsured. Back home in Georgia, we have been talking about the Democrats' approach to the high-risk pools. It is clear that their approach is not the best, and this report confirmed that.

The Democrats want to set aside $5 billion for high-risk pools, but this report says that is not enough and that it will run out within 1 to 2 years. Plus, their plan only covers 375,000 Americans. What happens when the funds run out? Premiums will go up, services will be cut, there will be waiting lines formed, or States like Georgia will be forced to pick up the cost.

This is unacceptable for all Americans, and taxpayers especially.

MEDICARE SOLVENCY

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

Mr. ANDREWS. In the CMS report the minority references, the ''M'' stands for Medicare. CMS is in the business of counting and accounting for the Medicare program. Here's what they said:

Under the law before the health care bill passed, Medicare was going to run out of money in 2017. We have extended the life now to 2029 and can build on that to save Medicare.

The report also says that they made estimates, subject to interpretation, about health care costs in the rest of the system, but here's what they assumed:

They assumed that medical records sharing and technology won't save any money. Most people think it will. They assumed that wellness programs that stop people from smoking and start exercising won't save any money. Most people think it will. They assumed that insurance companies having to compete with each other will not save any money. Most people think that it will.

The fact of the matter is the health care law extends the life of Medicare by 12 years, something the erstwhile majority never did when it was in the majority.

THE SIDE EFFECTS OF HEALTH CARE REFORM ON BUSINESS

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, American business owners, large and small, have been telling the majority in this body for months that these health care bills were flawed and there is going to be a cost. There's going to be a cost in money—a lot of it—and a cost in jobs. AT&T had to restate earnings, lowering their earnings projections to $1 billion for the first quarter; John Deere & Co. $150 million, and it goes on and on.

The National Federation of Independent Business have said that the complicated and restrictive tax credits included in the bill actually help no one. And paperwork and increases in Medicare costs will cost small businesses millions of dollars and, in fact, cost the country millions of jobs.

Democrats claim that because of this new law, small businesses will no longer have to choose between hiring new employees and offering health insurance. Well, that's fantasy, and we all recognize that. Right now, small businesses across the country are making the decision that right now is not the time to hire. There is simply too much uncertainty that is created by this bill.

It should be no surprise that this bill will cost American companies millions of dollars. It will cost Americans millions of jobs. But Democrats express shock and disbelief when businesses, large and small, say the bill will cost them millions. That is just simply an inconvenient truth.

□ 1315

BENEFITS OF HEALTH REFORM

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I think we just heard something that is only a half truth. I was meeting with the realtors in my district a week or 2 weeks ago, and they had read all of this propaganda from the Republican Party. They said, ''Well, we cannot afford to buy insurance.''

I asked, ''Are you buying it now?''

''Yes, we are.''

I said, ''Are you aware there is up to a 50 percent tax credit for every insurance policy that you buy?''

''No, we didn't know that.''

''Are you also aware that if you have a child who is 23 who would drop off your insurance, they will be able to stay on your insurance until they are 26?''

''No, we didn't know that.''

''How about the cap on the yearly expenditures and the lifetime cap, do you realize that there will be no cap, whatever you need, you will be able to have it paid for by insurance?''

''We didn't know that.''

''And you're a senior; did you know that there is a $250 immediate tax rebate if you are buying those drugs in that doughnut hole?''

''We didn't know that.''

''And in 3 years it disappears?''

''We didn't know that. Well, then why do Republicans want to repeal all that? We don't understand. Why do the Republicans want to get rid of all that good stuff?''

HEALTH CARE COSTS TO INCREASE

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

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, imagine this: The Democrats' health care bill will not reduce health care costs, but actually increase them. That's right. According to CMS, the costs will increase over $300 billion. It brings to mind Yogi Berra's line: this is deja vu all over again.

Of course, taxpayers and families knew this would happen. Any time you have a big government, Washington-based program, it always costs more than advertised. The CMS findings underscore what taxpayers and families across this country understand: we need to repeal this bill and replace it with the right kind of reform.

WALL STREET REFORM

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

Mr. SCHAUER. Every day that Republican Senators block Wall Street reform, another day goes by that our Nation's middle class and our Nation's economy are at risk. Heads I win, tails you lose; I'm sure you remember that game.

Well, those are the same rules that Goldman Sachs rigged up to routinely bet against its own customers. Heads they won, tails their customers and the American people lost. And AIG, who the taxpayers bailed out, was a full partner in this fraud.

My constituents are angry. They want their money back. They want commonsense protections that will end too big to fail and make sure they never get stuck with the tab again. The House has already acted to protect hardworking middle-class families from the abuses of Wall Street. It is time for the Senate to do the same.

HONORING JOEL AND RUTH SPIRA

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to two fine American business owners, Joel and Ruth Spira, for their donation of a significant collection of materials to the Smithsonian's National Museum of American History. The items the Spiras are donating represent some of the most noteworthy technological advancements and energy-saving inventions in the history of electric lighting. The collection tells the story of American innovation and the 50-year history

of a country that has transformed the use of electricity.

Joel Spira is the inventor and developer of the solid-state electronic ''dimming device,'' and chairman and founder of Lutron Electronics headquartered in my Congressional district in Coopersburg, Pennsylvania.

A family-owned business, Lutron is governed by five principles: take care of the customer; take care of the company; take care of the people; innovate with high-quality products; and deliver value to the customer.

Lutron is known for its commitment to creating energy-saving products. Each year, the installed base of Lutron's products save the Nation nearly 10 billion kilowatt hours of electricity, or approximately $1 billion in utility costs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating Joel and Ruth Spira for this record of accomplishment and for their many contributions.

BENEFITS OF HEALTH REFORM

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the radical reactionary Republicans are at it again; they want to repeal everything. The radical reactionary Republicans want to repeal the fact that children can stay on their parents' health care policy up to age 26. The radical reactionary Republicans want to repeal the fact that there will be no preconditions.

The radical reactionary Republicans are the repeal Republicans. Any step forward, let's repeal them and turn them back. The radical reactionary Republicans are the new repeal Republicans; the no Republicans.

Let's keep the status quo as we move on to meet the foe. Let's move forward with progress.

HEALTH CARE JEOPARDIZED

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, over the past 18 months, the President repeatedly said about his health care plan, If you like your current health insurance, you can keep it. The majority of Americans knew this was nonsense, and now the Department of Health and Human Services confirms it.

A study just released by that department's chief actuary for Medicare concludes that the financial incentives in the new health care law will lead many employers to stop offering health care coverage altogether. That means about 14 million people with job-based insurance today will lose it, and instead will be required by law to obtain coverage individually.

Further, seniors in my State of Wisconsin have become big fans of Medicare Advantage plans. But the chief actuary for Medicare estimates that the President's and the majority party's Medicare cuts will reduce Medicare Advantage enrollment by 7 million people.

But there is more. The Medicare actuary reports that under the new health care law, 15 percent of all hospitals, nursing homes and other providers could be operating at a loss by 2019 which will jeopardize access to care. Doctors are threatening to drop out of Medicare because cuts in Medicare reimbursement rates mean they can't even cover their costs, much less make a living.

Sadly, these few problems are just the tip of the iceberg, as will be revealed in the months and years ahead as the health care law takes effect.

BENEFITS OF HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, how can you repeal a law that helps millions of Americans for better health care? The repeal Republicans are once again off base and not right in their assumptions.

Millions of Americans will benefit from the new health care bill. You and your doctor will determine your care and not the insurance companies. Small businesses with 50 employees or less will get tax credits to help them pay their premiums. So the millions of people who work in small businesses can now have health care.

Your children who are graduating from college and find themselves with no job will be able to stay on your health care until age 26.

These were the same rumblings they had in 1965 with Medicare, health care for over 44 million seniors. Medicare today is one of the best programs for health care for seniors, and this bill extends its lifetime almost a decade. Social Security, passed in 1934, is one of the most successful programs we have.

It is a good bill. The repeal Republicans are wrong again.

HEALTH CARE TAKEOVER

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, this radically Republican Texan rises today to highlight the CMS analysis for the government takeover of our health care system. As many have predicted, CMS concluded that the new law fails to contain cost increases in health care. CMS projects health care spending will rise to 21 percent of the GDP in the next decade. This places our country on an unacceptable path and getting less coverage for our money.

Even more alarming, CMS concluded that 50 percent of our Medicare Advantage patients will lose their coverage over the next decade when the law is fully implemented. Thousands of seniors in my district depend on Medicare Advantage. We need to repeal and replace this now. We need a new bill that will control health care costs while still allowing patients to keep the coverage that they have now and as they were promised.

BENEFITS OF HEALTH REFORM

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of health care reform, one can't help but ask rhetorically why there would be forces out there that would deny progress? Why promote misinformation? Why refuse to set up exchanges for the business community? Why promote a repeal?

I think it is pretty straightforward and easy to determine that there are those who are fighting for the people's interest ahead of those insurance profit column rises over the last decade. I think it is a threat to those asking for and ensuring that the doughnut hole will be closed, and adult children up to the age of 26 will be able to stay on their parents' coverage, no more caps on coverage but really benefit people in this insurance struggle they have faced in the past.

It is pretty obvious, this is an effort by those who have wanted to dismantle Medicare as we know it, those who want to privatize Social Security, those who want to protect the insurance industry's profit margin to yet score another victory with repeal.

I think we have a solid effort going forward. I believe we should stay the course.

START OVER ON HEALTH REFORM

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, in June of last year, President Obama told a crowd of people, ''If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor. If you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan. No one will take it away. No matter what.''

Mr. Speaker, it turns out there is someone who will take your health care plan away, and that person is President Obama himself. A report done by the President's own administration concludes that under Obama care, 50 percent of seniors will lose their Medicare Advantage plans, and it says that some of the Medicare cost control mechanisms may be unsustainable.

Our seniors are already struggling under the weight of the recession and they can't afford to lose the insurance that they depend on. House Republicans have better, common sense

health care reform plans that will help seniors and their families. House Republicans will work tirelessly to repeal this harmful bill and start over.

WORLD MALARIA DAY

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize World Malaria Day which was April 21.

Malaria kills almost 1 million people every year, and afflicts as many as half a billion. Just think of this startling fact, Mr. Speaker: every 30 seconds, a child in Africa dies from malaria. We owe it to the children and we owe it to mothers to do more to eradicate this preventable and treatable disease.

We must support programs that provide bed nets and safe indoor spraying. Malaria doesn't just affect the sick, it keeps kids out of school, it keeps adults out of the fields and away from the workplace, and brings down the economy. Sick parents can't care for their children.

Malaria prevention is key to preventing smart maternal health policies worldwide. I urge my colleagues to support funding for international malaria and survival programs to keep the world's children and their mothers healthy.

□ 1330

REPEAL AND REPLACE OBAMACARE

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid released a new analysis of ObamaCare that confirmed what Republicans have been saying all along: our Nation's health care costs will increase under ObamaCare, and this bill will hurt health care for seniors.

Mr. Speaker, a few simple facts:

First, under ObamaCare, our national health care expenditures will increase by $311 billion in the first 10 years. Second, health care will increase to 21 percent of GDP by 2019. Third, the government will spend $410 billion to expand Medicaid under ObamaCare. And, fourth, more than 7 million seniors will be forced off of their current Medicare coverage, including 50 percent of those who are currently on Medicare Advantage.

Speaker PELOSI, this is not the reform you promised; this is not the reform the country needs. That is why I will be fighting to repeal and replace this legislation with real reforms that lower costs and improve coverage and care without bankrupting our country.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, we just got yet another smoking gun in this latest report by the Obama administration on this government takeover of health care. And the report confirms what many of us said: the bill actually increases spending over $300 billion.

With all the new taxes on medical devices, drugs, and insurance, it's going to increase the cost of health care for American families and small businesses. Over $575 billion in cuts to Medicare, they point out, will actually lead to reduced services for Medicare recipients, and in fact 50 percent of all Medicare Advantage participants will lose that health care that they like.

The American people are asking us and continue to say, Why isn't Congress focusing on creating jobs? Well, we should be, but Speaker PELOSI and her liberal lieutenants just want more government takeovers and more Wall Street bailouts. They are now trying to push this permanent bailout fund of Wall Street, and the American people continue to ask: Where are the jobs? The tone-deaf liberals running this Congress just don't get it.

JOE WILSON WAS RIGHT

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, the reports are in and, sadly, not only does this health care scheme cost the American people more than it provides and increases the cost of health care, but at the same time, it exempts anyone illegally in this country from having to be taxed or to buy insurance. Everyone else who is legal in the country is required to buy the insurance or be taxed. So illegal immigrants are now exempt from the responsibility; but because the majority refused to put in the E-verification, the SERVE verification to make sure that illegals don't get into the benefit package, we have created a situation where illegals now are not required to pay, but they are guaranteed, because of a lack of verification, that they have access to the system.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, the fact is JOE WILSON was right: illegals do have access into a system that the President and Congress promised the American people would not be available.

THE NEW HEALTH CARE LAW IS A DISASTER

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, the government takeover of health care just celebrated its 1-month birthday, and we are already seeing the disastrous effect it will have on our Nation's economy.

Since the beginning of this debate, U.S. employers have warned that this bill would destroy American jobs and harm our fragile economy. Over the past few weeks, we've seen the real-life impact these job-killing tax hikes and health care costs are having on American employers. From AT&T to Caterpillar to Lockheed Martin, we have seen billions of dollars in losses to American companies which will result in further job losses, higher prices, and less choice for the American consumer. And to add insult to injury, actuaries at CMS working under Secretary Sebelius now confirm what most Americans already knew: health care costs will skyrocket as a result of this bill.

The long-term effects of this bill are still not fully fleshed out, will be devastating to this country's economy, and are not worth the time and effort that we have put into it. Let's move forward to repeal this law.

HEALTH CARE TAKEOVER

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, the majority in this body passed a bill that the American public knew was going to cost too much and not really effectively address the problems with health care; but despite claims made to the contrary, this body did pass the bill.

Just recently, the President's own administration said that the massive government takeover of our health care system will actually increase health care costs, not decrease them. And yet while costs increase, this administration admits that the health care takeover will still leave 23 million people, Americans, without insurance.

The best way to increase the number of insured Americans is to decrease health care costs, something this bill did not do. The President's own administration says the Democratic health care takeover does just the opposite, increases costs and doesn't cover every American. This is not what the people want.

STOP EXCESSIVE SPENDING

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern with the recently released analysis done by CMS of the health care bill that confirms that our Nation's health care costs will increase rather than decrease as the President has pledged to the Nation.

The CMS analysis concluded that the national health care expenditure will actually increase by $311 billion. At a time when our employment rate is continuing to rise, how are American families supposed to pay these increased costs?

The latest figures show that the Ohio unemployment rate is 11.5 percent, and in some parts of my district it is 14 percent. My constituents are continuing

to ask, where are the jobs? In addition, the small businesses in my district are asking how they're supposed to pay the new mandates being placed on them under this bill.

The CMS analysis also shows that the recently passed health care bill will increase health care costs to 21 percent of the GDP by 2019. In addition to this increased spending in health care, the Congressional Budget Office has stated that under current spending levels, by 2020 American taxpayers will be paying $2 billion a day in interest alone on the national debt. It also estimates that the debt will be $20 trillion by that year.

Our Nation's economic future requires that this administration and Congress exercise serious fiscal constraint and stop excessive spending.

STANDING FOR HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was there when the President signed the health care bill into law. I saw him sign it in ink, but my heart was heavy because I knew that while he was signing in ink, it was written in prayers, the prayers of some 46 million people who did not have insurance. Signed in ink, written in prayers, but also written in tears, the tears of parents who have children with preexisting conditions who could not get insurance for their children. Signed in ink, written in prayers, tears, as well as blood, because in this country 45,000 people die annually because they do not have insurance. That's one person every 12 minutes.

So I do not stand for and will not stand for reinstating tears, for reinstating those prayers, and I will not have the blood of the 45,000 on my hands. I stand with the bill.

REPEAL AND REPLACE HEALTH CARE BILL

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

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share my constituents' concerns and frustrations over the health care bill that unfortunately is now law.

Last night, I hosted a telephone town hall meeting; thousands of my constituents participated. I invited them to discuss any issue that they chose; every single one spoke about this new health care law. And they had concerns. One man who called in said, I'm 72 years old, I'm retired, and I get my health insurance from my company. Are they still going to provide prescription drug coverage? That's a fine question.

The wife of a family practitioner said, My husband is 62, and his patients are asking whether he will be able to stay around. And he tells them it will all depend on the government. It's sad to me that he doesn't even get to make his own choice about whether or not he retires.

Last week, the Obama administration's own experts confirmed what we've been saying for a year: this bill costs too much. Mr. Speaker, it's time to repeal this law and replace it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). 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.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAMS

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3253) to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3253

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

SECTION 1. ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAMS UNDER THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT AND THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the Act entitled ''An Act to extend temporarily certain authorities of the Small Business Administration'', approved October 10, 2006 (Public Law 109–316; 120 Stat. 1742), as most recently amended by section 1 of Public Law 111–136 (124 Stat. 6), is amended by striking ''April 30, 2010'' each place it appears and inserting ''July 31, 2010''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on April 29, 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, our economy is showing significant signs of improvement: consumer spending is climbing, manufacturers are adding jobs, and retail sales rose substantially for the first 3 months of this year. All of these are positive signs; however, if our recovery is going to produce the jobs that the American people need and deserve, small businesses will be central to the equation.

In every previous recession, small firms have served as job-creating catalysts. Not only do small firms add jobs faster than big companies, but many dislocated workers launch their own ventures during economic downturns. Those enterprises in turn often grow and create employment opportunities for the American people. For entrepreneurs to play this role, they need the right tools. The legislation before us will extend the Small Business Administration programs that help new ventures form and existing businesses grow.

Since the start of this Congress, the House has passed 16 bills to strengthen SBA initiatives. This included legislation to modernize the SBA's capital access programs so that small businesses can weather the credit crunch. However, before the SBA programs are fully updated, they must be extended. This bill ensures these initiatives keep operating. We cannot afford any of the SBA services to lapse just as our recovery is getting off the ground.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' and reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1345

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the chairwoman's request to suspend the rules and pass S. 3253. The bill is a simple 3-month extension of all the Small Business Administration's core programs until July 31, 2010.

This bill is necessary because the temporary extension we approved in January is going to expire at the end of this week. Over the past 3 years, the House Small Business Committee has worked in a productive, bipartisan manner to author legislation reauthorizing and improving the Small Business Administration and its programs. I commend the chairwoman on her leadership and willingness to work in this fashion. By working together, we have reported and passed several bills that would modernize the SBA, allowing it to serve small business owners in the 21st century.

Unfortunately, our counterparts in the other body have not worked as diligently, and unless we pass this extension, many of the SBA programs that our small businesses rely on are going to expire on Friday.

Small businesses are the backbone of our economy. It is because of them that we have seen nominal gains in our economy recently. Still, the national unemployment rate hovers around 10 percent, with some States experiencing as much as 14 percent. If we are serious

about our recovery efforts, helping our small businesses thrive has to be our first priority.

The programs run by the SBA provide a critical foundation that small businesses depend on to succeed. Whether it is designing a business plan, acquiring financing, or looking for technical assistance, the SBA is often the first place entrepreneurs turn to in helping build and growing their businesses. It's essential that we keep these programs running while we maintain our efforts to work on full reauthorization.

While we are continuing to work with our colleagues in the other body, we need more time to thoughtfully and completely reauthorize these critical programs. I am hopeful that we will be able to complete the work on full reauthorization by the end of this Congress.

Again, I support the chairwoman's request to pass S. 3253 and urge all of my colleagues to do so.

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 3253, which extends the Small Business Act.

I support this legislation because it is crucial that the Small Businesses Administration programs that have helped launch and sustain so many small businesses are allowed to continue.

Small businesses employ just over half of all private sector employees, with a payroll of about $175 billion, and create many of the new jobs we need. More than half of all Americans work at or own a small business. Small businesses have been responsible for the majority of new jobs created in this country. Anyone who talks about getting our economy on track and does not talk about what we need to do for small business is missing a huge piece of the puzzle.

In my district, the 37th Congressional District of California, there are approximately 16,300 small businesses.

But in the global economy of the 21st century, small businesses, very much like the banks and the auto industry, need sound fiscal options to remain competitive, especially in difficult economic times for them and their customers.

This is where the Small Business Administration can help.

The SBA exists to aid and protect the interests of small business concerns, to preserve free competitive enterprise and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of our nation.

The SBA was established in 1953 by the federal government to aid, counsel, assist and protect the interests of small business concerns, to preserve free competitive enterprise and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of our nation.

The SBA's Office of Business Development assists firms owned and controlled by economically and socially disadvantaged individuals enter the economic mainstream by providing firm-specific analyses, counseling, management training, professional consulting and monitoring services, and access to business development opportunities under section 8(a) of the Small Business Act.

Much like the loan guarantee program, the Section 8(a) program is well intended. But one of its problems is that too often program participants are "graduated" before they are sufficiently prepared to compete for contracts with large and established companies in the private sector.

This has resulted in a large number of former 8(a) companies failing to remain in business shortly after leaving the development program.

I have introduced legislation that can build upon the loan guarantee program extended by H.R. 493 and which would eliminate the problem of "graduating" Section 8(a) program participants before they are sufficiently prepared to compete for contracts with large and established companies in the private sector.

My legislation, H.R. 4897, the "Not Too Small to Succeed in Business Act," reforms and modernizes the Section 8(a) program to help more small and disadvantaged business enterprises (DBE) remain in business and hire more workers by doing the following:

1. Amending the Small Business Act to increase the net worth limits (to $750,000) used by SBA in determining whether an applicant satisfies the "economically disadvantaged" requirement for admission to the program and increases to $2.25 million the net worth required for early graduation from the program.

2. Extending the Section 8(a) program period to 11 years, from the current 9 years.

3. Granting a one-time 2-year reinstatement in the Section 8(a) program for companies who were graduated from the program at the expiration of the 9-year term.

Mr. Speaker, extending the programs under the SBA Act, including the Loan Guarantee Program and amending the Section 8(a) Small and Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program are a necessary part of strengthening our ability to help small businesses succeed and provide jobs for our people. I urge all members to join me in voting for S. 3253.

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

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. 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. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3253.

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.

GLOBAL YOUTH SERVICE DAY

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1240) supporting the goals and ideals of Global Youth Service Day, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1240

Whereas Global Youth Service Day is an annual campaign that celebrates and mobilizes the millions of children and youth who improve their communities each day of the year through community service and service-learning;

Whereas Global Youth Service Day will be celebrated from April 23, 2010, to April 25, 2010;

Whereas the goals of Global Youth Service Day are to mobilize and support young people to identify and address the needs of their communities, schools, and organizations, to provide opportunities for youth engagement, and the public, the media, and policymakers to recognize and raise awareness of young people as assets and resources;

Whereas Global Youth Service Day, a program of Youth Service America, is the largest service event in the world, the only day of service dedicated to youth engagement, and in 2010 is being observed for the 22nd consecutive year in the United States and for the 11th year globally in more than 100 countries;

Whereas Global Youth Service Day engages millions of young people worldwide with the support of more than 200 National and International Partners, 85 State and local Lead Agencies, and thousands of local partners;

Whereas high quality community service and service-learning programs increase young people's academic engagement and achievement, workforce readiness, 21st century skills, and civic knowledge and engagement;

Whereas community service and service-learning provide opportunities for young people to apply their knowledge, idealism, energy, creativity, and unique perspectives to improve their communities by addressing a myriad of critical issues, such as health, childhood obesity, education, illiteracy, poverty, hunger, environment, climate change, violence, and natural disasters;

Whereas Global Youth Service Day is an opportunity for citizen diplomacy, as evidenced by the growing number of projects that involve youth working collaboratively across borders to address global issues, increasing intercultural understanding, and promoting the sense that they are global citizens;

Whereas thousands of participants in schools and community-based organizations are planning Global Youth Service Day activities as part of a Semester of Service in which young people spend the semester addressing a community need connected to learning goals or academic standards over the course of at least 70 hours;

Whereas Global Youth Service Day provides an opportunity for young children, teenagers, and young adults, to gain experience as active citizens and community leaders, and assist schools, community organizations, faith-based organizations, government agencies, businesses, and families; and

Whereas the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act recognizes Global Youth Service Day as a national day of service and calls on the President to encourage people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate youth-led community improvement and service-learning activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes and commends the significant contributions of youth of the United States and encourages the cultivation of a civic bond between young people dedicated to serving their neighbors, their communities, and the Nation;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of Global Youth Service Day; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States to observe Global Youth Service Day by—

(A) encouraging youth to participate in community service and service-learning projects and joining their peers in such projects;

(B) recognizing the volunteer efforts of the young people of the United States throughout the year; and

(C) supporting the volunteer efforts of young people and engaging them in meaningful community service, service-learning, and decision-making opportunities as an investment in the future of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 1240 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1240, a resolution to support the goals and ideals of Global Youth Service Day. Global Youth Service Day is an annual worldwide event that highlights and celebrates the ongoing contributions of youth to their communities through volunteer service and service learning.

Global Youth Service Day is the largest service event in the world, and over the past 21 years it has brought together more than 40 million people in thousands of communities worldwide. This past weekend it was observed for the 22nd consecutive year in the United States, and for its 11th year globally, in more than 100 countries.

Mr. Speaker, service learning extends the classroom into the community, providing young people with the opportunity to give back locally. It is also an academic tool that builds real-life applications into student curriculum, keeping students engaged in their education. High quality service learning that is integrated with academic curriculum increases students' cognitive engagement, motivation to learn, school attendance, and academic achievement. Global Youth Service Day takes that one step further by promoting projects that encourage youth to work collaboratively across national borders to address global issues, to increase intercultural understanding, and to promote the sense that we are all global citizens.

There are countless benefits associated with volunteerism and service. Evidence shows that there exists a conclusive correlation between youth service, character development, lifelong adult volunteering, philanthropy, and other forms of civic engagement.

Opportunities like Global Youth Service Day provide avenues for youth to apply their knowledge, idealism, energy, creativity, and unique perspectives to improve local communities by addressing critical issues such as poverty, hunger, illiteracy, education, natural disasters, climate change, and so very much more, Mr. Speaker.

As part of Global Youth Service Day here in the District of Columbia, Greater D.C. Cares organized 7,000 volunteers as part of its annual Servathon to restore national monuments, landscape parks and playgrounds, prepare and distribute food, and paint murals on schools in 100 locations within the metro area.

In Detroit, Michigan, more than 125 students from an inner city Detroit school educated their classmates and families about having a healthy diet and nutrition and incorporating exercise in their daily lives. In Atlanta, Georgia, Mr. Speaker, the local YMCA coordinated with over 100 community partners and 1,000 young people in feeding the homeless, in yard work for the elderly, community gardening with the Atlanta Community Food Bank, among many other things.

Both young people and their communities will benefit greatly from expanded opportunities like these which allow youth to engage in volunteer community service and service learning worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution serves to recognize and commend the significant contributions of youth of the United States and to support the goals and ideals of Global Youth Service Day 2010.

I thank Representative ROSA DELAURO from Connecticut for introducing this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1240, supporting the goals and ideals of Global Youth Service Day. Global Youth Service Day supports and encourages community service and service learning throughout these United States, and enables millions of students to make contributions to their communities. America's young people, from kindergartners to college students, have the desire, energy, and ability to make a real difference in their communities. Global Youth Service Day is an opportunity for them to convert their ideas and energy into action.

Through community service and service learning, we can inspire, empower, and celebrate young people who recognize the need to do something for their communities, believe in their ability to get it done, and then take action. Service learning engages students in the educational process, using what they learn in the classroom to solve real-life problems. Service learning and community service enables students to not only learn about democracy and citizenship, but to become actively contributing citizens and community members through the service that they perform.

There are a growing number of opportunities for youth to get involved in service activities through schools, service clubs, religious affiliations, family, or neighborhood-based volunteering. The challenge is to maintain youth interest and commitment to community service by showing them the benefits to the community that they are serving and to themselves. I stand before you today to commend the significant contributions our youth are making in our Nation's communities.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the author of H. Res. 1240.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in support of this resolution honoring and supporting the goals and ideals of Global Youth Service Day, which took place this past weekend. I want to commend my colleague, Representative EHLERS, for taking the lead in cosponsoring this important resolution.

Global Youth Service Day is a public awareness and education campaign led by Youth Service America with the National Youth Leadership Council and the Global Youth Action Network. It emphasizes the importance of public service. It highlights the valuable contributions that young people make to their communities all year long.

In the words of Gandhi, ''The best way to find yourself is to lose yourself in the service of others.'' That is the simple truth that animates Global Youth Service Day. By mobilizing young people around the world to identify and address the needs of their neighbors, by supporting their community service, and by civic engagement efforts, we not only help our communities to thrive, we help the next generation find themselves through service and commitment to a greater good.

This past weekend, young people all around the world designed and carried out community service projects in areas ranging from literacy and mentoring, to the environment and energy conservation, to hunger and homelessness. This year saw 2,631 projects in 87 countries and all 50 States.

We often say that service is its own reward, but it actually has the benefit of being true. In addition to the positive results these projects have on our communities, research shows that young people who participate in community service also enjoy increased civic engagement and they do better in school. By recognizing the interdependence of their community, they become more independent, more grounded, more cognizant of the world around them. They become better citizens.

The cycle of service and citizenship is why we passed the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act 1 year ago last week, to offer young people more opportunities to serve their nation. It is why we continue to encourage our young men and women to become deeply involved in the life, health, and education of our communities through such programs as AmeriCorps, Teach for America, and Summer of Service. It

is why we honor the passion and the sacrifice of those young Americans who choose to make a difference in distant lands, such as members of the Peace Corps and our Armed Forces.

All of us in this room today know firsthand the value of public service. Global Youth Service Day helps to transmit that priceless value to the next generation. All around the world it encourages boys and girls to get involved, to give of themselves, to use their enthusiasm, their energy, and their passion to help our communities.

I urge my colleagues to honor these values of civic and community service, and to support this resolution.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the lead coauthor of this legislation, our respected colleague from the State of Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

I am a great believer in volunteer efforts, and I believe that is what makes our Nation tick. And I think it is especially appropriate to educate children and young adults at a very early age to become involved in volunteer work.

Global Youth Service Day is a major means of implementing that, and bringing to children the awareness of and importance of volunteer work, and also developing ways to make volunteer work seem interesting and fun to the youth of our Nation.

I do have to warn them, however, as I have learned myself, volunteer service can lead to the halls of Congress. I would have never been elected to office, never even would have become politically active without my volunteer activities. But I soon learned when engaging in volunteer activities and helping people that much of the problems I was trying to solve should have been solved by the local elected officials. And with some friends we got together and got some very good people elected. Never did I suspect that I might myself someday be called upon to do the same thing and follow a path that led to Congress.

The Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act is a wonderful device to give recognition to the youth of this Nation, gives an opportunity for us to recognize the service that they have rendered, and also calls on the President of the United States to encourage people of the United States to observe this day and make it clear to young people what marvelous opportunities for volunteerism they have.

□ 1400

There are many different ways in which the youth can contribute to the functioning of the Nation, but two that come to mind as being especially useful are, one, helping the elderly who often have trouble adjusting to new homes or who simply don't know how to handle the electronics of the new abodes that they've moved into. Another method is working with the young people of this Nation, with the very young people—the children who are having trouble with how to read or who are having trouble learning math. This is a wonderful opportunity for younger people who have more experience with science and mathematics and who are able to communicate their love of science and mathematics to help the young people around them.

So it is with pleasure that I rise. It is with great pleasure that I am a cosponsor of this resolution. I think it is an extremely important issue.

I thank Ms. DELAURO and Ms. WOOLSEY for their working on this as well.

This is a golden opportunity for all of us to express our gratitude to the young people of this world who continue to act as volunteers in so many different ways and in meaningful ways which will direct their careers as well as will help the Nation.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to compliment Congresswoman DELAURO and Congressman EHLERS for their amazing efforts in this regard, and I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 1240, a resolution to support the goals and ideals of Global Youth Service Day.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1240, 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.

NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION MONTH

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1293) expressing support for the goals and ideals of National Child Abuse Prevention Month, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1293

Whereas ''National Child Abuse Prevention Month'' is observed in April 2010;

Whereas in 2008, out of an estimated 6,000,000 children referred for investigations and assessments, approximately 772,000 children were determined to be victims of abuse and neglect;

Whereas in 2008, an estimated 1,740 children died as a result of abuse and neglect;

Whereas in 2008, an estimated 80 percent of the children who died due to abuse and neglect were under the age of 4;

Whereas in 2008, of the children under the age of 4 who died due to abuse and neglect, the majority were under the age of 1;

Whereas abused and neglected children have a higher risk in adulthood for developing health problems, including alcoholism, depression, drug abuse, eating disorders, obesity, suicide, and certain chronic diseases;

Whereas a National Institute of Justice study indicated that abused and neglected children are 11 times more likely to be arrested for delinquent behavior as juveniles, and are 2.7 times more likely to be arrested for violent and criminal behavior as adults;

Whereas an estimated ⅓ of abused and neglected children grow up to abuse or neglect their own children;

Whereas providing community-based services to families impacted by child abuse and neglect is less costly than the emotional and physical damage inflicted on children who have been abused and neglected, providing services to abused and neglected children (including child protective, law enforcement, court, foster care, or health care services), or providing treatment to adults recovering from child abuse; and

Whereas child abuse and neglect has long-term economic and societal costs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses support for the goals and ideals of National Child Abuse Prevention Month;

(2) recognizes and applauds the national and community organizations that work to promote awareness about child abuse and neglect, including by identifying risk factors and developing prevention strategies; and

(3) supports efforts to—

(A) increase public awareness of prevention programs relating to child abuse and neglect; and

(B) reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUMMINGS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 1293 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1293, which supports the goals and ideals of National Child Abuse Prevention Month. Our children are our most precious resources, and they need our support to thrive and to grow into healthy, productive adults.

During National Child Abuse Prevention Month, we raise awareness of the critical necessity of responding to child abuse, to promoting healthy families, and to nurturing our children in safe environments free from abuse, neglect, or fear.

The effects of child abuse and neglect have enormous consequences on our Nation's children. On average, five children every day are killed as a result of child abuse or neglect, and a report of child abuse is made every 10

seconds in the United States—the wealthiest nation on Earth, I must remind us.

In 2008, an estimated 1,740 children died as a result of such abuse, and that number leaves out many more deaths which are not properly reported for their actual causes. Tragically, sexual, emotional, and physical abuse threaten too many of our Nation's children every single day.

Studies have shown that abused or neglected children have a higher risk in adulthood for developing other health problems, including alcoholism, depression, drug abuse, eating disorders, obesity, suicide, and certainly other chronic diseases.

Our entire communities—parents, guardians, relatives, neighbors, and organizations—all share the responsibility of preventing the crime of child abuse, and our government plays an important role as well. We must support families to help them stay together and to raise children into becoming happy, stable, and successful adults.

National Child Abuse Prevention Month is about increasing awareness of the problem so that we can stop child abuse and neglect before it starts. Together, we can protect children. We can strengthen families. We must ensure that every child grows up in a safe, stable, and nurturing environment.

National Child Abuse Prevention Month highlights the roles of important prevention resources, such as early childhood programs, family resource centers, parent support groups, respite and crisis care, and educator training, which can help reduce the risk factors for child abuse and promote healthy families.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution in support of National Child Abuse Prevention Month serves to remind us of our collective responsibility to protect our children from maltreatment and to ensure that all of our kids have childhoods free from abuse and free from neglect.

I thank Representative PETRI for introducing the resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution before us, H. Res. 1293, expressing support for the goals and ideals of National Child Abuse Prevention Month.

Child abuse is an unfortunate reality for many of the Nation's children. No child should have to experience abuse or neglect, but cases of such are reported every day. Recent data from 2008 indicate that 772,000 children were victims of child abuse and neglect and that 1,740 children died as a result of child abuse and neglect. Eighty percent of those children were under the age of 4.

Besides the immediate physical and emotional pain that abuse and neglect can inflict on a child, these experiences can have long-term effects on the victims as well. Data show abused and neglected children are at a higher risk of developing health problems, such as alcoholism, depression, drug abuse, and obesity in adulthood. A National Institute of Justice study indicates that children who are abused or who are neglected are 11 times more likely to be arrested for delinquent behavior as juveniles and are 2.7 times more likely to be arrested for violent and criminal behavior as adults.

National Child Abuse Prevention Month aims to raise awareness about child abuse and neglect and to encourage individuals and communities to support children and families, as community awareness and involvement is paramount to the prevention of child abuse and neglect, and the goals of National Child Abuse Prevention Month encourage members of every community to support the children in that community.

I would like to thank my colleague, Congresswoman JUDY BIGGERT of Illinois, for introducing this important legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to support House Resolution 1293, supporting the goals and ideals of National Child Abuse Prevention Month.

Ms. LORETTA SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Child Abuse Prevention Month, which raises awareness of child abuse and the services available to victims.

Child abuse is a tragic, destructive, and a largely silent epidemic that affects millions of Americans—both children and adults.

And it is never more tragic than when it is sexual in nature. Unfortunately one in six children in our country experiences this type of abuse in their lifetime.

In my district, I can think of one young woman in particular who was abused by a teacher she knew and respected over a decade ago. I am proud to say that she has recovered and is leading a happy life. She is also one of the officers in a group headquarted in Santa Ana called The Innocence Mission, which is working to help prevent abuse.

The Innocence Mission is putting forward a message of empowerment, one that tells parents they can prevent child sexual abuse. A message that speaks directly to children and adult survivors and says to them,—"you are not alone." Victims have the support of their communities, and have nothing to be ashamed of.

Far too often we read stories of child abuse in the headlines. It is heartbreaking and preventable, and that is why Congress and groups like the Innocence Mission must continue to advocate for victims and raise public awareness.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 1293, authorized by the gentlewoman from Illinois, Congresswoman JUDY BIGGERT. I gave Congressman PETRI the credit, but he does so many good things that I just made that mistake. I ask my colleagues to support the goals and ideals of National Child Abuse Prevention Month by voting for this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1293, 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.

NATIONAL ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS WEEK

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1131) expressing support for designation of the week of April 18, 2010, through April 23, 2010, as National Assistant Principals Week, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1131

Whereas the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Association of Elementary School Principals have declared the week of April 18, 2010, through April 23, 2010, as National Assistant Principals Week;

Whereas the assistant principal is responsible for establishing a positive learning environment and building strong school-community relationships;

Whereas the assistant principal is a member of the school administrative team who interacts with sectors of the school community, including support staff, instructional staff, students, and parents;

Whereas assistant principals play a pivotal role in the instructional leadership of the school by conducting instructional supervision, mentoring teachers, recognizing the achievements of staff, encouraging collaboration, ensuring the implementation of best practices, monitoring student achievement goals and progress, facilitating and modeling data driven decision-making to inform instruction, and guiding the direction of targeted intervention and continual school improvement;

Whereas the day-to-day logistical operations of schools require assistant principals to monitor and address facility needs, attendance, transportation issues, and scheduling, as well as supervise extra and co-curricular events;

Whereas assistant principals are entrusted with maintaining an inviting, safe, and orderly school environment that supports the growth and achievement of each and every student by nurturing positive peer relationships, recognizing student achievement, serving as mediators, analyzing behavior patterns, providing interventions, and conducting discipline;

Whereas the National Association of Secondary School Principals/Virco National Assistant Principal of the Year program began in 2004 to recognize outstanding middle and high school assistant principals who have demonstrated success in leadership, curriculum, and personalization; and

Whereas the week of April 18, 2010, through April 23, 2010, would be an appropriate week

to designate as National Assistant Principals Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of National Assistant Principals Week;

(2) honors and recognizes the contributions of assistant principals to the success of students in schools in the United States; and

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous materials on H. Res. 1131 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1131, which supports the goals and ideals of National Assistant Principals Week. With this resolution, we recognize the critical role that assistant principals serve in our Nation's schools, and we honor their hard work and dedication.

Many of us have fond memories of the assistant principals who served in our schools. They were the ones who made sure we were safe in the hallways and that we didn't miss our buses. They stopped by our classrooms to make sure we had all of the supplies we needed, and they counseled us through mistakes and successes to help us grow and to learn as students and citizens.

Assistant principals are the unsung heroes of our schools. They serve as a behind-the-scenes link between every sector of the school community. Their job description has expanded significantly over the past decades, and they are the backbone of a school's administrative team. They interact with students, with teachers, with staff, and with parents on a daily basis to ensure that every child is receiving the best education possible. National Assistant Principals Week recognizes their important contributions.

Since 2004, the National Association of Secondary School Principals and Virco have partnered to applaud secondary school assistant principals in their dedication and success in school leadership as part of National Assistant Principals Week. Their National Assistant Principal of the Year program recognizes outstanding middle level and high school assistant principals who have demonstrated success in leadership, curriculum, and personalization.

I would like to congratulate Mr. Nathan McCann, assistant principal at Flowing Wells High School in Tucson, Arizona, who has been named the 2010 National Assistant Principal of the Year. Mr. McCann is leading an effort to reform his school's curriculum in response to student feedback, and he has worked closely with school counselors to help the graduates of Flowing Wells to pursue their goals of postsecondary education.

I thank Mr. McCann for his hard work, for his dedication to his school and for being the role model he is for assistant principals nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I express my support for National Assistant Principals Week, and I thank the Nation's assistant principals. I thank Representative FUDGE for bringing this resolution to the floor, and I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1131, expressing support for the designation of the week of April 18 through 23 of this year as National Assistant Principals Week.

The successful operation of an educational institution requires competent administrators. An assistant principal, sometimes called a ''vice principal'' or a ''deputy principal,'' assists the principal in the general governance and leadership of a school. Assistant principals are often responsible for student discipline, for classroom observations, for teacher evaluation and supervision, for facilitating parent meetings, for maintaining schedules, and for handling logistical matters.

Additionally, the assistant principals frequently serve as testing coordinators; they assist in training staff on procedures related to standardized assessment as well as to account for testing materials. In addition to these duties, assistant principals are instructional leaders.

□ 1415

Assistant principals are members of the school's administrative team who interact with virtually every sector of the school community including support staff, instructional staff, students and parents. As a result of being the center of activity, they are able to foster positive relationships and resolve conflicts among all stakeholders throughout the school community.

These administrators play a key role in the leadership of the school by mentoring teachers, encouraging collaboration, and monitoring student achievement while ensuring that all students thrive in a safe, inviting, and orderly environment that is conducive to learning.

Today we recognize assistant principals in elementary, middle, and high school throughout the Nation for their dedication to the educational advancement of our children. We honor them for the contribution that they have made in ensuring that every child has access to a high-quality education.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 1131, authored by Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE from Ohio, and I urge my colleagues to support the goals and ideals of National Assistant Principals Week.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1131, 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF WORKERS' MEMORIAL DAY

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 375) supporting the goals and ideals of Workers' Memorial Day in order to honor and remember the workers who have been killed or injured in the workplace, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 375

Whereas, each year, about 5,000 workers are killed due to workplace-related injuries in the United States, and more than 2,000,000 workers across the world die of workplace-related accidents and diseases;

Whereas, each day, an average of 14 workers are killed due to workplace injuries in the United States;

Whereas there are about 3,700,000 occupational injuries and illnesses in the United States annually;

Whereas tens of thousands of Americans with workplace injuries or illness become permanently disabled;

Whereas more people are killed worldwide each year at work than in wars;

Whereas, on February 7, 2010, 6 workers were killed and 26 injured when there was a massive natural gas explosion at the Kleen Energy power plant in Middletown, Connecticut;

Whereas, on April 2, 2010, 7 workers were killed by a fire at the Tesoro oil refinery in Anacortes, Washington;

Whereas, on April 5, 2010, 29 miners were killed and 2 were injured in a massive explosion at the Upper Big Branch Mine in Raleigh County, West Virginia, in the worst coal mine disaster in 40 years;

Whereas, on April 20, 2010, there was an explosion and fire on the British Petroleum-

leased Transocean Deepwater Horizon drilling rig in the Gulf of Mexico 50 miles off the coast of Louisiana in which 17 workers were injured and 11 workers went missing;

Whereas observing Workers' Memorial Day allows us to honor and remember victims of workplace injuries and disease; and

Whereas observing Workers' Memorial Day reminds us of the need to strive for better worker safety and health protections: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Workers' Memorial Day to honor and remember workers who have been killed or injured in the workplace;

(2) recognizes the importance of worker health and safety standards;

(3) encourages the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the Mine Safety and Health Administration, industries, employers, and employees to support activities aimed at increasing awareness of the importance of preventing illness, injury, and death in the workplace; and

(4) calls upon the people of the United States to observe such a day with appropriate ceremonies and respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 375 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 375, which supports the goals and ideals of Workers' Memorial Day.

A number of recent tragedies serve to remind us of the importance of occupational and mine safety. In early February, six workers were killed and 26 injured in a natural gas explosion at the Kleen Energy Power Plant in Middletown, Connecticut. On April 2, seven workers were killed in an explosion and fire at the Tesoro Refinery in Anacortes, Washington. On April 5, 29 miners lost their lives in a massive explosion at the Upper Big Branch mine in West Virginia. This incident was the worst U.S. coal mining disaster in 40 years.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, today our thoughts and prayers remain with the friends and families of those 11 miners who went missing after an explosion last week at the Deepwater Horizon oil rig in the Gulf of Mexico. Seventeen workers were also injured, and we wish for their speedy recovery.

Too many workers in this Nation are subjected to dangerous conditions at work and have sacrificed their lives and health as a result. Everyone is entitled to a safe and healthy workplace. Every family deserves to know that when they send their loved one off to work, that loved one will come home that evening.

Mr. Speaker, with this resolution we remember and we honor all of these fallen workers, and we redouble our commitment to make our Nation's workplaces safe and healthy for all workers.

I thank Representative EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON from Texas for introducing this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Today we honor the men and women who have lost their lives on the job. With this resolution, we honor their sacrifice and offer our condolences to their families. And as ever, we use this occasion to recognize the importance of policies and practices that will encourage safe workplaces and prevent on-the-job illnesses, injuries, and fatalities.

Bringing this resolution at this time is particularly important given the recent tragedies and loss of life in the mining accidents in West Virginia.

Our diverse economy sometimes place workers in challenging situations. Some jobs are inherently more dangerous than others. Yet all workers should know the utmost precautions are being taken to limit dangers on the job. Employers must work diligently every day to provide safer work sites, free of hazards to ensure that all employees come home to their families at the end of the day.

This resolution speaks to preventing accidents and injuries on the job. A proactive approach to safety creates a safe working environment. By working together, employers, employees, and government safety officials involved can ensure safer work sites.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the author of H. Res. 375.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the presiding Member for yielding.

On Wednesday of this week, which is tomorrow, millions of people worldwide recognize Workers' Memorial Day.

Each year in this country, thousands of workers are killed due to workplace-related injuries, and tens of thousands more die of occupational illnesses. It is staggering to think that every day an average of 14 workers are killed due to injuries on the job. Worldwide more than 2 million workers die of occupational illness and injuries annually. That means more people are killed on the job each year than in wars.

The bottom line is that everyone deserves a safe and healthy workplace. Many of us take this basic right for granted. But for millions of Americans, the threat of being permanently disabled or even killed on the job is very real.

Workers' Memorial Day not only recognizes and honors those who have been killed or injured on the job, it also reminds us of the overwhelming need to improve health and safety standards in our Nation's workplaces.

It has been 40 years since the creation of OSHA, and over this time, worker health and safety standards have vastly improved. However, there is still work to be done, as evidenced by several recent workplace disasters.

The month of April has been particularly devastating for workplace deaths in the United States. On April 2, seven workers were killed by a devastating fire at Tesero Refinery in Washington. And just last week, as has been mentioned, we also saw a large explosion and fire on the Deepwater Horizon drilling rig 50 miles off the coast of Louisiana. Seventeen workers were injured and 11 are missing and thought now to be dead.

April 5, as has been mentioned, the explosion at the Upper Big Branch coal mine in West Virginia where 29 lives were lost. Additionally, a miner was killed this past week at Pocahontas Mine in West Virginia. Both of these mines had a pattern of repeat safety violations. It appears that these companies were not dedicated to the safety of their employees. Rather, they were dedicated to staying open by doing the bare minimum to meet regulations.

Chairman MILLER, Congresswoman WOOLSEY, and Congressman RAHALL have been diligent in working to bring to light repeated violators and holding those who continue to operate unsafe mines accountable.

I would like to express my deepest sympathy to the families and loved ones of those who were killed and injured in these tragic events, as well as all those workers who were injured or killed worldwide. These are our mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, sons, and daughters. They left home for work in the morning like all of us do, only never to return.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the gentlewoman.

We hear again and again that those who died knew the risk of what they were doing, a risk many felt was necessary to provide for their families. Yes, accidents do happen. But often accidents are preventable, and we must do all that we can to prevent injury and death on the job.

I would like to thank House leadership and Chairman MILLER for their support in bringing this resolution to the floor today, and I would also like to thank Congressman BRUCE BRALEY and Congresswoman LINDA SÁNCHEZ for their assistance in bringing this resolution forward.

I urge my colleagues to support the recognition of Workers' Memorial Day.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BRALEY), who has played a significant part in making this bill come forward.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution honoring Workers' Memorial Day.

The recent mining disaster in West Virginia serves as a strong reminder of the millions of Americans who put their lives on the line every day they go to work. Workers' Memorial Day commemorates those who have been injured or killed on the job. And, Mr. Speaker, this is personal to me because when I was 2 years old, my father was severely injured in a workplace accident, and one of the things I am proudest of was setting up a scholarship fund in his name to help injured workers and their families in Iowa get a new start on life.

Over the past several decades in the United States, we have made great progress in preventing injuries and deaths in the workplace. However, there is still much work that needs to be done, and each year more than 5,000 Americans are killed due to workplace injuries and millions more experience occupational injuries and illnesses. Work-related accidents are still too common in the United States. On average, 16 Americans are killed every day due to workplace injuries. We need to continue to work to ensure that every workplace is a safe one.

While in the United States we have improved workplace safety in recent decades, the numbers across the globe are overwhelming. It's estimated that nearly 2 million workers die each year due to work-related accidents or diseases worldwide. More people are killed due to workplace injury or disease than are killed in war.

As a founder of the Populist Caucus, dedicated to strengthening the middle class, I will continue to fight for workplace safety. I am also committed to recognizing this holiday and the millions of workers across the world who have given their lives on the job. That's why I was proud to work with my friends, Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON and fellow Populist Caucus member Congresswoman LINDA SÁNCHEZ as we continue to honor the millions of men and women who have given their lives for the continued progress of humankind.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to yield 4 minutes to the chair of the Education and Labor Committee, the number one champ for workers in our Congress, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and I thank the subcommittee chair for all of her work on behalf of workers in our country and her leadership on not only worker issues but also family issues as workers struggle to keep family and the workplace together and in sync from time to time.

I also want to thank Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON for her introduction of this resolution for Workers' Memorial Day and to all of the members of the committee who have supported it, to Mr. PETRI for his support.

This is the 21st annual Workers' Memorial Day, a day to honor workers who have lost their lives or become sick or injured because of the unsafe and unhealthy workplaces in the past year.

Our Nation's workers have had a tough year. Last Sunday, our Nation paused to remember 29 fallen miners in the Upper Big Branch mine, the worst U.S. coal mining accident since 1970. Upper Big Branch was not the only horrific workplace catastrophe this year. Last week 11 workers died in an explosion on the Deepwater Horizon oil rig in the Gulf of Mexico.

□ 1430

Three days before the blast at Upper Big Branch, seven workers perished in an explosion at a refinery near Seattle. This comes after a devastating explosion at a power plant under construction in Connecticut, which cost six workers their lives. These explosions are a reminder that while we have made some strides in workplace safety, unacceptable risks still remain for our workers. Fourteen workers die on the job every day. We have to do better.

Take the Upper Big Branch mine: 2 months ago, my committee learned about how many mine operators managed to avoid some of the tougher sanctions implemented after the Sago mine explosion. While some have made safety a priority, others have responded by indiscriminately challenging nearly every safety citation. By flooding the system with unwarranted appeals, these companies have been able to avoid full accountability for their actions. The consequences of these delays can be deadly.

Last August, the Mine Safety and Health Administration identified 48 mines that were able to escape the possibility of tougher scrutiny because of these unresolved appeals. Upper Big Branch mine was one of them. So was the nearby Pocahontas mine, where a worker was killed last week.

Loopholes in our safety laws aren't exclusive to mining. Sadly, penalties for companies that violate health and safety laws are woefully outdated. Multimillion-dollar corporations often face little more than a slap on the wrist for potentially fatal violations. Without effective enforcement, it's easy for bad actors to become repeat offenders. Without adequate whistleblower protections, workers who want to report hazards often live in fear of retribution. According to the New York Times, one Upper Big Branch foreman recalled, ''I have had guys come to me and cry,'' because they were too afraid to report concerns about high methane levels in the mine. Workers shouldn't have to choose between losing their lives and losing their jobs.

These tragedies call for immediate reforms that will make all workplaces safer. First, we must allocate funding that will start to clear the backlog of the mine safety appeals. Second, we need to look at outdated and ineffective laws that continue to allow companies to put workers in harm's way. In 2008, I authored legislation that would have strengthened the mine disaster prevention efforts, improved emergency responses, and reduced long-term health risks to miners. The S–MINER Act passed the House, but died in the Senate because of a veto threat. We don't know yet if it would have prevented the Upper Big Branch tragedy, but it certainly could have helped.

Finally, Congress should pass the Protecting America's Workers Act. This bill will modernize safety protections for workers across all industries through stronger penalties, effective whistleblower protections, and meaningful accountability when employers break the law.

Four years ago, I made a promise to the families who lost a loved one in the Sago, Darby, and Aracoma Alma mine disasters. I told them we would do everything we could to heed the lessons of those disasters and keep miners safe. Unfortunately, I've had to make the same promise to families at the Crandall Canyon mine disaster and now the Upper Big Branch mine disaster. This has got to stop.

On this Workers' Memorial Day, it's time to live up to this promise for all the families of workers who have lost their lives on the job—and all working men and women across this country. We cannot afford to let another year go by without meaningful reform.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE).

Mr. HARE. I want to thank Chairman WOOLSEY for her leadership on the Workforce Protection Subcommittee, who I have had the pleasure of serving with.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 375. On April 28, we observe Workers' Memorial Day, when people all over the world gather to remember and mourn the workers killed or injured on the job. April 28 also commemorates the creation of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Since its inception in 1970, OSHA has been a driving force in improving workplace safety and health conditions across the country. Over the past several decades, through the work of OSHA, we have made enormous strides

in protecting workers, yet there's still much work left to be done.

Mr. Speaker, worker safety has been at the forefront of our social conscience lately. We've seen devastating tragedies from West Virginia to Connecticut to Washington State and now Louisiana. While we grieve for those lost in these tragedies, we should never forget those who are killed on the job but never make the front pages. Their families' pain is no less substantial and our obligation to protect them is no less important. Each of these deaths should remind us that failing to give OSHA the tools it needs to regulate the workforce efficiently leaves our constituents, the American workforce, in jeopardy.

The government alone cannot fully protect our workers. Workers' Memorial Day must also be a reminder to our Nation's employers of their obligation to keep their employees safe. The days of certain companies skirting safety just to save a buck must come to an end once and for all. For those employers that fail to comply, we must strengthen worker protections and make penalties more severe.

On behalf of all of those who we honor on Workers' Memorial Day, I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join Chairman WOOLSEY and me in the fight to modernize OSHA to protect the lives and health of America's workers. Let us all stand together today in solidarity in recognizing Workers' Memorial Day, honor all those we have lost, and vow to take the steps necessary to make every American safer at work.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 7, 2010, while a lot of families were returning from church, myself included, an explosion occurred at the Kleen Energy power plant in Middletown, Connecticut, a plant that was under construction—a new natural gas plant—where workers, particularly from Local 777 of the Plumbers and Pipefitters, were there as almost a nonstop series of shifts to get the plant online since a lot of the power credits had already been sold to the owners.

It was an explosion which took place in the middle of the State of Connecticut. It was heard as far away as Long Island Sound. That was the size and violence of the explosion. They were purging the natural gas power lines. There was a buildup of natural gas. Unfortunately, there was some ignition that caused the explosion to take place. Six workers were killed. Twenty-six more were injured. Among them was Raymond Dobratz of Old Saybrook, Connecticut, someone who was a father and a grandfather, a beautiful family. He was very active in the community. The other was Ronnie Crabb of Colchester, Connecticut. Ronnie is a friend of mine. His wife, Jodi Thomas, is the probate judge in Colchester, Connecticut. A young family. Ronnie was somebody who was so devoted to his wife and child and also would do anything in the community, whether it was raising money for charities, being involved in Little League, being involved in his union. The loss is something that is still felt so deeply in the community because of what a wonderful person he was.

The Education and Labor Committee, under Congresswoman WOOLSEY's leadership and Mr. MILLER, is going to conduct a study because there are certain rules that have now been recommended by the Chemical Safety Board for power plant construction because there is a wave of natural gas power plants that are under construction because of the Energy Act. The fact of the matter is, the law has not caught up with the technology that surrounds this very dangerous work.

I, again, applaud Congresswoman WOOLSEY for bringing this motion forward. But to honestly honor these individuals who lost their lives, we need to make sure that the laws are enacted to make sure that there are real protections for workers and their families and we don't have situations like the Crabb family and Dobratz family are experiencing today.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON).

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this extremely important issue. I rise in strong support of this resolution. This Thursday, April 28, 2010, millions of workers and their families throughout the world will gather to commemorate Workers' Memorial Day. We will remember and honor those injured or killed on the job, and we will renew the call for stronger workplace protections.

Since 1970, when the Occupational Safety and Health Act was passed, more than 410,000 workers' lives have been saved due to improvements in working conditions. However, the number of workplace-related illnesses, injuries, and deaths remains far too high. In 2008, more than 4 million workers were injured and 5,214 workers were killed due to job hazards. In Ohio, 168 workers lost their lives in the workplace in 2008; 168 Ohioans went to work and lost their lives as a result of workplace hazards. One hundred and sixty-eight men and women went to work and never returned to their families. This is about more than statistics. This is about lost lives.

This Workers' Memorial Day we pause and remember the thousands of lives lost in workplaces around the world. In the past 3 months alone, we have witnessed four major workplace tragedies that claimed the lives of 41 workers. Eleven workers are still missing after an oil rig explosion last week. We must act to ensure our workplaces are safe and our workers are protected. We must continue to fight to create well-paying, safe jobs for the American people. We must continue to fight to protect our workers' safety and health and to hold those who put their employees at risk accountable.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, as we've heard, every year about 5,000 workers are killed and 4 million are injured on the job, with an additional 50,000 dying each year from occupational diseases. There are about 4 million cases of reportable workplace injuries and 3.7 million occupational illnesses and injuries on an annual basis. While coal mining remains one of the most dangerous jobs in the United States, every single day hardworking miners show up to the mines in order to provide for their families. We need to do whatever we can to ensure that they and other workers return home safely each and every night.

To honor those who have sacrificed their lives, their health, and their loved ones who sacrificed the lives of those that went to work and didn't come home, we must do more. We have to do more than talk. We have to bring OSHA and MSHA into the 21st century. That is my commitment to the workers of America. That is what I'm working on with the support of my subcommittee in Education and Labor, the Workforce Protection Subcommittee, and our chairman, GEORGE MILLER. That is what we know must happen.

So I urge my colleagues, in closing, to support H. Res. 375, support the goals and ideals of Workers' Memorial Day, and I thank Congresswoman JOHNSON and Congressman BRALEY and those that worked with her on this amazing resolution. It is so important.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 375, supporting the mission and goals of Workers Memorial Day, introduced by my good friend, the gentlelady from Texas.

On Workers Memorial Day, we pause to remember workers who have been injured, sickened, or even killed on the job.

We were recently given a harsh reminder of the realities of workplace danger in West Virginia. The coal miners who lost their lives in that tragedy paid the ultimate price while working to support their families and supply energy to this great nation.

Sixteen workers are killed on the job each day in America. my home, Los Angeles County, that means that, on average, one worker dies every 3 days. We lose a neighbor on the job every 3 days.

Accidents don't just happen in the most dangerous industries or on the most hazardous job sites. They also happen in offices, stores, and warehouses.

The fact is, deaths and injuries at work are preventable. We just need to give the issue

the attention it deserves. I applaud steps taken so far.

President Obama's Labor Department has already raised the profile of this issue and OSHA and MSHA have been empowered to do much more than ask for compliance with voluntary standards.

With passage of the Recovery Act, we were able to shift resources to agencies that enforce workplace safety and health laws.

While the recent tragedy in West Virginia reminds us that we have far to go, my point is that it shouldn't take a disaster to put our eye on the ball. One preventable death at work is too many.

Disasters, like the recent loss of so many lives in West Virginia, serve as a stark reminder of the inadequacies that still exist. No family should ever have to suffer loss because we do not properly or fully inspect a workplace.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this resolution.

I also urge you to join the members of the Labor and Working Families Caucus as we continue our efforts to make it safe to go to work in America.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 375, 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1445

CONGRATULATING THE ONONDAGA COMMUNITY COLLEGE LADY LAZERS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 561) congratulating the Onondaga Community College Lady Lazers for winning the National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA) Division I Women's Lacrosse Tournament.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 561

Whereas, on May 10, 2009, the Onondaga Community College Lady Lazers defeated Monroe Community College 9–7 in the finals of the National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA) Division I Women's Lacrosse Tournament at Herkimer County Community College;

Whereas the Lady Lazers won the national title in their first year of existence;

Whereas the Lady Lazers' players, coaches, and staff are excellent representatives of Onondaga Community College;

Whereas Lauren Welch, Amanda Cizenski, and Emily Pierson were named 1st Team NJCAA All-Americans; and

Whereas the residents of Onondaga County and fans are to be congratulated for their support, dedication, and pride in the team: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulates the Onondaga Community College Lady Lazers for winning the National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA) Division I Women's Lacrosse Tournament.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 561 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Onondaga Community College Lady Lazers for winning the National Junior College Athletic Association Division I Women's Lacrosse Tournament.

On May 10, 2009, the Onondaga Community College Lady Lazers team celebrated their National Junior College Athletic Association Division I championship title with a solid winning score of 9–7 over Monroe Community College. This was an especially notable victory for the Lady Lazers, winning the national title in their first year of existence. Winning the championship game was the conclusion to an outstanding season where their only loss all season was to Monroe College during the regular season. Getting to avenge that loss, resulting in the winning of the championship, made the triumph even sweeter for the team of young athletes.

Each Lady Lazers team member is a proud representative of the community college which is located in the heart of Upstate New York, near the Finger Lakes, Lake Ontario, and the St. Lawrence Seaway as well as the Adirondack Mountains. The community college takes pride in a history of excellence and athletics with more than 200 athletes who participate in one of the institution's 11 competitive teams.

Lady Lazers attacker Lauren Welch was named first team NJCAA All-American in addition to being named the Region III Player of the Year. Midfielders Amanda Cizenski and Emily Pierson were also named First Team All-Americans. Welch, Cizenski, and Pierson were also First Team All-Region selections.

I congratulate these residents as well as the fans all across the great State of New York for their support, dedication, and pride in the Lady Lazers champion team, and I wish them great success in the 2010 season.

I thank Representative MAFFEI for bringing this resolution forward, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of House Resolution 561, introduced by our colleague Mr. MAFFEI, congratulating the Onondaga Community College Lady Lazers for winning the National Junior College Athletic Association Division I Women's Lacrosse Tournament.

Noted for its hills, wooded terrain, and expansive view of the surrounding countryside, Onondaga Community College is a college of the State University of New York system. Onondaga is a diverse educational learning community, committed to creating and maintaining an atmosphere where individuality is not only recognized but encouraged to contribute to the fabric of the campus environment. Onondaga Community College serves the educational and economic development needs of the region. Their focus is on a student-centered environment, learning-focused institution with a community-oriented approach.

In addition to its academic success, Onondaga Community College has a history of excellence in athletics and is proud of its more than 200 athletes who participate in one of the institution's 11 competitive teams. In the past 3 years, Onondaga teams have captured five national championships and, in 2009, became the first college in NJCAA history to achieve two simultaneous national championships in men's and women's lacrosse.

On May 10, 2009, the Onondaga Lady Lazers defeated Monroe Community College 9–7 in the finals of the National Junior College Athletic Association Division I Lacrosse Tournament. The Lady Lazers won the national title in their first year of existence. In addition, Lauren Welch, Amanda Cizenski, and Emily Pierson were named First Team NJCAA All-Americans.

So today we congratulate Onondaga Community College, its students, faculty, and fans on their win. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MAFFEI), who is the author of this resolution.

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California and the gentleman from Wisconsin for their support of this legislation, which I do support on behalf of the community college team in my district.

I wanted to quickly mention that the word Onondaga is an Hodenosaunee word, an Iroquois word. The Iroquois Confederation was a major Native American confederation of actually

five and then six Native American Indian nations. Its capital was called Onondaga, and, indeed, the word means ''on top of the hill'' and was very, very close to where Syracuse is now—the city that I'm from—and it's a very, very special place. The college that, indeed, these teams are from is named after that original people.

Our community colleges are a tremendous asset that are too often taken for granted in our communities. In my community, we have one of the best community colleges, Onondaga Community College, and today I rise to congratulate two great lacrosse teams from this college. Before I do, I want to congratulate this college for its academics.

This college is becoming one of the best 2-year institutions of higher learning in this country, thanks in large part to the leadership of President Debbie Sydow. Onondaga is at the forefront of providing education to its students, and exhibits excellence in the high-tech and cutting-edge careers that are becoming the future of the economy in central New York and, indeed, in the country as a whole, particularly in the areas of health care, environmental technology, and high-tech manufacturing. It has become a center for art, music, and culture in our community. And with its extremely popular residence facilities, it now offers the full college experience.

After two or more years of study at Onondaga, students have gone on to transfer their credits and continue their education at some of the most prestigious institutions of higher learning in this country, including Columbia, Cornell, Syracuse University, the Rhode Island School of Design, NYU, University of Southern California, and Clarkson.

But I am here today to rise in congratulations of two of the college teams. I am going to congratulate one team now because that's the subject of H. Res. 561, and then I am hoping the gentlelady will yield to me when we consider H. Res. 563. I will talk about the other team.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Onondaga Community College Lady Lazers for winning the 2009 National Junior College Athletic Association women's lacrosse tournament. I am incredibly proud to represent the Lady Lazers. They had an incredible season and, of course, this national championship.

In 2009, as mentioned, their inaugural season, the Lady Lazers defeated Monroe Community College 9–7 in the finals of the NJCAA women's lacrosse tournament at Herkimer County Community College. This was the conclusion of a fantastic season by a fantastic team. Three Lady Lazers were named First Team NJCAA All-Americans, and all of the Lady Lazers were tremendous representatives of Onondaga College and their community. The 2010 season is already well underway, and the Lady Lazers are currently ranked number two in the country with a 7–1 record.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the OCC Lady Lazers on a tremendous season and a 2009 NJCAA national championship.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 561, congratulating the Onondaga Community College Lady Lazers for winning the National Junior College Athletic Association Division I Women's Lacrosse Tournament.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 561.

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.

CONGRATULATING THE ONONDAGA COMMUNITY COLLEGE LAZERS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 563) congratulating the Onondaga Community College Lazers for winning the National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA) Division I Men's Lacrosse Tournament.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 563

Whereas, on May 10, 2009, the Onondaga Community College Lazers defeated Nassau Community College 9–8 in the finals of the National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA) Division I Men's Lacrosse Tournament at Herkimer County Community College;

Whereas the Lazers now holds 3 men's lacrosse national titles;

Whereas Head Coach Chuck Wilbur was the NJCAA Men's Lacrosse Coach of the Year;

Whereas the Lazers completed an undefeated season;

Whereas the Lazers' players, coaches, and staff are excellent representatives of Onondaga Community College;

Whereas Jerome Thompson and Jon Fiorillo were named the Offensive and Defensive Players of the Year respectively by the NJCAA Men's Lacrosse Coaches Association; and

Whereas the residents of Onondaga County and fans are to be congratulated for their support, dedication, and pride in the team: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulates the Onondaga Community College Lazers for winning the National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA) Division I Men's Lacrosse Tournament.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous materials on H. Res. 563 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Onondaga Community College Lazers for winning the National Junior College Athletic Association Division I Men's Lacrosse Tournament. On May 10, 2009, the Onondaga Community College Lazers men's lacrosse team defeated Nassau Community College with a final score of 9–8 during the finals of the NJCAA Division I Men's Lacrosse Tournament at Herkimer County Community College.

The game that secured the Lazers' victory was remarkable, as it marked the third national title for Onondaga Community College's men's lacrosse program. The victory was also especially sweet as it concluded an undefeated season for the team. In addition to winning the NJCAA division championship, the 2009 men's team also won its fifth consecutive NJCAA Region III championship as well as its ninth consecutive Mid-State Athletic Conference title in 2009.

I congratulate Head Coach Chuck Wilbur on winning eight consecutive Mid-State Athletic Conference championships, five consecutive Region III championships, and three national championships. Chuck was named the NJCAA Men's Lacrosse Coaches Association National Coach of the Year in 2009, the third time he was given that honor.

I also wish to congratulate attack man Jerome Thompson and midfielder Jeremy Thompson, who were named the offensive and defensive players of the year, respectively, by the NJCAA Men's Lacrosse Coaches Association. In addition to Jerome Thompson and Jeremy Thompson, midfielder Ed Prevost, defenseman Pete Mumford, and goalie Jon Fiorillo were all named to the NJCAA All-American First Team.

In 2009, Mr. Speaker, Onondaga Community College became the first college in NCAA history to achieve two simultaneous national championships in men's and women's lacrosse, with both the men's Lazers team winning the title along with the Lady Lazers team. Onondaga Community College is very proud of its athletes as well as its academic programs.

I congratulate each member of the team, and I congratulate the community college family on winning the NJCAA Division I championship, and I wish them great success in 2010 for their men's lacrosse season.

I thank Representative MAFFEI for bringing this resolution forward, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of Representative MAFFEI's resolution, House Resolution 563, congratulating the Onondaga Community College Lazers for winning the National Junior College Athletic Association Division I Men's Lacrosse Tournament.

Onondaga Community College is a college of the State University of New York system and one of 30 locally sponsored community colleges throughout New York State. They offer 2-year degree programs that serve as transfer opportunities for baccalaureate degree programs at 4-year campuses and for direct entry to the workforce, and they offer certificate programs that can be completed in 1 year. The college currently has over 11,000 students enrolled and strives to provide the full college experience.

The Onondaga Community College men's lacrosse team is an example of the college's excellence, with three national titles to its name. The team has included 35 All-American and 47 Lacrosse Coaches Association Academic All-Americans. The 2009 men's lacrosse team completed the season 16–0, an undefeated season.

□ 1500

The team captured the 2009 NJCAA National Championship against Nassau Community College on May 10, 2009, with a 9–8 victory, closer than the ladies who won 9–7. Jerome Thompson and Jon Fiorillo were named the offensive and defensive players of the year, and Head Coach Chuck Wilbur was named the NJCAA Men's Lacrosse Coach of the Year.

I stand to congratulate the Onondaga Community College men's lacrosse team, Coach Chuck Wilbur, the students and fans, and the faculty and staff at OCC. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution before us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the gentleman from New York (Mr. MAFFEI) for such time as he may consume.

Mr. MAFFEI. I thank the gentlewoman from California as well as the gentleman from Wisconsin. We have had a very, very good year in lacrosse last year in upstate New York. In fact, a good portion of the bills that I have come to sponsor on the floor have been congratulatory resolutions for all of the various teams that we have had. Syracuse University won its tournament. Le Moyne was second in its division in lacrosse, and we have already mentioned the OCC women.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think the word that the gentleman from Wisconsin used, ''excellence,'' is the only way to describe this particular team. These young men had extremely high expectations on their shoulders, and yet they exceeded even those.

So I rise to congratulate the Onondaga Community College Lazers for winning the 2009 National Junior College Athletic Association men's lacrosse tournament. I am incredibly proud to be the congressman who represents the Lazers, and I am incredibly proud of them for an undefeated season and their third national championship in the past 4 years.

In 2009, the Lazers defeated Nassau Community College 9–8 in the finals of the NJCAA men's lacrosse tournament at Herkimer County Community College. This was the conclusion of a great season with many talented players, too numerous to mention here, but I will say that Jerome Thompson and Jon Fiorillo were named the offensive and defensive players of the year, and Head Coach Chuck Wilbur was named the NJCAA Coach of the Year.

All of the Lazers are tremendous representatives of their school and their community. The 2010 season is well underway, and the Lazers are currently ranked number 3 in the country with an 11–2 record.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Onondaga Lazers on a tremendous season and a 2009 NJCAA national championship.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 563 congratulating the Onondaga Community College Lazers for winning the NJCAA Division I men's lacrosse tournament.

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. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 563.

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.

NATIONAL HEALTHY SCHOOLS DAY

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1280) expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the goals and ideals of National Healthy Schools Day, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1280

Whereas there are approximately 55,000,000 children and 7,000,000 adults who spend their days in the Nation's more than 125,000 public and private schools;

Whereas children spend an average of 30 to 50 hours per week in school;

Whereas one-third of public school principals report that some environmental factors interfere with classroom instruction;

Whereas some environmental hazards that are common in schools include unsafe drinking water, ventilation problems and poor indoor environmental quality which are associated with a wide range of problems that include poor concentration, poor attendance, lower student test scores, respiratory illnesses, cancer, and other safety hazards;

Whereas about 9 percent of the Nation's students have asthma, which is a leading cause of school absenteeism and is aggravated by poor air quality and ventilation problems;

Whereas healthy and high performance schools are designed to improve indoor environments and other environmental factors by improving ventilation, providing for moisture and mold controls, temperature and humidity controls, as well as acoustics and noise controls, and other design elements;

Whereas healthy and high performance schools provide a healthier and safer learning environment for children and improved academic achievement and well-being;

Whereas National Healthy Schools Day is an important day to celebrate and promote healthy and green school environments for all children;

Whereas National Healthy Schools Day is coordinated by Healthy Schools Network in collaboration with the Environmental Protection Agency and the Council of Educational Facility Planners—International and is celebrated on the first day of School Building Week; and

Whereas April 26, 2010, would be an appropriate day to designate as ''National Healthy Schools Day'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of National Healthy Schools Day; and

(2) supports the goals and ideals of this day which include the promotion of healthy and safe places to learn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 1280 into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1280, a resolution recognizing the goals and ideals of National Healthy Schools Day.

Every year we celebrate National Healthy Schools Day to promote healthy and green school environments for all children. Across the country, more than 55 million children and 7 million adults spend their days in over 125,000 public and private schools in the United States. That is why it is essential that we recognize the importance of healthy learning environments. This year, National Healthy Schools Day 2010 focuses on the importance of good indoor air quality, nontoxic cleaning supplies, and environmentally friendly building materials.

The need for healthy schools is clear. Scientific studies show that poor environmental conditions in schools harm students' health and academic achievement. On the other hand, healthy

schools help students reach their maximum potential. According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency, more than half of the schools in the U.S. have problems linked to unhealthy indoor air quality. Too many school districts struggle with the poor physical condition of their facilities, and this reality has only become worse because of the fiscal crisis affecting our country.

Schools in urban and rural areas are often overcrowded, unhealthy, inadequately maintained, and reduce quality learning. Healthy school environments encourage better school attendance and participation. Kids who feel healthy are more likely to stay in school. Healthy schools also encourage students to spend time at school for extracurricular activities, which is a key part of President Obama's goal to make our schools the community centers that they should and could be. All students deserve dry, clean, and quiet facilities with good indoor air, lighting and sanitation.

National Healthy Schools Day highlights simple steps we can take that can improve school environments for our children. This year's healthy schools campaign focuses on the importance of green, nontoxic cleaning products. Approximately 25 percent of chemicals in cleaning products used in schools are toxic and contribute to poor indoor air quality, smog, cancer, asthma and other diseases. Simply replacing toxic products with all natural cleaners could immediately improve the health of our students.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency provides guides and assessments on their Web site to help schools improve indoor air quality. National Healthy Schools Day raises awareness of tools like these to help make our schools healthier and safer for kids.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution in support of National Healthy Schools Day serves to recognize the importance of healthy, safe, and green learning environments in our Nation's schools. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for introducing this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1280 expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the goals and ideals of National Healthy Schools Day. Most parents recognize the importance of keeping their children healthy, and strive to do so. National Healthy Schools Day recognizes the important role that schools also play in keeping students healthy and ready to learn.

Approximately 55 million children spend 30–50 hours a week in our Nation's schools. Local communities strive to make their school buildings places that support positive environments in which learning can thrive. For example, by taking steps to improve indoor air quality, school districts can decrease irritants in the air that may aggravate asthma and allergies in some children. Districts are also responsible for ensuring that school buildings are safe from physical danger and that all children will be protected during their time at school.

National Healthy Schools Day promotes schools that support parents' efforts to ensure their children are safe and healthy whether at home or at school.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring local schools that meet the commitment to keeping all children healthy and safe.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), the author of this legislation, for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California and the gentleman from Wisconsin. I rise today in support of H. Res. 1280, a resolution that I introduced to recognize National Healthy Schools Day. National Healthy Schools Day recognizes the importance of having a clean, healthy and safe indoor environment in our Nation's schools.

Each day millions of students, teachers, and staff go to work and school in our Nation's schools. Not all of these are healthy environments, especially for our young children. The EPA estimates that up to one-half of those schools have problems with indoor air quality. And 32 million students attend schools that have self-reported environmental problems with their facilities that can affect our children's health and learning.

Indoor air quality is one of the most common environmental problems in schools, which can aggravate children's allergies and asthma problems. Nine percent of our Nation's schoolchildren have asthma, which is the leading cause of absenteeism in schools. Other common environmental problems in schools include mold infestations, lead and copper contaminated drinking water, playgrounds and classrooms with high levels of pesticides, unchecked furnaces and buses leaking carbon monoxide, and exhaust from gasoline-powered equipment.

These problems affect the health of our Nation's schools and the people in them, and can contribute to absenteeism, learning difficulties, sick building syndrome, staff turnover, and liability issues for our school districts.

Research shows that simple steps can be taken to make our schools healthier. Heating and ventilation equipment can be improved to enhance indoor air quality. New schools can be built with a healthy design at non-polluted sites, in more sustainable ways that reduce energy and maintenance costs. Nontoxic products can be used for cleaning, maintenance and teaching. The use of natural light can be improved.

Healthy and high performance schools are designed to improve the indoor environment for the students and staff members who go to work and school in these buildings each and every day. They are more energy efficient and lead to better overall health. Many States, in fact, have already adopted guidelines for building healthy and high performance schools, like my home State of New York.

National Healthy Schools Day draws attention to the importance of having a safe and healthy school environment for our Nation's students. National Healthy Schools Day is supported by the Healthy Schools Network, the EPA, the National Education Association, and many more organizations. I am proud to be counted as a supporter of National Healthy Schools Day, and look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues here to ensure that every student has a healthy environment in which to learn. After all, our children are the foundation for this country's great future. Shouldn't we be providing them with the safest and healthiest places to learn?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution recognizing National Healthy Schools Day authored by Congressman TONKO from New York, and recognizing the importance of ensuring healthy and green school environments for all of our children.

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. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1280, as amended.

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

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: ''Expressing support for designation of April 26, 2010, as National Healthy Schools Day.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1515

RURAL HOUSING PRESERVATION AND STABILIZATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5017) to ensure the availability of loan guarantees for rural homeowners, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5017

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 ''Rural Housing Preservation and Stabilization Act of 2010''.

SEC. 2. LOAN GUARANTEE FEES.

(a) UP-FRONT FEES.—Paragraph (8) of section 502(h) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1472(h)(8)) is amended to read as follows:

''(8) GUARANTEE FEES.—With respect to a guaranteed loan under this subsection, the Secretary may collect from the lender, at the time of issuance of the guarantee, a fee equal to not more than 4.0 percent of the principal obligation of the loan, as determined sufficient by the Secretary to cover the costs (as such term is defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a)) of loan guarantees under this subsection.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 739 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 2001 (as enacted by Public Law 106–387; 114 Stat. 1549A–34) is hereby repealed

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF AMOUNT OF LOAN GUARANTEES.—Section 513 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1483) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) AUTHORIZATION FOR LOAN GUARANTEES.—The Secretary may, to the extent approved in appropriation Acts, guarantee loans under section 502(h) in aggregate amounts not to exceed $30,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.''.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5017, the Rural Housing Preservation and Stabilization Act. This legislation aims to preserve the U.S. Department of Agriculture's section 502 Single Family Housing Guaranteed Loan Program that helps low- and moderate-income rural residents obtain safe and affordable housing.

Since its inception, this program has helped hundreds of thousands of families realize the American dream of homeownership. Managed by the USDA's Rural Housing Service, the program provides a vital source of mortgage credit in communities of less than 20,000 residents. USDA currently guarantees rural home loans with the money that it receives through the appropriations process and the upfront fees it collects on loan originations.

Historically, Congress has also set, through the annual appropriations process, the statutory limit on the maximum loan commitment authority that the Federal Government will guarantee. These guarantees decrease the exposure of home lenders to default so that they will underwrite more mortgages for low- and moderate-income families in rural America.

In 2009, the 115,000 loans made under the program averaged $112,000. The financial crisis, however, has created unprecedented demand for and spiked homebuyer interest in the program. As a result, the program has more than tripled in recent years from guaranteeing about $3 billion in 2006 to guaranteeing more than $10 billion at the end of March 2010.

In March, USDA notified its State directors and participating lenders in the program that they would have to stop making conditional loan commitments at the end of April because they had exhausted their funding and would have to wait until they received additional appropriations. H.R. 5017 offers a commonsense solution to this problem by raising the upfront fee that USDA can charge commercial lenders up to 4 percent and increasing the USDA's loan authority to $30 billion for the current year. USDA confirms that these amounts would be sufficient for the program to continue to operate without interruption.

Moreover, by making this program self-sustaining, we would also reduce discretionary spending by $24 million in the current fiscal year. So this legislation represents a win for American taxpayers and a win for America's heartland.

This legislation additionally enjoys broad support and passed out of the Financial Services Committee by a bipartisan vote last Thursday. In this regard, I am especially grateful for the work of my colleague, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), who has worked closely with me on these matters. Her suggestions have helped make a good bill even better.

Additionally, many groups have called upon Congress to act quickly to fix this problem, including the National Association of Realtors, the Mortgage Bankers Association, and the American Bankers Association. We should heed their advice and pass this bill.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, to preserve the dream of homeownership in America's heartland, I urge all my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 5017.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. KANJORSKI, for his good, solid work on this bill. We have worked well together on H.R. 5017, and I think we see the results of that work together here today on the floor.

This legislation extends the USDA 502 loan guarantee program. This program is a very important homeownership tool for many rural Americans, many of whom live in my State of West Virginia, providing a loan guarantee on privately issued loans. The 502 program has a very low default rate.

Over the last few years, demand for the program has increased, and consequently loan commitment authority for the 502 program will be exhausted. Without swift action, borrowers who rely on this program will run out of options for affordable home loans.

Last week, I offered an amendment during the markup of H.R. 5017 in the Financial Services Committee that provides the 502 program with additional loan commitment authority and makes an important improvement to the program. In order to make the program self-sufficient, we are raising the guaranteed fee up to 4 percent, granting the Secretary the authority to choose the appropriate level. This ensures that the program will no longer be reliant on taxpayer funds to build capital reserves, a welcome part of the 502 program.

Although I am committed to continuing to work with my colleagues on potential long-term modifications to the 502 program that serve the best interests of the homeowners and the taxpayers, I believe it is important that the language increasing the loan commitment authority to $30 billion be limited to the current fiscal year and not beyond that time period. We must be aware of the impact on the private market and ensure that private entities are able to regain appropriate market share.

Mr. Speaker, with these changes, we strike a balance of extending the program through the rest of the year. I, and I'm sure many of my colleagues here, have heard from numerous Realtors, lenders and potential homebuyers about the situation that the 502 program has found itself in. Since its inception, the 502 program has helped hundreds of thousands of families with low to moderate incomes realize homeownership. Over the past several weeks, as I said, many constituents have contacted me stressing just how important this program is as they are on their path towards homeownership and wish to see its continued funding.

Again, I would like to thank Mr. KANJORSKI for working with me on this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the U.S. Department of Commerce released figures for March for the sale of single family homes. It increased by 27 percent, the biggest increase since 1963.

We are finally starting to see real signs of recovery in the housing market, but it didn't happen by itself entirely. Prices have certainly gone

down, there are good rates available out there, but programs like the one Congressman KANJORSKI's legislation will protect and nurture have been a huge reason why we've seen the growth in numbers that the U.S. Department of Commerce reported last week.

The 502 program in eastern Connecticut has been a lifeline throughout 2009 and early 2010 where, again, the spike in numbers that Mr. KANJORSKI described has been a reality and has allowed, again, the market to thrive, but also to provide people an avenue to obtain financing that otherwise they never would have been able to get in the regular market.

As was said by the Congresswoman from West Virginia, lenders are holding their breath, homeowners are holding their breath, and the first-time homebuyer tax credit is about to expire in a few days. Passing this legislation which will provide an avenue to protect this program will continue the upward momentum that we are finally starting to see in the housing market.

Again, I congratulate Mr. KANJORSKI for his creative solution to this problem, which will not cost the taxpayers additional funds, but will keep, again, a growing real estate market moving in the right direction.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I would just, again, reiterate my support for this bill. I think it's timely. It's something that we want to do in an expeditious and responsible manner, and I believe that this bill addresses those concerns.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5017, the ''Rural Housing Preservation and Stabilization Act of 2010.''

This bill would preserve the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Rural Housing Service (RHS) Section 502 Single Family Direct Homeownership Loans Program, which is set to expire at the end of this month.

Section 502 is USDA's main housing loan program and is designed to help low-income individuals purchase, build, repair, or renovate homes in rural areas.

Currently, Section 502 is the only federal program targeting safe and affordable homeownership opportunities to low- and very low-income rural households. The annual average income of a Section 502 direct borrower is 55 percent of area median income, or $18,500 a year.

Since its inception, Section 502 has provided loans to approximately 2.5 million families at an extremely low cost to the federal government. Unfortunately, the amount appropriated for rural housing programs has been insufficient to meet the demand. The current backlog for Section 502 direct loans includes 27,000 rural households, totaling $2.9 billion in loan applications.

H.R. 5017, will preserve the Section 502 program and establish a self-sustaining program at no cost to taxpayers. I believe Section 502 is vital for our rural communities throughout the nation and this bill is absolutely necessary to help preserve a critical program at no cost to taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this important bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5017, 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. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROHIBITING A COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN 2011

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5146) to provide that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5146

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

SECTION 1. NO COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT IN PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no adjustment shall be made under section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31) (relating to cost of living adjustments for Members of Congress) during fiscal year 2011.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, while there are positive signs of economic recovery around the country, the budget deficit is still an important issue. Therefore, it is appropriate that we continue to forego a cost-of-living adjustment at this time as we did for 2010. I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this measure.

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

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation, providing Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011, sponsored by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. MITCHELL), actually mirroring language that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) has had before our body for some period of time. Both gentlemen have worked on this together, it is my understanding.

Across the country, we know that there are serious issues plaguing Americans, mainly a deteriorating economy and very high unemployment rates. In my home State, the underemployment rate is over 20 percent. In my district, Sacramento County has an unemployment rate of 12.9 percent, which is actually lower than some of the cities in my district. The city of Galt, for example, has an unemployment rate of 15 percent. So it goes without saying that things are not well in our economy and people are suffering.

As Americans around the country are struggling and sacrificing to make ends meet, it appears that we in Congress should not be immune. Other institutions are doing likewise. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court recently announced in his Year-End Report for the Judiciary that he would not be requesting the usual salary increase for Federal judges given that ''so many of our fellow citizens have been touched by hardship.'' The President has also announced a pay freeze for top White House officials and other appointees in the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, recently in this House we passed H. Res. 1257, supporting the goals and ideals of National Financial Literacy Month, 2010. This legislation sought to raise public awareness about financial education through highlighting the importance of maintaining and managing personal finances, increasing personal savings, and reducing indebtedness in the United States. Some would ask whether we in Congress ought to undertake that same examination with respect to our spending in this House and our spending overall on the Federal budget.

□ 1530

At a time when we are passing resolutions telling Americans to be more cognizant of their financial situation, their debt, their savings, we do need to do the same in the House.

Millions of Americans are not getting a pay raise this year. Many, unfortunately, are not even getting paychecks. Under these circumstances, Congress must forgo a pay raise to save the hardworking taxpayers and hard-looking job seekers in this country a little of their money. Relative to the overall Federal budget, this single act doesn't have that great an impact. But any dollar, any Federal dollar, is something that we should treat with utmost responsibility because it comes to us in a sense involuntarily from our constituents. It comes through taxes or future taxes to pay for current debts.

So under these circumstances I think most of my colleagues, if not all of my colleagues, would agree that this is the time for us to forgo a pay raise. I would urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I would like to yield 3 minutes to the bill's sponsor, the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5146, the Cancel the Pay Raise for Members of Congress in Fiscal Year 2011 Act, a bill to stop Members of Congress from receiving an automatic pay raise in fiscal year 2011. Last week the Senate approved this same legislation, and I am pleased that today the House is finally following suit.

With unemployment high and so many families under stress, it would be simply unconscionable for Congress to raise its own pay. But that is precisely what will happen in fiscal year 2011 unless Congress takes action to stop it. This bill is simply the right thing to do. Earlier this year, Chief Justice Roberts announced that, in a major break from tradition, he will not seek a salary increase this year for Federal judges in light of the fact that, quote, ''so many of our fellow citizens have been touched by hardship.'' Likewise, President Obama has announced a pay freeze for senior White House officials as well as top appointees across the Federal Government. And as I mentioned, last week the Senate approved legislation to block the next automatic pay raise for Members of Congress.

It is time—past time—for the House to act. The American people are not getting a raise this year. Neither should Congress.

I want to thank Representative RON PAUL for his steadfast leadership on this issue. He and I have worked closely with each other for several years now to block the annual pay raise, and today's vote would not have been possible without him. Dr. PAUL, thank you.

I also want to thank the National Taxpayers Union and Citizens Against Government Waste for their support of our efforts to block the pay raise. And of course I want to thank Representative JIM MATHESON for his work on this legislation, as well as House leadership for allowing this important bill to come to the floor today.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 5 minutes to the indomitable distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), who has worked on this issue for some time.

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

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, and I want to compliment Mr. MITCHELL from Arizona for getting this bill to the floor. We have worked on this for several years. I am pleased that this is going to be passed today.

Much has been said about the unemployment rate in this country. And I saw one other take on unemployment today, where it said that for low-income people below $20,000, the unemployment rate is actually 31 percent, which shows how devastating this recession is, and for some it is an actual depression.

I would like this bill to be passed, but not just as symbolism. It is good symbolism and important symbolism. As was mentioned by the gentleman from California, it is not a tremendous amount of money, but it is important for us to recognize that we have a serious problem in this country and that we shouldn't be careless about the way we think about this problem. It shouldn't make us feel necessarily good because we passed this. This is just necessary.

It does remind me of a piece of legislation I introduced many years ago, in the 1970s, when we had rampant inflation, which I anticipate will probably come back to this country. Back then we had a 15 percent inflation rate. My suggestion then in the form of legislation, to get the Members' attention to understand what inflation was all about, I said we should take a pay cut at the rate of inflation. Even today we might suggest that. There is a lot more inflation out there than we admit to. So maybe not only should we freeze our salaries, maybe we should be taking a pay cut so that we can do a better job, because we really can't brag about the job that we have done for the country because of the condition the country is in.

But I would like to extend this motivation to freeze the pay of Congressmen to freezing a few other things. I would like to see our budget at least frozen where it is. That would go a long way to solving some of our budgetary problems. And how about freezing the debt level. Let's not raise the debt level. Instead, this next year our national debt is going to go up about $2 trillion when you add up all that we borrow from our trust funds.

Also, I would like to see a freeze on regulations because regulations usually backfire. There are unintended consequences, they cost a lot of money, they act as a tax, and they don't improve the economy overall.

I would be in support of freezing the wealth transfer system, the system that most people think is going to help all the poor people. The trouble is the wealth transfer system helps the rich people, and they are the ones who get the bailouts and the poor people don't. So a freeze on wealth transfer would go a long way toward restoring a free society and a constitutional government.

Also, I think the consensus of the American people today is we ought to freeze the bailouts. Let's not bail out anybody anymore. But it looks like it will be a long time before that happens because we have a monetary system where we have somebody over there called the Federal Reserve that says we can print money at will, and our job is to be the lender of last resort. That means to bail anybody and everybody out that needs money. And it looks like that will be domestic as well as international.

I would like to freeze the ability of the Federal Reserve to print money out of thin air. That in moral terms is counterfeit, and yet that is the encouragement for us to run up our deficits because the Fed can come in and increase the money supply. A sound monetary system would have frozen anybody's ability to just create money out of thin air.

I would also like to freeze the income tax at the 1912 level. And that indeed would be a real boost to the people of this country. All of a sudden there would be great wealth in the hands of the consumer. Just think if all the money that we spent on the bailouts that just tided things over, if just a portion of that had been used to get rid of the income tax, I think the money would have been better spent because the people would have been spending the money instead of the bureaucrats and the politicians and the regulators that bailed out the people who were making all the money in the first place.

But I would also extend this freeze onto some other things, too. I would like to freeze some of our militarism. I think we have enough fighting going on. I don't think we should expand the war. I don't think we should be looking for another enemy. I would like to freeze the sanctions on countries. I would like to see a lot more free trade. I would like to see that the bombing is not extended, that we quit allowing our CIA to extend the bombing of countries that have not attacked us. I would also like to put a freeze on this concept of preventive war. This whole idea of the concept of preventive war means that we can literally start the war.

So, yes, it's good that we are freezing the salaries of us here in the Congress. But if we really want to restore the Republic, we will freeze a lot of these other issues as well.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I would like to yield 2 minutes to the bill's cosponsor, the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, as so many people in this country continue to struggle to find work, let alone receive a pay raise, I am glad Congress has chosen to highlight this issue. Now, last year Congress recognized how inappropriate it would be to accept the stealth salary increase and passed a measure to block a congressional pay raise for the current fiscal year. This past week the Senate continued the freeze on congressional pay without a single dissenting vote. And now I urge my fellow House Members to follow suit and pass this commonsense measure.

The need for this bill also underlines another significant problem with the

congressional pay raise system because every year, unless both the House and the Senate actually vote against a pay raise, like we are talking about doing right now, we automatically receive a pay raise. In almost every profession, salary increases are dependent on performance, experience, tenure, or any number of factors other than really showing up to work every day.

This system which shrouds the congressional pay increase in arcane procedures deters a healthy, open debate of the issue. This legislation is a straightforward measure to stop the pay increase for fiscal year '11 and has been widely supported in a bipartisan manner.

I commend Congressman MITCHELL and Congressman PAUL for their work on this issue over the past 2 years. Now, beyond this one-time issue we are talking about today, I would be remiss if I didn't mention I have introduced a separate piece of legislation which would permanently repeal the provision of the law granting automatic pay raises and bring this issue to an open, up or down vote to let the public know where we stand on this issue every year. The Senate has also passed this legislation. I look forward to discussing this issue as we move forward to address our budgetary priorities.

As I have said for the past many years, spending priorities in a time of war and economic turmoil should not include an automatic salary increase for Members of Congress. I urge my fellow Members of the House to prevent a pay raise for 2011 and vote in favor of the legislation on the floor today.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

After listening to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), I am reminded of some freezes I would like to see. In addition to this freeze on our pay for a year, I would like to see us put a freeze on regulations on small business.

The previous speaker just mentioned that he believes we have somewhat of an arcane procedure for providing for pay raises to Members of Congress. That may be true. But there is certainly no more arcane activity that we engaged in than when we passed the health care bill in that having a new burden on business, particularly small business. And I speak of section 9006 of the health care bill, which has nothing to do with health, but has everything to do with regulation in that now, as opposed to the law which has existed for many years in which you had to file a 1099 on someone who provided a service for you, the purpose of which was to make sure that there was some paper trail to see if you were paying payroll taxes, we now have decided under this bill, the health care bill, section 9006, to require anybody involved in a trade or a service, that is any type of business who makes a purchase from some other corporate entity of any type that amounts to more than $600 cumulatively over a single year, that requires a 1099 to be filed with the person that you purchase the product from and the Federal Government.

What this means is that now if you purchase plane tickets and it amounts to more than $600 and you are engaged in a business, you will have to file a 1099 with United Airlines or American Airlines and the Federal Government. If you purchase food for your company and it amounts to more than $600, you will have to file a 1099. If you happen to be a rancher and you purchase bales of hay, you are going to have to keep a running tab all year long, and when you go over $600 you are going to have to file a 1099. If you in fact utilize FedEx or UPS, if during the course of the year it is more than $600, you will have to file a 1099 with FedEx or UPS and the Federal Government.

So this is a new burden that will require accounting procedures for anybody involved in business, particularly imposed on small business. But more than that, there is a double-edged sword to this. And that is this is a dagger at the heart of small business. Because if you have this obligation, it is easier to deal with one single big vendor than to have a number of them. Instead of going to your local hardware store if you are a small company and you need some hardware, you ought to go to one of the big guys because their universe of products is greater. And so if you have everything you purchased from them, knowing it is going to be over $600, you only have a single 1099 to file.

So what we have done in one fell swoop is make it more difficult to actually operate with this new regulatory scheme, and on the other hand, create disincentives for small business.

Now, when we contacted the Internal Revenue Service to see how they are going to interpret it, they said we haven't interpreted it yet because we are waiting for HHS to give us guidance. So now we have tax policy going to be determined by HHS.

□ 1545

All I'm saying is, if people think that we've had arcane procedures for means of pay raises for Members of Congress, it is nothing compared to what we've done in this health care bill with regulation on small business. I actually call that provision of the health care bill the ''universal snitch act'' because, when you file this 1099, it has nothing to do with your obligation to pay taxes. It has got to be premised on the idea that every vendor you deal with cheats and that the only way to catch cheaters is to have this new paper trail.

So I don't know. It just seems repugnant to me that we would do that, and I happen to have a bill that I introduced yesterday that would repeal that.

I just bring this up because the gentleman from Texas prompted this thought in my mind about freezes that would be appropriate. Then when the previous speaker mentioned arcane procedures, there was nothing more arcane than the health care bill we passed.

In fact, when we called the IRS, they weren't sure that this was in the bill. When we talked to the Congressional Research Service, they said, Oh, it couldn't be. Then when we pointed out that the new language in the bill is property and not just services—and that includes anything that you purchase—it has an unbelievable obligation on small business.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as a small business man in the oil and gas industry for over 30 years, I know that, when times are tough, we have to tighten our belts. That is why the very first bill that I sponsored in Congress was a bill to stop the automatic pay raise for Members of Congress.

Last year, we were able to get enough signers to stop this pay raise for this year, and I was proud to work to get that done. I am proud that our work has again paid off and that I am standing here today in support of a bill that will again stop the automatic pay raise that Members have taken advantage of for too long.

While many working New Mexicans are struggling to make ends meet, it is insulting that anyone would accept an automatic pay raise, which is something most of the constituents in my district will have to do without—if they are earning salaries at all. Our constituents expect honest and responsible leadership from their Congress. That's why I encourage my colleagues to just say ''no'' to the dough.

Mr. Speaker, we need to take this a step further. I call on my fellow Members of Congress to cosponsor legislation I have sponsored with my colleague from Arizona, Representative KIRKPATRICK. Our bill would cut pay for all Senators and Representatives by 5 percent beginning January 1, 2011. This would be the first congressional pay reduction since 1933.

I think it's about time that Congress has their pay cut just like the rest of the country, so I ask you to join me in this fight today.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the pride of the Coast Guard, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. I thank my friend from California.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on behalf of this bill.

Some would say, Well, it's just a symbolic gesture. Well, it may be symbolic, but it is symbolically significant. What better time to impose a freeze against ourselves than now during these harsh economic times of people being beneficiaries of pink slips, of being told their jobs are gone. Then

they see that Congress gets an automatic COLA. I think this is a good bill, and I urge its passage.

I thank the gentleman from California for having elevated me to the ''distinguished'' category as well.

Folks, we are on the right track here. This bill needs to be passed. We need to impose a freeze upon ourselves for the next fiscal year. I think it would send a message which would be well received by our constituencies across this land.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

I would just urge my colleagues to support this resolution. This is appropriate at this particular time. I think all Members of Congress recognize the difficult economic straits we are in. It is a simple resolution. It forgoes the pay raise for the year 2011, and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to comment very briefly because my colleagues were asking for basically a freeze on a status quo of the health care that we know today.

They spoke of repugnant policies. I want to talk just for a minute about the repugnant policies that we know of today, which don't allow people to get insurance if they have preexisting conditions that have ratings which discriminate, particularly against women, and which make it almost impossible for small business to be able to take care of and to help their employees when it comes to health insurance. So, yes, we have some policies that we have been trying to change. Unfortunately, my colleagues are asking for a freeze.

Yet I do want to applaud the fact that we are here on a singular effort today, and that is to forgo the cost-of-living adjustment for Congress. I think that's a good idea. It is a very timely idea, and it is very important that we move forward with it today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Kansans continue to suffer from the effects of the recession. Times remain tough for many. Small business owners are struggling to keep the doors of their businesses open. Families are struggling to pay their bills. When faced with difficult times, Kansans make sacrifices. They cut back where they can and stretch every dollar to make ends meet.

Times are also tough for the Federal Government. The national debt is more than $12 trillion and it continues to grow every day.

When times are tough, Kansans expect their government to act like they do—to make sacrifices and cut spending. Yet, the Federal Government is spending more than ever before.

One of the first places Congress should look to cut spending is the annual cost-of-living increase for Members of Congress. Representatives and Senators do not deserve a raise, especially when many Kansans will not receive a raise this year and the unemployment rate remains high.

I have long been opposed to the hidden process by which Members of Congress get an increase in their pay. The lack of transparency in the yearly raise only serves to increase skepticism, disillusion and distrust of government. Last year, I sponsored H.R. 1597, which eliminates the automatic pay increase for Members of Congress. If Members of Congress believe they have earned a raise, they should vote on it in full view of the public.

I am pleased today, that the House of Representatives is considering a bill in clear view of the public that would do away with the cost-of-living increase for next year. While this legislation, H.R. 5146, is only a one-year fix to the problem, it is an important first step and I am proud to be one of the sponsors of this legislation. I oppose the yearly automatic increase in pay and strongly support today's legislation to make sure Members of Congress do not get a raise next year.

Our employers, the voters, are right to be unhappy with Washington's spending spree. There should be no increase in congressional pay until Congress listens to the public and cuts spending.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5146.

The question was taken.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 1131, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5017, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5146, 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.

NATIONAL ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1131, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1131, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—411

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)

Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Barrett (SC)
Becerra
Berry
Brady (TX)
Davis (AL)
Fallin
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Harman
Hoekstra
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Price (GA)
Reyes
Richardson
Schwartz
Souder
Velázquez
Wamp

□ 1620

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 224, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

RURAL HOUSING PRESERVATION AND STABILIZATION ACT OF 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAPUANO). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5017, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5017, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 352, nays 62, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

YEAS—352

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccieri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gerlach
Giffords
Gordon (TN)
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—62

Akin
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Chaffetz
Coffman (CO)
Culberson
Duncan
Flake
Fleming
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Granger
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hunter
Inglis
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Lamborn
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lummis
Mack
Marchant
McClintock
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Myrick
Nunes
Paul
Pence
Petri
Poe (TX)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Stearns
Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—16

Barrett (SC)
Becerra
Berry
Davis (AL)
Fallin
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Harman
Hoekstra
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Price (GA)
Reyes
Ruppersberger
Souder
Wamp

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1631

Messrs. BURTON of Indiana, NUNES, Mrs. LUMMIS, Messrs. BROWN of South Carolina, ROONEY, MICA, KINGSTON, WESTMORELAND, GINGREY of Georgia, LINDER, and Mrs. SCHMIDT changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. MCHENRY changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcalls 224 and 225. If present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcalls 224 and 225.

PROHIBITING A COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TONKO). The unfinished business is the

vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5146, 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 California (Mrs. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5146.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 15, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

YEAS—402

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

NAYS—15

Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Thompson (MS)
Conyers	Kilpatrick (MI)	Towns
Edwards (MD)	Lee (CA)	Watt
Ellison	Meeks (NY)	Woolsey
Jackson Lee (TX)	Moran (VA)	
	Payne	

NOT VOTING—13

Barrett (SC)	Harman	Souder
Berry	Hoekstra	Wamp
Davis (AL)	Marshall	Waters
Fallin	Moore (WI)	
Gohmert	Price (GA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1641

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. BARTON of Texas changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to make a correction on the vote on passage of H.R. 5146, providing that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011.

Madam Speaker, I would like to state for the RECORD that I support the denial of a cost of living adjustment for Members. The correct vote for rollcall No. 226 would have been ''aye'' instead of ''nay,'' providing that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011.

Again, I want to state that Congresswoman JACKSON LEE opposes the cost of living adjustment for Members of Congress as stated appropriately in H.R. 5146.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5013, IMPLEMENTING MANAGEMENT FOR PERFORMANCE AND RELATED REFORMS TO OBTAIN VALUE IN EVERY ACQUISITION ACT OF 2010

Mr. ARCURI from the Committee on Rules submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111–467) on the resolution (H. Res. 1300) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5013) to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for performance management of the defense acquisition system, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHU). 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.

SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS MONTH

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1259) recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of Sexual Assault Awareness Month.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1259

Whereas, on average, a person is sexually assaulted in the United States every 2½ minutes;

Whereas the Department of Justice reports that 203,830 people in the United States were sexually assaulted in 2008;

Whereas 1 in 6 women and 1 in 33 men have been victims of rape or attempted rape;

Whereas the Department of Defense received 2,908 reports of sexual assault involving members of the Armed Forces in fiscal year 2008, representing an eight percent increase from fiscal 2007;

Whereas children and young adults are most at risk of sexual assault, as 44 percent

of sexual assault victims are under the age of 18, and 80 percent are under the age of 30;

Whereas sexual assault affects women, men, and children of all racial, social, religious, age, ethnic, ability, and economic groups in the United States;

Whereas women, children, and men suffer multiple types of sexual violence, including but not limited to acquaintance, stranger, spousal, and gang rape, incest, child sexual molestation, forced prostitution, trafficking, forced pornography, ritual abuse, sexual harassment, and stalking;

Whereas it is estimated that the percentage of completed or attempt rape victimization among women in higher educational institutions may be between 20 and 25 percent over the course of a college career;

Whereas, in addition to the immediate physical and emotional costs, sexual assault has associated consequences that may include post-traumatic stress disorder, substance abuse, major depression, homelessness, eating disorders, and suicide, among others;

Whereas only 41 percent of sexual assault victims pursue prosecution by reporting their attack to law enforcement agencies;

Whereas two-thirds of sexual crimes are committed by persons who are not strangers to the victims;

Whereas sexual assault survivors suffer emotional scars long after the physical scars have healed;

Whereas, with recent advances in DNA technology, law enforcement agencies have the potential to identify the rapists in tens of thousands of unsolved rape cases;

Whereas aggressive prosecution can lead to the incarceration of rapists and therefore prevent them from committing further crimes;

Whereas national, State, territory, and tribal coalitions, community-based rape crisis centers, and other organizations across the Nation are committed to increasing public awareness of sexual violence and its prevalence, and to eliminating it through prevention and education;

Whereas important partnerships have been formed among criminal and juvenile justice agencies, health professionals, public health workers, educators, first responders, and victim service providers;

Whereas free, confidential help is available to all survivors of sexual assault through the National Sexual Assault Hotline, more than 1,000 rape crisis centers across the United States, and other organizations that provide services to assist survivors of sexual assault;

Whereas, according to a 2010 survey of rape crisis centers by the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, 72 percent of programs have experienced a reduction in funding over the past year, 56 percent have experienced a reduction in staffing, 23 percent currently have a waiting list for services, and funding and staffing cuts have resulted in an overall 50 percent reduction in the provision of institutional advocacy services;

Whereas individual and collective efforts reflect our dream for a Nation where citizens and organizations actively work to prevent all forms of sexual violence and no sexual assault victim goes unserved or ever feels there is no path to justice; and

Whereas April is recognized as ''National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(A) National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month provides a special opportunity to educate the people of the United States about sexual violence and to encourage the prevention of sexual assault, the improved treatment of its survivors, and the prosecution of its perpetrators;

(B) it is appropriate to properly acknowledge the more than 20 million men and women who have survived sexual assault in the United States and salute the efforts of survivors, volunteers, and professionals who combat sexual assault;

(C) national and community organizations and private sector supporters should be recognized and applauded for their work in promoting awareness about sexual assault, providing information and treatment to its survivors, and increasing the number of successful prosecutions of its perpetrators; and

(D) public safety, law enforcement, and health professionals should be recognized and applauded for their hard work and innovative strategies to increase the percentage of sexual assault cases that result in the prosecution and incarceration of the offenders;

(2) the House of Representatives strongly recommends national and community organizations, businesses in the private sector, colleges and universities, and the media to promote, through National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, awareness of sexual violence and strategies to decrease the incidence of sexual assault; and

(3) the House of Representatives supports the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1645

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, studies of the prevalence of crime and of victimization show that one in six women and one in 33 men will be a victim of rape or attempted rape in their lifetimes. On average, a person is sexually assaulted in the United States every 2½ minutes. In my home State of Wisconsin, we have learned that nearly 93 percent of sexual assault survivors are violated by someone they know and trust; tragically, oftentimes as youngsters before they have even reached the age of 15.

Nationwide, we know that children and young adults are most at risk. Forty-four percent of sexual assault victims are under the age of 18, and 80 percent are under the age of 30. It is estimated that 20–25 percent of women attending college are raped or assaulted over the course of their college career.

These statistics are staggering and unconscionable. Yet, as is often the case, statistics alone can't adequately convey the urgency of a future where no child, no woman, no man is ever sexually violated again.

Last fall I got a chance to hear from a courageous woman from Wisconsin who was sexually assaulted in 1993. I will call her Carrie, although that is not her real name. Carrie was walking from her home to meet her husband at a party in suburban Milwaukee. She was approached by three strangers with guns. Madam Speaker, she was raped for 45 minutes while two guns were held against her. She thought about screaming, but she was afraid she would be shot. After the assault, Carrie said, I lay there and the first thought that came to my head was: I wish they had killed me because this isn't going to go away.

Fifteen years later, the memories of the assault have not gone away. But with incredible personal strength, Carrie has channeled the horrendous experience of victimization and subsequent pain and fear into an incredibly positive way. She has dedicated herself to creating the social change necessary to end sexual violence, and she speaks eloquently about the need to support prevention programming and services for victims of sexual assault and their families. But maybe more importantly, she bravely puts a human face on sexual assault with those less familiar with the issue or its consequences.

Carrie is a neighbor, a daughter, a sister, a wife. And Carrie is a reason to fight as long as it takes to keep other women from experiencing what she has endured. She is a true survivor and an inspiration to me, and should be to all of us.

Although, like Carrie, most victims are younger women, the effects of sexual assault cut across all racial, social, religious, ethnic and economic boundaries. Whether the crime is rape, incest, child sexual abuse, stalking or sexual harassment, sexual assault impacts everywhere: our schools, workplaces, streets and homes. Sexual assault is a threat to both public health and public safety, and it requires a coordinated response in the form of increased support for prevention, education, law enforcement, prosecution, and services provided to survivors.

This year, as our country faces difficult economic times, sexual assault service providers are seeing marked increases in reported sexual violence for a variety of reasons. Yet according to a 2010 survey of rape crisis centers by the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, fully 72 percent of sexual assault prevention programs have experienced a reduction in funding over the past year; 56 percent have experienced a reduction in staffing; 23 percent currently have a waiting list for services; and funding and staffing cuts have resulted in an overall 50 percent reduction in the provision of institutional advocacy services.

We still have far to go in eradicating the harm inflicted in our communities by sexual assault. There is a clear and

significant need for more public education and awareness.

The National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month does just this. Recognized each year in April, this dedicated month provides a special opportunity to educate Americans about sexual violence and to encourage the prevention of sexual assault, the improved treatment of its survivors, and the prosecution of its perpetrators. As part of the National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, we recognize national and community organizations as well as private sector supporters for their work in promoting awareness about sexual assault, and also applaud public safety, law enforcement, and health professionals for their hard work and innovative strategies to increase the percentage of sexual assault cases that result in the prosecution and incarceration of offenders.

Along with my colleagues, Congressman TED POE from Texas and Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ from Florida, I introduced House Resolution 1259 to recognize April 2010 as the National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month. By supporting this resolution, we highlight the efforts of individuals and agencies that provide rape crisis intervention and prevention services. We also call attention to sexual violence as a major public health issue and raise awareness of the need for increased resources for preventing sexual violence.

Madam Speaker, I want to extend my thanks to a number of advocates for their work on sexual assault prevention, and tireless work to help victims cope with the trauma of sexual assault and transition from victim to survivor.

In Wisconsin, we are incredibly lucky to have the Wisconsin Coalition Against Sexual Assault working to create the social change necessary to end sexual violence. My thanks go to the coalition and their member organizations across the State for the important work that they do.

And finally, I want to extend my sincere thanks to my colleagues, Congressman TED POE and Congresswoman DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for their strong support as the lead sponsors of this resolution. Thank you for your work and leadership.

Although we have made significant progress, we still have far to go in eradicating the harm inflicted on our communities by sexual assault, and I urge all of my colleagues to fully support this resolution recognizing National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, today the House considers House Resolution 1259, a resolution designating the month of April as Sexual Assault Awareness Month, and I totally support this important legislation. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) for sponsoring this bill and bringing it to the attention of Congress again this year. It is important that we recognize Sexual Assault Awareness Month to bring awareness to this tragic crime that occurs throughout the United States.

The goal of the resolution is to raise public awareness and educate communities and individuals about sexual assault and sexual violence. It encourages the prevention of sexual assault and the improvement of treatment of its survivors and the prosecution of perpetrators.

The numbers tell the story we cannot ignore. On average, a person is sexually assaulted in the United States every 2½ minutes. According to the Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics, individuals age 12 or older experienced an estimated 222,000 rapes or sexual assaults in 2008, the last year for which we have data. The Rape Abuse Incest National Network, called RAINN, provides statistics about incidents of sexual assault in this country. And according to RAINN, children and young adults are the greatest risk of sexual assault: 44 percent of sexual assault victims are under the age of 18, and 80 percent are under the age of 30. One in six women and 1 in 33 men are victims of rape or attempted rape. And over the course of their lifetimes, 18 percent of all women in the United States are raped.

Thankfully, there are thousands of advocates across the country who serve as a bridge to recovery and encourage survivors of sexual assault to report the crimes as soon as it occurs. As my friend from Wisconsin has pointed out, there are numerous victims groups. I call them the victims posse, who are out to help victims of crimes, especially in the area of sexual assault, and we commend them for their work in this country.

As we work to empower victims of sexual assault, we also need to support the efforts of law enforcement officials to punish sex offenders and combat future occurrences. Unfortunately, only 41 percent of sexual assault victims report their attacks to law enforcement. We must encourage victims to report the crimes so we can aggressively prosecute rapists and remove them from our communities. That is why we build penitentiaries, to house rapists and people who sexually assault children.

Today's House resolution increases public awareness of sexual assault and works to combat it through prevention, education, and punishment. As chairman and co-chair of the Victims Rights Caucus, along with my friend from California (Mr. COSTA) we totally support this legislation.

I have no further requests for time and am prepared to close.

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, as my friend has pointed out, this resolution, Sexual Assault Awareness Month, the statistics really don't tell the story because it is a story about people. Real people. She mentioned one from her State of Wisconsin. And there are too many to mention and talk about. But I would like to talk about one person that impacted my life.

Before I came to Congress, I spent all of my time at the courthouse in Houston, first as a prosecutor and then as a criminal court judge. Every day for years, almost 30, I saw criminal cases, either prosecuting them or hearing them as a judge.

One of those cases involved a young lady. I will call her Lisa. Lisa was a student at the University of Houston. She was married and had a couple of sons. She worked in the daytime and went to school at night to get a second degree. She had left school one evening and she was driving down one of our freeways heading home out in the suburbs. The lights came on on the dash of her car, she had car trouble, and she pulled off to a service station she thought was open. It was not open, but she thought it was. Lisa talked to the service station attendant, turned out he wasn't the service station attendant but she thought he was, trying to get some help late at night.

The first thing that happened, Luke Johnson pulled her out of that car. He kidnapped her. He took her to a remote area of east Texas in the piney woods. He sexually assaulted her. He beat her so bad with a pistol that he thought he had killed her. In fact, when he later was arrested, he was mad that he hadn't killed her. Lisa was a remarkable woman. She survived that brutal attack even though she laid in the woods for a couple of days before a hunter found her. She was rescued. Her physical needs were met. The person who committed that crime, Luke Johnson, was captured by the police. He was charged with aggravated sexual assault. He was tried in my court. Lisa came and testified about the events. Luke Johnson was convicted and sent to the penitentiary for 99 years.

You see, Madam Speaker, we would hope that would be the rest of story and life would go on and victims would recover; but that is not the world we live in. Victims are people, and because they are people, things happen to them emotionally as well as physically.

□ 1700

The first thing that happened to Lisa was she didn't go back to school; she never went back to that campus again. The next thing that happened is she lost her job; she was fired because she could not concentrate based upon this crime. Her husband, being the kind of guy he was, he decided he no longer wanted her. He filed for divorce, divorced her, got custody of the children, and moved to another State.

Lisa started abusing drugs. First it was alcohol, then it was everything else. She couldn't quite handle the fact that she was a victim of crime, even

though the perpetrator was off in the penitentiary. And not too long after this crime was committed, I received a phone call from Lisa's mother, and she told me that Lisa had taken her life. She left a note, Madam Speaker, that I still have in my office today across the street, and the note reads, ''I'm tired of running from Luke Johnson in my nightmares.''

See, she got the death penalty for being a victim of sexual assault. And we would hope that victims could handle it, that they could move on with their life, that they could cope, but that's not the world we operate in because they're real people. And we as a Nation need to be sensitive to victims of sexual assault. It's the most unusual crime in our culture. We can sort of see why people commit theft. We can see sometimes why people get mad and in a rage they might even commit a murder. But there is no logical reason why anybody would commit the crime of sexual assault against another person unless it's an attempt to steal the very soul of that person, and that's what criminals are trying to do when they commit this crime. That is why it is such a horrible crime, and we as a culture must be concerned about it.

So this resolution helps bring that to the public forum, that Sexual Assault Awareness Month is something that we should be, as a people, concerned about because victims have rights, too. The same Constitution that protects defendants protects victims of crime. And as it has been said before, we are not judged by the way we treat the rich, the famous, the powerful, the important folks. We're judged by the way we treat the innocent, the weak, the victims of crime. That's how we as a people will be judged.

So I commend the gentlelady from Wisconsin for sponsoring this resolution. I wholeheartedly support it and I urge its adoption.

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

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my cosponsor of this legislation for also putting a name, a story, and a face on this very consequential matter. Lisa and Carrie from our respective States represent many other victims and survivors alike, and it speaks to the importance of this resolution. I commend the gentleman for his advocacy and ask for support of this resolution.

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TITUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1259.

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.

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DAY

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1208) supporting the goals of World Intellectual Property Day.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1208

Whereas intellectual property is the backbone of the economic competitiveness of the United States and the only economic sector in which the United States has a trade surplus with every nation in the world;

Whereas well over 50 percent of United States exports now depend on some form of intellectual property, compared to less than 10 percent 50 years ago;

Whereas intangible assets that stem from intellectual property, such as high-value services, global branding, technological know-how, and scientific research, must be recognized as cornerstones in achieving economic recovery and creating jobs;

Whereas intellectual property assets today represent more than one third of the value of United States-based corporations and more than 17 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States;

Whereas intellectual property plays a significant role in an increasingly broad range of services, ranging from the Internet to health care to nearly all aspects of science and technology and literature and the arts, and the potential for innovation and invention must be fostered as its greatest attribute;

Whereas the United States and all countries share the challenge of combating piracy and counterfeiting of intellectual property, including illicit trade in life-saving drugs, cutting edge technologies, film, music, books, and inventions that affect the quality of life;

Whereas the piracy and counterfeiting of intellectual property have a significant impact on economies around the world, translate into lost jobs, lost earnings, and lost tax revenues, and threaten public health and safety;

Whereas the World Intellectual Property Organization, with 184 member states, is the primary organization in the world focused on the development and protection of intellectual property rights for all creators and all countries;

Whereas World Intellectual Property Day provides an opportunity to reflect on how intellectual property touches all aspects of people's lives, how copyright helps music to be heard and art, films, and literature to be seen, how industrial design helps shape the world in which people live, how trademarks provide reliable signs of quality, and how patenting helps promote ingenious inventions that make life easier, faster, safer, and sometimes completely changes the way people live;

Whereas the theme of 2010 World Intellectual Property Day is ''Innovation-Linking the World'', and presents an opportunity to champion the role of intellectual property rights in providing incentives for the development of the innovative solutions needed to meet today's global challenges while creating jobs and stimulating the United States economy;

Whereas April 26, 1970, was the date on which the Convention establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization entered into force;

Whereas, in 2000, member states of the World Intellectual Property Organization established World Intellectual Property Day to celebrate the contribution made by innovators and artists to the development and growth of societies across the globe and to highlight the importance and practical use of intellectual property in everyone's daily lives; and

Whereas April 26, 2010, has been designated as World Intellectual Property Day, a time to celebrate the importance of intellectual property to the United States and the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals of World Intellectual Property Day to promote, inform, and teach the importance of intellectual property as a tool for economic, social, and cultural development;

(2) recognizes the ever-increasing importance of intellectual property and the new challenges and serious threats to its protection, which affect prospects for future growth of the United States economy;

(3) supports robust and ongoing efforts to protect the health and well-being of citizens in the United States from fraudulent and illegal counterfeiting and piracy;

(4) congratulates the World Intellectual Property Organization for building awareness of the value of intellectual property and developing the necessary infrastructure to help citizens take full advantage of their own creativity; and

(5) applauds the ongoing contributions of human creativity and intellectual property to growth and innovation and for the key role they play in promoting and ensuring a brighter and stronger future for the United States and the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 1208 supports the goals of World Intellectual Property Day and recognizes the importance of protecting intellectual property. World Intellectual Property Day brings attention to the impact that intellectual property has in our daily lives, educates us on how intellectual property protection promotes creativity and innovation, and celebrates its contributions to society.

The theme for World Intellectual Property Day this year is, ''Innovation: Linking the World.'' The focus is to educate us on how innovation technologies have created an interlinked and global society.

Yesterday, we celebrated the 10th annual World Intellectual Property Day. This day was selected because on April 26, 1970, the United Nations established

the World Intellectual Property Organization, otherwise known as WIPO. WIPO works to promote the protection of intellectual property throughout the world, and yesterday was WIPO's 40th anniversary. This resolution congratulates the World Intellectual Property Organization for building awareness of the value of intellectual property. This resolution also celebrates the contributions of innovators throughout the world and reminds us of the importance of protecting intellectual property rights.

Protecting intellectual property rights is key to maintaining incentives for the development of innovative solutions to meet today's global challenges, and so we must continue to fight against piracy and counterfeiting of intellectual property. Piracy damages our national economy and the world economy. It results in lost jobs and stifles innovation.

I would like to thank Congressman ADAM SMITH for introducing this resolution. I would also like to acknowledge the strong bipartisan support of members of the Intellectual Property Caucus.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he might consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and a former chairman of the Intellectual Property Subcommittee.

Mr. COBLE. I thank my friend from Texas (Mr. SMITH) for yielding.

Madam Speaker, intellectual property has been described as the cornerstone, or one of the cornerstones, of America's economic future; and I think that is an accurate description.

H. Res. 1208 supports the goals of World Intellectual Property Day, which falls on April 26 every year, which this year also happened to fall on the 40th anniversary of the World Intellectual Property Organization, commonly known as WIPO. WIPO has grown to 184 member states, and its new director general, Francis Gurry, issued a statement honoring World Intellectual Property Day, which pledged to ensure that the intellectual property system continues to serve its most fundamental purpose of encouraging innovation and creativity, and that the benefits of the system are accessible to all, helping to bring the world closer.

Robust and effective laws combined with effective enforcement are absolutely necessary to meet General Gurry's global ambitions. According to the Department of Commerce, intellectual property-intensive industries employ nearly 18 million workers, account for more than 50 percent of all U.S. exports, and represent 40 percent of the country's growth in the United States. USA for Innovation estimates that U.S. intellectual property is worth between $5 trillion and $5.5 trillion. The credit for this success belongs to our great innovators and for our robust intellectual property laws which have enabled innovation to flourish in America.

Expanding similar intellectual property protections throughout the world is, in my opinion, Madam Speaker, in everyone's best interest. In this regard, WIPO plays a very important role, and it is my hope that General Gurry will make every effort to help others realize the significance of intellectual property rights and work to help implement and enforce robust laws which ensure that intellectual property will flourish everywhere.

I urge support of H. Res. 1208.

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the author of the resolution before us.

(Mr. SMITH of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 1208.

I would like to thank Chairman CONYERS as well as his staff for their support in bringing this resolution to the floor, and for the kind remarks from the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE). I also want to thank the other Chairs of the House Intellectual Property Caucus, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO MACK) and, again, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), who have joined me in sponsoring House Resolution 1208.

This important resolution commemorates World Intellectual Property Day, which was observed yesterday, April 26. Each year since 2001, World IP Day has been held in observance of the establishment of the World Intellectual Property Organization by the United Nations. World Intellectual Property Day calls attention to the importance of IP for both our Nation and the international economy. It recognizes the contributions made by the countless artists, innovators, and other creative minds that enrich, assist, and inform us in many ways.

In and around my district in Washington State, I am able to observe daily the critically important role played by innovation and intellectual property to the economies of the South Sound region and the United States. As many of my colleagues are aware, Washington State is fortunate to boast a robust technological and innovative economy, with companies that range in size from major corporations to hundreds of smaller and medium-size businesses. Together, these industries directly and indirectly create hundreds of thousands of jobs and generate billions of dollars in economic activity. Each relies upon innovation and respect for intellectual property to remain successful and internationally competitive.

Similarly, in States and localities throughout America, artists, inventors, and employees in IP-intensive industries play a major role in supporting economic vitality. IP creates well-paying job opportunities for workers of multiple skill levels, drives research and development investment, creates new products and services that make our Nation more globally competitive, and drives American exports to foreign markets.

For intellectual property to work, it has to be protected; people have to know that they will get the value of their inventions and of their brain power. We must protect intellectual property to grow jobs here in the U.S. It is critical.

I am proud to recognize World Intellectual Property Day, and I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution to recognize World Intellectual Property Day and the role that intellectual property plays in our Nation.

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

Madam Speaker, the purpose of House Resolution 1208 is to congratulate the World Intellectual Property Organization, WIPO, for its work and to support the goals of World Intellectual Property Day. This day includes teaching the importance of intellectual property as a tool for economic, social, and cultural development.

WIPO is considered the most important international organization for the promotion of intellectual property. Among other responsibilities, WIPO administers treaties, such as the Berne and Paris Conventions, that protect intellectual property globally. The United States, of course, is a WIPO member.

Nine years ago, WIPO member states commemorated the founding of the organization by establishing World Intellectual Property Day. April 26, 1970 is the date on which the convention that created WIPO took effect. This resolution commemorates the achievements of WIPO and its designation of April 26, 2010 as World Intellectual Property Day for the current year. In addition, the resolution contains background information on the extent to which intellectual property generates jobs, sales, and exports for the United States, while contrasting these benefits with the problems related to piracy and anti-counterfeiting.

I support this resolution and I urge its adoption.

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

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1208.

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.

□ 1715

INTERSTATE RECOGNITION OF NOTARIZATIONS ACT OF 2009

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3808) to require any Federal or State court to recognize any notarization made by a notary public licensed by a State other than the State where the court is located when such notarization occurs in or affects interstate commerce.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3808

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 ''Interstate Recognition of Notarizations Act of 2009''.

SEC. 2. RECOGNITION OF NOTARIZATIONS IN FEDERAL COURTS.

Each Federal court shall recognize any lawful notarization made by a notary public licensed or commissioned under the laws of a State other than the State where the Federal court is located if—

(1) such notarization occurs in or affects interstate commerce; and

(2)(A) a seal of office, as symbol of the notary public's authority, is used in the notarization; or

(B) in the case of an electronic record, the seal information is securely attached to, or logically associated with, the electronic record so as to render the record tamper-resistant.

SEC. 3. RECOGNITION OF NOTARIZATIONS IN STATE COURTS.

Each court that operates under the jurisdiction of a State shall recognize any lawful notarization made by a notary public licensed or commissioned under the laws of a State other than the State where the court is located if—

(1) such notarization occurs in or affects interstate commerce; and

(2)(A) a seal of office, as symbol of the notary public's authority, is used in the notarization; or

(B) in the case of an electronic record, the seal information is securely attached to, or logically associated with, the electronic record so as to render the record tamper-resistant.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ELECTRONIC RECORD.—The term ''electronic record'' has the meaning given that term in section 106 of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act (15 U.S.C. 7006).

(2) LOGICALLY ASSOCIATED WITH.—Seal information is ''logically associated with'' an electronic record if the seal information is securely bound to the electronic record in such a manner as to make it impracticable to falsify or alter, without detection, either the record or the seal information.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3808, the Interstate Recognition of Notarizations Act of 2009, requires all Federal and State courts to recognize documents lawfully notarized in any State of the Union when interstate commerce is involved. An identical version of this bill passed the House in 2007.

A notary public has the professional expertise to verify the identity of the signatory to a document and ensure that it was willingly signed. Notary publics are a critical first line of defense against fraud. Although notarization serves the same purposes in all States, there are differences in State laws governing notarization, and also varying technical formalities. That makes it difficult for a State to recognize an out-of-state notarization.

For example, some States dictate that ink seals must be used, while others require embossers. Some States require very specific language in the acknowledgment certificate, and thus the language used in other States may not be acceptable. Such technical differences between State law hinder the recognition of documents that were lawfully notarized in the State in which the notarization was performed, and this can cause unnecessary delays that impact important legal rights and interstate commerce.

The fact that some States do not recognize documents lawfully notarized in other States also presents a constitutional issue. The U.S. Constitution requires that each State give full faith and credit to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State. The 21st century affords advances in transportation and telecommunications that have expanded the ability of individuals and businesses to conduct their affairs across State boundaries. The laws governing notarization should not be permitted to continue encumbering their ability to do so.

By giving those laws reciprocal recognition, effectively harmonizing them, H.R. 3808 will bring those laws within the spirit of the Constitution's vision and bring much needed relief from antiquated formalities.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, at the outset I want to thank the sponsor of the bill, Representative ADERHOLT, for his persistence and patience. This is the third time the full House has considered his bill to streamline the use of notarized documents across State lines, and I hope this will be the last, followed by the Senate, and then enactment.

H.R. 3808 eliminates unnecessary impediments in handling the everyday transactions of individuals and businesses.

Many documents executed and notarized in one state, either by design or happenstance, find their way into neighboring or more distant states.

If ultimately needed in any one of the latter jurisdictions to support or defend a claim in court, that document should not be refused admission solely on the ground it was not notarized in the state where the court sits.

H.R. 3808 ensures this will not happen.

A notarization in and of itself neither validates a document nor speaks to the truthfulness or accuracy of its contents.

The notarization serves a different function—it verifies that a document signer is who he or she purports to be and has willingly signed the document.

By executing the notarial certificate, the notary public, as a disinterested party to the transaction, informs all other parties relying on or using the document that it is the act of the person who signed it.

Consistent with the vital significance of the notarial act, H.R. 3808 compels a court to accept the authenticity of the document even though the notarization was performed in a state other than where the forum is located.

Madam Speaker, much of the testimony we received at our Subcommittee hearing on the bill in 2006 addressed the silliness of one state not accepting the validity of another state's notarized document in an interstate legal proceeding.

Some of the examples were based on petty reasons. For instance, one state requires a notary to affix an ink stamp to a document, an act that is not recognized in a sister state that requires documents to be notarized with a raised, embossed seal.

Passing the bill will streamline interstate commercial and legal transactions consistent with the guarantees of the Full Faith and Credit Clause of the Constitution.

Madam Speaker, I urge Members to support H.R. 3808.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's support for this legislation to be brought to the floor, and of course the support of Ranking Member SMITH on this legislation as well. Without it, this legislation, we would not be here today where we are.

One other person who has been very supportive and who actually brought this to my attention several years ago is my friend MIKE TURNER, from Birmingham. We've worked together on this to try to resolve this issue through the United States Congress, and so here we are, as mentioned, the third time to try to resolve this.

There is an old saying, ''The third time's the charm,'' and I am hopeful today that saying holds true. As my colleagues who serve on the Judiciary Committee are well aware, today marks the third time that the House of

Representatives has brought up, and hopefully will pass, this bill. The key, of course, lies with our friends in the other Chamber. So I look forward to working with our colleagues in the Senate and getting the bill moved through that Chamber as well.

I was first made aware of this problem, as I say, by my friend MIKE TURNER when I was first elected to Congress back in 1997. Here we are in 2010. The issue is still not resolved. This is an issue of great frustration to people who deal with notaries on a daily basis.

Several years ago, the House Judiciary Committee worked with supporters of this issue to find a satisfactory solution to the problem of the recognition of notarizations across State lines. In March of 2006, the Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property heard from several witnesses who all agreed that this is an ongoing and difficult problem for interstate commerce. To businesses and individuals engaged in businesses across State lines, this is a matter long overdue.

In a nutshell, as it has been stated, H.R. 3808 will expedite interstate commerce so that court documents and other notarized documents will be fully recognized from one State to another. Today States can refuse to acknowledge the integrity of notarized documents from one State to another. This legislation, H.R. 3808, will streamline the interstate, commercial, and legal transactions consistent with the guarantees of the States' rights that are called for in the full faith and credit clause of the United States Constitution.

This legislation preserves the rights of States to set standards and regulate notaries, while reducing the burden on the average citizen who has to use our court systems. Currently, as the law stands today, each State is responsible for regulating its notaries. Typically, an individual will pay a fee, they will submit an application, and they will take an oath of office. Some States require the applicants enroll in educational courses, to pass exams, and even obtain a notary bond. Nothing in this legislation will change those steps. Please know we are not trying to mandate how States regulate notaries which they appoint. The bill will not preclude the challenge of notarized documents such as a will contest.

Again, I want to stress that this is in no way trying to mandate what a State should do or what a State should not do. It simply allows there to be more free flow of commerce between States, and particularly when you are talking about the regulation of notaries themselves.

Again, I want to thank the chairman and also the ranking member for their support of this legislation to allow us to move forward. I would urge my colleagues that when this legislation is brought for a vote that they would support it under suspension of the rules.

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

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 3808, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3808.

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.

NATIONAL AUTISM AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. DOYLE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1033) expressing support for designation of April 2010 as ''National Autism Awareness Month'' and supporting efforts to devote new resources to research into the causes and treatment of autism and to improve training and support for individuals with autism and those who care for individuals with autism, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1033

Whereas autism is a developmental disorder that is typically diagnosed during the first 3 years of life, affecting individuals' ability to communicate and interact with others;

Whereas autism affects an estimated 1 in every 110 children in the United States;

Whereas autism is four times more likely to be diagnosed in boys than in girls;

Whereas autism can affect anyone, regardless of race, ethnicity, or other factors;

Whereas it costs approximately $80,000 per year to treat an individual with autism in a medical center specializing in developmental disabilities;

Whereas the cost of special education programs for school-age children with autism is often more than $30,000 per individual per year;

Whereas the cost nationally of caring for persons affected by autism is estimated at upwards of $90,000,000,000 per year;

Whereas despite the fact that autism is one of the most common developmental disorders, many professionals in the medical and educational fields are still unaware of the best methods to diagnose and treat the disorder; and

Whereas April 2010 would be an appropriate month to designate as ''National Autism Awareness Month'' to increase public awareness of the need to support individuals with autism and the family members and medical professionals who care for individuals with autism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States House of Representatives—

(1) expresses support for designation of a ''National Autism Awareness Month'';

(2) recognizes and commends the parents and relatives of children with autism for their sacrifice and dedication in providing for the special needs of children with autism and for absorbing financial costs for specialized education and support services;

(3) supports the goal of devoting resources to researching the root causes of autism, identifying the best methods of early intervention and treatment, expanding programs for individuals with autism across their lifespans, and promoting understanding of the special needs of people with autism;

(4) stresses the need to begin early intervention services soon after a child has been diagnosed with autism, noting that early intervention strategies are the primary therapeutic options for young people with autism, and that early intervention significantly improves the outcome for people with autism and can reduce the level of funding and services needed to treat people with autism later in life;

(5) recognizes the shortage of appropriately trained teachers who have the skills and support necessary to teach, assist, and respond to special needs students, including those with autism, in our school systems; and

(6) recognizes the importance of worker training programs that are tailored to the needs of people with developmental disabilities, including those with autism, and notes that people with autism can be, and are, productive members of the workforce if they are given appropriate support, training, and early intervention services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DOYLE. 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 in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 1033. This resolution expresses support for the designation of this month, the month of April, as National Autism Awareness Month.

Autism spectrum disorders are a group of developmental disabilities that affect an estimated one in 100 children nationwide. ASDs, or autism, are typically diagnosed within the first 3 years of life. Autism occurs in all racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups. However, we know that autism affects each person and certain groups differently.

People with Asperger's syndrome, one form of autism, typically do not have difficulty with language or intellectual disability. Others with autism have more notable language delays and social challenges, among other symptoms. This form of autism is referred to as autistic disorder, or classic autism. Autism is at least four times more likely to be diagnosed in boys than in girls.

We have made important progress in research on autism within the past few years, and I and dozens of Members of

Congress who annually seek and obtain billions of dollars for autism funding know that there remains much to learn about the risk factors and causes of this group of conditions.

We must also continue to raise awareness regarding the signs and symptoms of autism. Today's resolution gives us an opportunity to do just that. This awareness raising is particularly important since early intervention has shown to improve a child's development.

This resolution recognizes and commends parents and relatives for their dedication in caring for children with autism. It supports the investment of resources into research that will help improve our understanding of autism and promote early intervention and treatment. It also recognizes the importance of appropriately trained educators to respond to students with special needs.

Those are the reasons why my friend CHRIS SMITH and I, as founders and cochairs of the Congressional Autism Caucus, introduced H.R. 2413, the Autism Treatment Acceleration Act. That bill will reinforce our country's work to identify the causes of autism by improving the coordination of our government's efforts. And it establishes a national network of autism research in order to strengthen linkages between research and service initiatives at the Federal, regional, State, and local levels, and facilitate the translation of research on autism into services and treatments that will improve the quality of life for individuals with autism and their families. A national data repository will be created to share emerging data, findings, and treatment models.

This resolution on the floor today mentions the needs of adults with autism, and our bipartisan bill, H.R. 2413, actually creates an adult services demonstration project to provide an array of services to adults with autism spectrum disorders, including postsecondary education, vocational and self-advocacy skills, employment; residential services, supports and housing; nutrition, health and wellness, recreational and social activities; and transportation and personal safety.

I am proud that our bill, H.R. 2413, will also create a national training initiative on autism and a technical assistance center to develop and expand interdisciplinary training and continuing education on autism spectrum disorders.

We ask all the Members of the House, including this resolution's sponsors, to join us and cosponsor H.R. 2413, the Autism Treatment Acceleration Act, a meaningful bill that would achieve the goals of today's resolution.

I want to commend Representative REICHERT, the sponsor of this resolution, for his work on this resolution at a time when so much needs to be done for children and adults with autism.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to note that the Committee on Education and Labor received a secondary referral for this resolution. The committee agreed to waive the opportunity to exercise its jurisdiction in the interests of advancing this resolution. I want to say thank you to Chairman MILLER for allowing this resolution to be brought to the floor as quickly as possible. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1033, expressing support for National Autism Awareness Month, and I am pleased to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the cochair of the Autism Caucus, on behalf of the other cochair of the Autism Caucus, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), as well as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), the prime sponsor, and Mr. BACHUS of Alabama and Mr. GERLACH from Pennsylvania, who are other sponsors of this resolution.

□ 1730

The resolution, as was stated, acknowledges April as National Autism Awareness Month, and it supports the research efforts for the causes and treatments of autism. I would like to recognize the efforts of those who have gone through the appropriate training and who have provided support to individuals with autism.

I would also like to recognize the parents, the relatives, the friends of those with autism for their sacrifices and dedication, especially for absorbing many times the significant costs for specialized education and support services.

Some have estimated that one in every 110 children in the United States is affected by a disorder on the autism spectrum. Once diagnosed, early intervention is important to improve the outcomes of those with autism and to reduce the level of funding and services needed to treat people with autism spectrum disorder later in life. Continued research to identify the root causes of autism and support for the training of caregivers and teachers who work with children with autism will ensure that people with autism will continue to be important and productive members of society.

I would like to thank especially the author of the resolution, Mr. DAVID REICHERT of Washington, for his leadership in raising autism awareness, and I would like to commend the efforts of those who care for individuals with autism. I encourage all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOYLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER).

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1033, expressing the House of Representatives' support for April as National Autism Awareness Month.

There are an estimated 1.5 million Americans living with autism, a developmental disorder that affects a person's ability to communicate and to interact with others. A recent report shows that autism prevalence is on the rise. It now occurs in one out of every 110 births in the United States. We need to take action to address the causes of autism now and provide support to individuals and families affected by the disorder.

National Autism Awareness Month is an important advocacy tool for those affected by autism and by those affected by Asperger's to raise awareness about a similar but distinct condition. Asperger's disorder is distinctive from autism in that its symptoms are less severe. Individuals with Asperger's often possess above-average intelligence and want social interaction with other people, but their condition is an obstacle to communication. Americans with Asperger's and autism have so much to offer. With the right support to help overcome the barriers of their disorders, they can share their talents and can be productive, engaged members of our communities.

I am proud to offer my support to National Autism Awareness Month, and I urge my colleagues to support not only this resolution but individuals and families affected by autism and Asperger's throughout our country.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the cochair of the Autism Caucus, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend, Mr. PITTS, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1033, a resolution designating April 2010 as National Autism Awareness Month.

I thank my friends and colleagues Messrs. REICHERT, GERLACH, and BACHUS. I especially want to thank my good friend and colleague, the cochair of the House caucus, who is MIKE DOYLE, and Mr. PITTS for their leadership on this very important resolution and, most importantly, on this very important issue.

This resolution serves an important function of increasing awareness of the 1.5 million individuals who are living with autism spectrum disorder and of the extreme dedication and efforts of their families in providing the best possible care and environments for their children, grandchildren, brothers, and sisters.

I want to especially note that the parents and the grandparents of children with autism have earned our enormous respect. I know many families with autism. It can be a very harrowing ordeal. Yet they do it with such class and with such love and dedication to their children. The concerns of the parents are validated in the community, and have since been found to be true nationwide in terms of the numbers.

I will point out to my colleagues that I've been involved in autism since 1981,

since my first term. I'll never forget visiting Eden Institute in Princeton, which does tremendous breakthrough research and work with autism children and young adults. Frankly, for me, it wasn't until 1998 when two parents, Bobbie and Billy Gallagher from Brick Township, New Jersey, came to me after hours and said, Congressman, we'd like you to sit down and look over some of the evidence and data we've accumulated because it is our belief that there is a prevalent spike in autism in Brick.

We brought in all of the good players. We brought in the CDC; we brought in the NIH folks, and we brought in public health experts. We put together a study to find out what was or is the trigger that was seemingly causing this huge spike in autistic children in one particular town in the State of New Jersey. To our shock and dismay, as this was going on, we discovered that there was a prevalence spike for sure, but it was most likely throughout the rest of New Jersey and probably, as it was highly suggestive, throughout the entire country of the United States.

So we put together a piece of legislation to establish what we called the Centers of Excellence to look at, especially, and to apply the best principles and prevalence techniques to determine what was causing this and to determine how many children were being malaffected by autism. To our shock and dismay, again we discovered that the United States didn't have a one in 10,000 prevalence, which is what the expectation was when I was elected in 1981, but that it was much higher. At that point, it was put at about one out of every 150 children.

So the Centers of Excellence were funded. The legislation was passed. I'll never forget that Congressman MIKE BILIRAKIS was kind enough to accept our legislation as Title I of the Children's Health Act, which was a very comprehensive law designed to help children. Title I not only put more money into the CDC but also into the National Institutes of Health, which then was very much underfunding this effort to try to help autistic children.

Just for the record, we were spending $287,000 per year on autism at CDC. As my colleagues know, that falls off the table at some of our bureaucracies. That number has now gone up significantly to about $15 million, and now we have a critical mass of money working very synergistically with local health departments and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention as well as on these prevalence efforts to find out what the parameters are of this developmental disability, because you can't combat something unless you know the who, what, when, where, and why of it, and that is what we are trying to do.

In the early 2000s, Mr. DOYLE and I launched the Autism Caucus. We have tried throughout these years to be very supportive of every legislative effort, including the cure autism efforts of these past several years. The key has been more money for research, more money for early childhood interventions and trying to deal with the issue of what happens after a child reaches adulthood. It seems to me that every dollar we spend early-on means that we can have a higher functioning autistic child, now young adult, who can get a job, who can become gainfully employed, and who can become as independent as humanly possible. So every dollar we spend on autism is a dollar well spent.

Mr. DOYLE and I have already entered into a compact with friends in Northern Ireland, in Wales, and in Scotland where they have an autism problem. This is a global phenomenon, as my friends and colleagues know, and we need to do more.

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

Mr. PITTS. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have introduced a bill which would provide small grant money to fledgling nongovernmental organizations throughout the world.

In my travels to places like Nigeria, I met up with a small nongovernmental organization which was like David versus Goliath. I was trying to get the government there to realize that they have an autistic problem that is estimated to affect about 1 million children in Nigeria alone. Nobody knows how accurate that is, but the best and most well-intentioned people in Nigeria have come to that number.

So we do have a serious spike. What is the trigger? Is it too many vaccines given at one time, you know, where the megadosing that occurs today in that little child can't metabolize and where the body can't deal with it in a way that leads to the child's being safe from those other diseases? Is it thimerosal? For our children and for our young adults who have autism, we need to continue to leave no stone unturned in finding what the trigger is or what the multiple triggers are.

Finally, again, I want to thank Bobbie and Billy Gallagher, who are the two parents in Brick Township who came forward with a stack of papers and who said, Please, will you take this up?

I took it up, and I've enjoyed working closely with friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle so that we can cure autism now. The sooner the better.

Mr. DOYLE. I would just like to say that I deeply appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from New Jersey on behalf of all people with autism and on behalf of their families. He has been a true champion, and I appreciate his friendship, too.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS).

Mr. TOWNS. Thank you very much for yielding time to me.

Of course I want to commend the members of the Autism Caucus for their outstanding work that they're doing. I also hope that this resolution will bring about awareness and support for autism.

Madam Speaker, let me just say that we know that more research is needed, and I think that any way that we can make it possible for people to focus on it and to understand how important these additional resources are makes a whole lot of sense.

I just want to commend my colleagues for their outstanding work that they have done to bring us to this point. I am hoping that, as a result of this, we will get more Members involved and, of course, more people involved in this issue, because there are still a lot of unanswered questions. At any time we can create a situation where people will focus on it, then I think answers will be coming forth.

So I just want to commend my colleagues for this effort. I look forward to working with them because this is a very serious problem. It is one that should not be ignored, and it is one on which we really should spend time making certain we get the word out in order to get the kind of research that we need to have in order to bring about a solution.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to one of the cosponsors of the resolution, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, as a parent myself, I know that there is nothing more important than the well-being of a child to a parent. When there is a change in a child's behavior and when the parents or grandparents notice that something is wrong, they are the first to notice, and they are also the first to want answers. Often those answers are that the child has autism or is on the autism spectrum.

I also join in commending MIKE DOYLE and CHRIS SMITH for their long labors on this issue, and I would like to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. TOWNS and of others.

Autism has always been a challenging diagnosis. There is an increased instance of autism spectrum disorder. It is quite a phenomenon. As of yet, it hasn't really been explained, but it is something that children, families, and siblings will have to deal with their entire lives. There are two very important things that we now know about autism:

The first is that awareness is critical, so I commend Mr. REICHERT and Mr. GERLACH, along with Mr. PITTS and the other speakers today. That's what makes the designation of April as National Autism Awareness Month so significant. The sooner an autism spectrum disorder is identified, the sooner a child can receive specialized treatment.

The second thing we know is that early intervention programs can make an exceptional difference in the quality of life for these precious children. This has been proven not just by studies but by the personal stories told by individual families. They've seen their

young people literally blossom in front of their eyes as a result of early treatment.

The Birmingham area, from which I hail, has an innovative center called Mitchell's Place. It's named for Mitchell, who is the son of the two founders, the Meislers. It is a model for autism services, not just for Alabama but for the entire country. Mitchell's Place combines the latest in behavioral and developmental research on autism with a structured and caring environment. When you walk through the doors of the center, which is bright and nurturing, you can feel the love for the children, and they respond.

There are many promising developments to report to families living with autism. Recently, I and Congressman MIKE DOYLE, who is the chairman of the Congressional Autism Council, hosted a briefing at which we heard from the Director of the National Institutes of Health, Dr. Thomas Insel. He told us about exciting research which is progressing in a number of areas. Expert researchers are studying causes, early intervention programs, strategies for older individuals with autism, and even potential cures.

□ 1745

In my State, thanks to the efforts of State Representative Cam Ward, we now have an Autism Task Force which is coordinating our State resources, and I know we patterned that after Pennsylvania, Congressman GERLACH.

In conclusion, it's an honor to speak on behalf this resolution and of the children and parents and grandparents and loved ones of those with autism. It's a pleasure to work with many Members of Congress who care so deeply about this issue, including the lead cosponsors, Congressmen REICHERT and GERLACH, along with Mr. PITTS from Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. DOYLE. Today's resolution has great meaning to millions of families across America affected by autism spectrum disorder.

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

Mr. PITTS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. BACHUS. If it encourages parents to be more attentive to the symptoms of autism and to get early treatment for their children, we will have done a great service for their families.

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

Mr. PITTS. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my good friend JIM GERLACH.

Mr. GERLACH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues and to thank my colleagues—Congressman BACHUS, Congressman REICHERT, Congressman PITTS, Congressman SMITH, Congressman DOYLE, Congressman TOWNS. Thank you for joining in support of this resolution to recognize April 2010 as National Autism Awareness Month.

As you may know, last December the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention released a report on the prevalence of autism. This report concluded that autism affects an estimated one out of every 110 children in the United States, including one in 70 boys. This means that autism is more common than childhood cancer, juvenile diabetes, and pediatric AIDS combined. In addition to being one of the most common disorders that affect our children, autism is believed to cost more than $90 billion a year to treat.

Earlier this month, the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare released its Pennsylvania Autism Census, which conducted a county-by-county census on the number of individuals suffering from autism. The total number of individuals with autism in the Commonwealth is estimated to be over 25,000, including 3,500 adults with the disorder.

Despite the prevalence of autism and its impact on individuals, families, and our Nation's health care system, there is still much to be learned about how best to diagnose and treat this disorder. That's why our resolution supports devoting resources toward researching the root causes of autism and identifying the best treatments and programs to help individuals with the disorder.

Because autism affects the entire family, not just the child with the disorder, our resolution also commends the parents and relatives of children with autism for their dedication in providing for their special needs. While there's no single cause known for autism, I believe we should focus our attention on increased awareness and funding for autism research. Our resolution is an important step in achieving our goal of searching for better treatments and hopefully, one day, a cure.

Please join me and my colleagues in supporting this resolution.

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, more children will be diagnosed this year with autism than with diabetes, cancer, and AIDS combined. It is the fastest-growing serious developmental disability in the world.

In fact, the United Nations General Assembly has gone so far as to adopt a resolution declaring April 2 as annual "World Autism Awareness Day" (WAAD). Autism is only the third disorder to be recognized in this manner by the UN, showing the disorder's pervasive nature and ever-increasing effect on millions of people throughout the world.

Autism afflicts one in every 150 American children—nearly one in every 94 boys. This statistic is disturbing, especially when we know so little about the root causes of the disorder.

As the Founder and co-chair of the Congressional Children's Health Care Caucus, I recognize the destructive force of autism and am proud to do my part to raise awareness of this life-altering and little known disorder. Children deserve a solid foundation—and communities are starting to understand autism like never before, but there is more we can do.

By raising public awareness of autism, my goal is to see that resources are dedicated to research the disorder's cause and to develop treatments and possibly, one day, a cure. Funding for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) is an important part of this equation, as it offers the best hope to finding treatments and cures for diseases and disorders like autism.

Collectively, we must commit every available resource to research and treatment in order to enhance the quality of life for children, their families, and the people who care for and assist them in their lives.

Currently there is no medical detection or cure for autism, but early diagnosis and intervention holds much promise. Through enhancing awareness of autism, together we will offer hope to people who desperately need it. I encourage my colleagues to join in this mission to raise awareness and recruit the resources that will bring hope to children, their families, and their caregivers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H. Res. 1033, supporting the designation of April of 2010 as ''National Autism Awareness Month'' and supporting efforts to devote new resources to research into the causes and treatment of autism and to improve training and support for individuals with autism and those who care for individuals with autism. I would also like to commend Congressman DAVID REICHERT, the sponsor of this resolution, for his commitment to improving training and supoort for individuals with autism and those who care for individuals with autism.

This resolution draws critical attention to the impact that autism has on the people of the United States. Although only 1 percent of the population of children ages 3–17 in the U.S. have an autism spectrum disorder, the cost of autism over the lifespan is 3.2 million dollars per person. The effects of autism are widespread. Autism is the fastest-growing developmental disability with a 1,148 percent growth rate. There are 1 to 1.5 million Americans who live with an autism spectrum disorder.

I have had the pleasure of visiting the Marcus Autism Center, near my district, where I was able to see and experience first hand just how crucial it is that families and children affected by autism are given the attention, support, and resources they need, The Marcus Autism Center is a non-profit organization with a mission to provide information, services and programs to children with autism and related disorders, their families and those who live and work with them. The Marcus Autism Center offers integrated advanced clinical, behavioral, educational and family support services. Through the encouragement and financial support of the Marcus family, Marcus Autism Center has become a nationally recognized center for excellence for the provision of coordinated and comprehensive services for children and adolescents with developmental disabilities. The Marcus Autism Center has served more than 30,000 people to date.

Please join me and support this resolution to bring awareness to improve training and support for individuals with autism and those who care for individuals with autism in the United States.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1033, a resolution designating April 2010 as ''Nation Autism Awareness Month.'' I thank my friends and colleagues, Representatives REICHERT,

GERLACH and BACHUS for introducing this resolution—and my friend and co-chair of the House Autism Caucus, MIKE DOYLE.

This resolution services an important function of increasing awareness of the 1.5 million individuals living with an autism spectrum disorder (ASD) and the extreme dedication and efforts of their families in providing the best possible care and environment for their children, grandchildren and brothers and sisters. Especially the parents and grandparents of individuals with autism deserve our enormous respect and support. Also deserving recognition are the many ASD advocacy groups who have been working hard for so long and the many providers of care and services for individuals with autism.

From my first session in Congress in 1981, I have been a consistent advocate for individuals with developmental disorders, including autism. In 1998, I became much more deeply involved after learning and listening to parents in a local community in my district—Brick Township—about their concerns that the frequency of autism was much higher than was being reported by officials at the time. The concerns of those parents were validated for their community and have since been found to be true nationwide. As stated in the resolution before us, autism is now known to affect every 1 in 110 children—my own state of NJ has among the highest rates in the nation at 1 in 94.

Autism generally is a life-long disability that can overwhelm families, as their lives become consumed with the considerable challenges of identifying appropriate biomedical and psychosocial treatments, schooling and other needed support systems for their autistic child—and eventually for an autistic adult.

Our nation is in the midst of an autism crisis that becomes more severe each passing month, a crisis that costs our nation tens of billions of dollars annually in medical care, behavioral therapy, special child care, and a range of child and adult services needed to care for these individuals. The resolution before us provides the staggering financial costs of autism—$80,000 per year to provide specialized treatment in a medical center, $30,000 per child per year for special education services, and a nationwide costs of over $90 billion per year.

The resolution appropriately recognizes the critical importance of early diagnosis and early treatment for children with autism in order to have the greatest positive impact on their lives, and it recognizes the extremely important need to provide worker training for young adults and adults with autism so that they can active members of the workforce.

Thankfully, Madam Speaker, in December 2006, this Congress passed and then President Bush signed the Combating Autism Act, which added significant provisions to broaden and strengthen activities related to autism. Among its provisions, that law requires the National Institutes of Health to expand ASD-related research—including investigating possible environmental causes of autism, authorizes grant programs to improve the epidemiology of autism, and also includes a very robust section ''Autism Education, Early Detection, and Intervention,'' to improve the early screening, diagnosis, interventions, and treatments for ASDs.

While we all were gratified with passage of the Combating Autism Act, we also recognized that there is a tremendous unmet need to improve services for both children and adults with autism. That is why I am extremely gratified to have joined my friend MIKE DOYLE, along with Rep. ELIOT ENGEL, in introducing, the Autism Treatment Acceleration Act (H.R. 2413), to provide for enhanced support, services and treatment, as well as research for individuals with autism spectrum disorders and their families.

To mention only two provisions of the bill—it would establish an Adult Services Demonstration Project to provide an array of services to adults with autism spectrum disorders including: post secondary education, vocational and self advocacy skills, employment; residential services, supports and housing; nutrition, health and wellness; recreational and social activities; and transportation and personal safety. And it would establish a ''National Network for Autism Spectrum Disorders Research and Services'' to strengthen linkages between research and service initiatives at the federal, regional, state and local levels, and facilitate the translation of research on autism into services and treatments.

I know that all of us here share the commitment to dramatically improve the lives for the well over a million American children and adults who have an autism spectrum disorder and improve the outlook for their families and other loved ones. I thank my friends Representatives REICHERT, GERLACH and BACHUS for introducing this resolution. And I thank my friend MIKE DOYLE for his leadership in establishing new programs to help individuals with autism.

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

Mr. DOYLE. Madam Speaker, I hope that the House will unanimously approve House Resolution 1033, as amended, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1033, as amended.

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

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: ''Expressing support for designation of April 2010 as 'National Autism Awareness Month' and supporting efforts to devote resources to research into the causes and treatment of autism and to improve training and support for individuals with autism and those who care for individuals with autism.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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.

IN RECOGNITION OF BOYS AND GIRLS HIGH SCHOOL BOYS BASKETBALL TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Boys and Girls High School in Brooklyn, New York. The boys basketball team last month won the New York City Public School Athletic League, PSAL, city championship. It is really referred to as the High, as it is affectionately known in Brooklyn, and has a long known history of athletic excellence.

I'm not standing here recognizing the High's boys basketball team only because it won its first PSAL championship in 31 years or because it has several players who college scouts are seriously recruiting. All of that is noteworthy and I think it is just great that that has occurred. But I also stand here because of the coach, Ruth Lovelace, the coach of the High's basketball team. She is the first woman in the history of the PSAL to take a male team to the championship and win.

Ms. Lovelace did not do it alone. She did not shoot or dribble a ball or even get fouled. Rather, she provided the leadership to take them all the way.

Ms. Lovelace starred in basketball at the High, played both at Hilbert Junior College and Seton Hall. As coach, she won 377 times and lost only 108 games during her 15-year tenure. Coach Love and the team have been featured in documentaries on ESPN, NBC, and CBS.

Coach Love would not have had the opportunity to lead a male team to a basketball championship without Congress's efforts to pass title IX in 1972. This signature piece of legislation opened the doors for women like Ruth Lovelace to participate in organized sports.

Again, I applaud the Boys and Girls High School boys basketball team for having a winning season and making the residents of the 10th Congressional District of Brooklyn, my fellow Brooklynites, so proud.

I would like to just enter the names of these great athletes into our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because they are not only great athletes, they're also great scholars, they're also great gentlemen, and I think that within itself is something that we should recognize today.

I would like to recognize Jonathan Arroyo, Dominique Bostick, Ralph Colon, Leroy Truck Fludd, Anthony Hemingway, Leroy Isler, Darren Kirby, Christopher Lockhart, Nkosi Brown, Jamal Mapp, Aaron McBurnie, Saequahn Pettus, Jeffland Neverson, Jobse Reyes, Antoine Slaughter, Calvin Sterling, Michael Taylor, Jerry White, Brandon Williams.

And let me just recognize the coaches. First I want to recognize the athletic director, Sheila Shale; and then head coach, again, Ruth Lovelace; and

her assistant coaches, Elmer Anderson, Jeff Wiggins, and Gene Carroll for the outstanding job that they have done on behalf of these young people who I know will go on to college and to make all of us proud.

So it's my honor and my pleasure to say to the Boys and Girls High School we are so proud of you and what you have done to bring back the pride to Brooklyn that we rightfully deserve. Congratulations, Boys and Girls High School.

NEWS FROM THE THIRD FRONT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I bring you news from the third front. The third front is the border that the United States has with Mexico, almost 2,000 miles long. The first front, of course, is the battle in Iraq. The second is the one in Afghanistan. The third front is the violence that occurs on our southern border with our neighbors in Mexico.

Tonight I would like to talk about one specific group, and that's our Border Patrol agents who are doing a noble job on the broard southern border with Mexico. Some people don't realize this, but our Border Patrol agents, Madam Speaker, are under constant attack, daily attack, and it's from people that are coming into the United States illegally. The assaults against our Border Patrol officers have increased up to 16 percent more than last year. Just in the Tucson area, assaults against Border Patrol agents in the first 2 months of this year have increased 300 percent from last year. Over 108 Border Patrol agents in a 2-month period have been assaulted in the Tucson area.

Let me show you a photograph, Madam Speaker. I'm not sure you can see this. Let me hold it up. This is a Border Patrol vehicle. It's a pickup truck. But you can see that there is mesh steel across portions of this Border Patrol vehicle. The Border Patrol calls this vehicle and others like it a ''war wagon.''

Now, why would they have this mesh steel across their windows, across the front windshield, on the roof protecting the lights, the red lights? Why would they have this? Well, it's to protect themselves. You see, when these Border Patrol vehicles go up and down the U.S. border with Mexico, those people who want to come into the United States illegally are waiting for them in different parts of the border, on our side right on the border, and throw rocks at our Border Patrol, and that's how many of the assaults have occurred against our Border Patrol agents in recent years.

So thus they have to build these war wagons, something that you might want to see in Afghanistan or Iraq, to protect themselves from those who enter the United States illegally because they are constantly throwing rocks at them to divert the attention of our Border Patrol.

□ 1800

The rocks are a weapon of choice by those who want to come into the United States illegally and who confront our Border Patrol. It's not just the weapons of choice by them, our cartels, of course—the drug cartels. They use other weapons. A little more firepower. Border Patrol is outmanned, out-gunned, and out-financed by the vicious border cartels who bring drugs into the United States and make money off of the illegal use of narcotics in bringing those drugs into the United States.

Now, finally, we have started hearing something about what is taking place on the border. It's because of the folks in Arizona; that's where Tucson is. That's where Border Patrol assaults on Border Patrol agents have increased 300 percent in 2 months. They have so desperately taken matters into their own hands and made it illegal to be in the United States if you do not have a passport or a legal document. They have taken the Federal law and allowed police officers, when they have reasonable suspicion, to arrest somebody that's illegally in the United States. In other words, they catch them for doing some other crime, they find out they're illegally in the country and it becomes a crime in Arizona.

They had to pass that law because the Federal Government, who's supposed to protect the sovereignty of the country and protect citizens from people who throw rocks at our Border Patrol, for example, it's the Federal Government's job to do that. But the Federal Government—because we're too busy, like today. We honor on the House floor all the assistant principals in the United States. Now I'm sure that was an important piece of legislation that we passed today, yet we're honoring assistant principals and naming post offices while we ought to be securing the borders of the United States.

We secure the borders of foreign countries better than we secure our own borders. We secure the borders of Iraq and Afghanistan and Third World countries, but not our own border. So we have to leave our Border Patrol on patrol, driving these war wagons to protect themselves when they're trying to enforce the rule of law.

I recently asked a Texas Ranger down in the Laredo area, I said, What's it like after the sun goes down? He said, Congressman POE, it gets western. It gets western. What he meant by that, it gets violent. And it does get violent. The gunfire, the violence, the kidnappings, the murders all take place down there because the drug cartels are trying to bring drugs into the United States. And they out-man, outgun, and out-finance our Border Patrol agents.

Our Border Patrol agents are doing as good a job as we'll let them do, and we need to help them all we can. Several Governors on the border States have asked that the President send the National Guard down there. That's probably a good idea. Let's send the National Guard to the border, secure the border, and make sure that our Border Patrol agents and our sovereignty is protected.

And that's just the way it is.

HELPING WOUNDED VETERANS AND THEIR FAMILY CAREGIVERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHRADER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, we have no greater obligation as a Congress and as a Nation than to look after the Americans who selflessly and patriotically have volunteered themselves into harm's way in Iraq, Afghanistan, and around the world. When they come home wheelchair-bound or with missing limbs or with a traumatic brain injury, they deserve nothing less than the very best treatment and care. Often, that care is provided not by health care professionals at a hospital, but by spouses, parents, other family members, or a loved one that isn't even next of kin. Many of these wonderful folks are already living on a tight budget. They're likely to be already caring for young children and/or aging parents. And often they have jobs they can't afford to lose.

I've fought to give these families the support they need. I introduced the first-ever expansion of the Family and Medical Leave Act, which provided Americans with 6 months of unpaid leave—unpaid, should be paid—of unpaid leave to care for wounded servicemembers and their families. Last week, a bipartisan majority in the House took important new steps by passing the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act. This would ease the enormous burden falling on those whose loved ones return from war with a severe injury. It provides tools and training so they can be better caregivers. When they accompany a veteran on medical visits, their lodging would be paid for. They would also be eligible for a monthly stipend as well as health care benefits of their own. And when the stress becomes too great, which of course it does, counseling and respite care would be available.

The bill also makes huge strides in recognizing the unique challenges faced by women who wear the uniform. It includes treatment for sexual trauma, which affects a staggering number of servicewomen. There is a child care pilot program so that women veterans can get the care they need without sacrificing the care of their children. Also, for the first time ever, there's neonatal care for the infants of returning soldiers giving birth.

I wish I didn't have to vote for that bill last week because I wish that bill

hadn't been necessary in the first place. Because the best way to support the men and women of the United States military, I believe, would be not to send them to fight in unnecessary wars in the first place.

The tragedy is all the more poignant, Mr. Speaker, because these injuries are being sustained in conflicts that are doing little or nothing to advance our national security interests. I can't help but think how many military families would have been spared the struggle if we had taken a SMART security approach to fighting terrorism or if we had doubled down on humanitarian aid rather than resorting to aggression, invasion, and occupation.

But as fiercely as I am in opposition to these two wars, I will never turn my back on the men and women who have been asked to fight them. In fact, the more skeptical you are about Iraq and Afghanistan, the greater you should be in your obligation to our troops on the front lines. There's one big solution to the strain on our veterans health care system and family caregivers, and that would be to reverse the disastrous policy that is creating more wounded combat veterans every single day.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better way to honor our soldiers than to end these wars and to bring all of them home—and bring them home now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

LADIES IN WHITE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Ladies in White are a group of wives, mothers, sisters, and daughters of Cuban political prisoners. The group came together after the arrests of 75 Cuban dissidents in April 2003. Seventy-five Cuban political prisoners who, 7 years ago, joined the thousands of others who are imprisoned in Cuba because of their political beliefs or for ''crimes'' that are only ''crimes'' in a country brutally oppressed by a totalitarian regime of gangsters, by gangsters, and for gangsters. Because that is what the Castro brothers are—gangsters.

Fidel Castro has been a gangster since he was a juvenile delinquent. He became a Communist to give ideological clothing to his gangsterism. Raul Castro came to gangsterism via Marxism-Leninism, after his brother sent him as an almost illiterate adolescent to then-Czechoslovakia, where he received a rigorous indoctrination in Marxism-Leninism. So the brothers arrived at gangsterism via separate paths, but they are both experienced and ruthless practitioners of the most violent and brutal forms of gangsterism.

The Ladies in White experience the tactics of the Castros' gangsterism every single day. The Castros' state security apparatus pays and trains thugs to strike fear in the hearts of all Cubans in order to keep the regime in power. The thugs, the plainclothes terrorists of the Castros' regime, harass, intimidate, insult, spit upon, and engage in violence against the unarmed dissidents and other independent civil society members in Cuba. These spectacles are known as ''acts of repudiation.'' The international press refers to the plainclothes thugs of the Castros' state security apparatus as ''civilian government supporters,'' but that doesn't change their true nature. No, they're not ''plainclothes government supporters.'' They're plainclothes thugs of Cuban state security.

On recent Sundays, the Ladies in White have gone to church, as every Sunday, to pray for their family members who are political prisoners, and the thugs have become more violent. Protected by uniformed state security agents, the plainclothes thugs have spat upon and committed acts of violence against Laura Pollan, Bertha Soler, Reina Tamayo, Julia Esther Nunez, Asuncion Carrillo, Loida Valdez, Laura Maria Labrada, and the other Ladies in White.

I hereby submit for the RECORD the names of 96 Ladies in White who have been actively demanding the release of Cuban political prisoners in recent months.

1. Martha Díaz Rondón
2. Regla Vaillant Planas
3. Mildre Noemí Sánchez Infante
4. Ercilia Correoso Pérez
5. Maritza Castro Martínez
6. Blanca Hernández Moya
7. Lilia Castañer Hernández
8. Ivonne Malleza Galano
9. Deysi Lázara Suárez Martínez
10. Odalys Sanabria Rodríguez
11. Caridad Caballero Batista
12. Zoila Hernández Díaz
13. Gertrudis Ojeda Suárez
14. Niurkis Rivero Despaigne
15. Mercedes Fresneda Castillo
16. Sara Martha Fonseca Acevedo
17. Ismari Salomón Carcasés
18. Tania Montoya Vázquez
19. Yolanda Martínez Guerra
20. Guadalupe Varela Mora
21. Zayli Figueroa Acosta
22. Odalys Zurman González
23. Bárbara Couyedo Riego
24. Miriam Espinosa del Valle
25. Doraida Pérez Paceiro
26. Iris Tamara Pérez Aguilera
27. Mayra Morejón Hernández
28. Mari Blanca Avila Espósito
29. Petra Serafina Díaz Castillo
30. Rosario Morales La Rosa
31. Sonia Garro Alfonso
32. Maylisis Abrahantes Muñoz
33. Juana Gómez Riego
34. Yudermis Fonseca Rondón
35. Crispina Xiomara Duquesne Suárez
36. Doralis Alvares Soto
37. Ana Iris Vega Rodríguez
38. Lázara M. Caballero Betancourt
39. Marlenis Guerra Martin
40. Nerys Castillo Moreno
41. Tania Maceda Guerra
42. Caridad Sarduy Fernández
43. Raquel Castillo Urquiza
44. Sandra Guerra Pérez
45. María Elena Fernández
46. Yaneris Pérez Rey
47. Roxaida Ramírez Matos
48. Dulce Avalo Díaz
50. Ariela Riviaux Castillo
51. Evelia Hernández Ravelo
52. Georgina Noa Monte
53. Belinda Barzaga Lugo
54. Marioris Moreno Noa
55. Xiomara Duquesne Suárez
56. Mirtha Gómez Colás
57. Madeline Lazara Betancourt
58. Yaquelín Cutiño
59. Gladis Lugo Expósito
60. Dulce María Quintana
61. Suyoanis Tapia Mayeta
62. Leonor Reynord Borges
63. Leydi Coca Quesada
64. Noely Camila Araujo Molina
65. Yordanka Peña López
66. Yeni Palenzuela Izquierdo
67. Ana Aguililla
68. Laura Inés Pollan Toledo
69. Bertha Soler Fernández
70. Melba Santana Ariz
71. Reyna Luisa Tamayo Danger
72. Belkis Cantillo Ramírez
73. Alejandrina García de la Rivas
74. Julia Núñez Pacheco
75. Nélida Borrego Aragón
76. Reyna Maria Ortiz Tamayo
77. Milka Maria Peña Martínez
78. Ana Belkis Ferrer García
79. Loida Valdés González
80. Lidia Esther Lima Valdés
81. Magaly Broche de la Cruz
82. Isabel Sánchez Altarriba
83. Yamilé Velázquez Batista
84. Sonia Alvarez Campillo
85. Asunción Carrillo Hernández
86. Irene Viera Filloy
87. Bárbara Rojo Arias
88. Iraida Soledad Rivas Verdecia
89. Amada Evelia Hernández Ravel
90. Catalina Cano
91. Elsa González Padrón
92. Belkis Barzaga Lugo
93. Gisela Delgado Sablón
94. Noelia Pedraza Jiménez
95. Nancy Sánchez Altarriba
96. Mercedes Acosta antiago de Cuba

I also submit for the RECORD a letter sent today by representatives of the Ladies in White outside of Cuba, Blanca Reyes Castanon and Yolanda Huerga, asking international leaders for support in the Ladies in White's struggle for human rights and liberty.

MARCH 27, 2010.

DEAR SIR, We write you as the Representatives of the Ladies in White in Europe and the United States, to seek your urgent attention for the current plight of Cuba's political prisoners and their families.

The Ladies in White are members of independent civil society and the group was born spontaneously, seven years ago, as a result of the arrest of 75 members of the peaceful opposition by the Cuban regime during the Black Spring of 2003. Wives, mothers, sisters, and daughters of these prisoners only ask for the right to see their unjustly jailed relatives freed.

By this means we seek to ask, that as a representative of a democratic nation where human rights and freedom of speech are respected, that you attempt, and within your ability, interest yourself personally and seek the attention of those individuals and institutions that you see fit, to defend these

women, and their relatives, so that all hostility that they suffer in the streets of Havana and in all of Cuba cease, both physically and verbally, for defending their right to freedom.

We thank you for your time and cooperation, and we trust in your invaluable help, at the same time that we insist that the current situation is extremely delicate and dangerous.

Respectfully,

BLANCA REYES CASTAÑÓN,
Representatives in Europe.
YOLANDA HUERGA,
Representative in the United States.

This last Sunday, the day before yesterday, the Ladies in White were surrounded and subjected to 7 hours of insults and acts of violence by the plainclothes thugs of the Castros' state security apparatus. Surrounded and subjected to nightmarish, abominable insults and grotesque sexual gestures, as well as loud, constant screams and chants of communist slogans and violence for 7 hours, the day before yesterday, subjected to the well-planned tactics which are part of the training of the plainclothes state security agents of the Castros' gangster regime.

But the Ladies in White continue to stand tall. Like the political prisoners who they defend, the Ladies in White represent the true Cuba. They embody the decency, patriotism, and love of the real Cuba—not the grotesque, perverted hatred, envy, and perfidy of the Castros and their gangster regime.

This evening, my thoughts and prayers of limitless admiration and solidarity are with Cuba's Damas de Blanco—the Ladies in White.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from 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 Virginia (Mr. FORBES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FORBES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BILBRAY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FINANCIAL REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, as we watch the Senate move on legislation yet again toward a cloture vote on Senator DODD's legislation, I think it is worth noting some of the concerns that many of us have and that many economists have with the Dodd-Frank approach on the legislation. I begin with focusing on a past occurrence, the rescue of investment bank Bear Stearns in the spring of 2008.

The Federal Government has committed trillions of taxpayer dollars to institutions like Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, AIG, Citigroup, and Bank of America out of fear that the demise of any of these too-big-to-fail institutions would trigger a systemic crisis and collapse of the global financial system. For my own part, I'd make the observation that I thought—I voted against those bailouts with the presumption that if we move to enhance bankruptcy, it would be preferable to setting up a system which would bring the moral hazard and the eventual evolution into a system where the Federal Government was guaranteeing institutions that were too big to fail.

But that is currently the concern I have about this legislation, even though the public has rejected this approach to financial regulation, the bailouts that we have seen, and abhor bailouts of financial institutions. If you have a town hall meeting, I guarantee you, you will sense the rejection of the Dodd-Frank approach.

□ 1815

Still, this approach, endorsed by the administration, would guarantee the bailout authority remains a powerful tool in the government's arsenal. Now, the President is hoping to use the tactic employed in the health care debate by dismissing legitimate concerns with rhetoric but not with facts. And I would take the comments he made in New York where he said, ''What is not legitimate is to suggest that we're enabling or encouraging future taxpayer bailouts, as some have claimed. That may make for a good sound bite, but it's not factually accurate.'' Well, actually it is accurate.

And let us look at the bailout fund in the House-passed bill. On the House side, H.R. 4173, subsection 1609(o), it provides authority for the government to borrow up to $200 billion that can be used by the government for its bailout actions.

In the Senate bill, Senate bill 3217, subsection 210(n), it creates a special $50 billion fund to resolve big financial institutions, to resolve those institutions when they've failed. Behind that fund is the ability to issue government debt—in other words, to issue taxpayer obligations. It is no wonder why our colleague on the other side of the aisle from California (Mr. SHERMAN) recently said of the Dodd bill, ''There are serious problems with the Dodd bill. The Dodd bill has unlimited executive bailout authority. That's something Wall Street desperately wants but doesn't dare ask for. The bill contains permanent, unlimited bailout authority,'' as my colleague on the other side of the aisle mentioned, and I agree with his assessment.

There is another piece of this in the broad expansion of open bank assistance authority granted to the FDIC. The House bill, section 1109, provides the FDIC authority to ''avoid or mitigate adverse effects on systemic economic conditions or financial stability by guaranteeing obligations of solvent'' financial institutions. The FDIC's guarantees can be up to $500 billion and may be expanded an additional $500 billion with permission from Congress. That is $500 billion in potential taxpayer liabilities to solvent companies.

This is not the death panel that Chairman FRANK so often claimed. This is not an ''enhanced bankruptcy process'' or an ''expedited bankruptcy'' that the administration wants people to believe. It is, in fact, a codification of the current ad hoc approach to bailouts. As Mr. SHERMAN has noted in the past, this amounts to TARP on steroids.

We are handing over the keys to the Treasury to unelected bureaucrats. If TARP was any indicator, regulators will always err on the side of doling out too many Federal dollars under the guise of preventing a systemic shock. If the letter of the law allows for them to guarantee $500 billion of debt for solvent companies, they will do just that.

And this is simply the wrong approach. Regulatory discretion armed with a large pool of taxpayer money will inevitably lead to political abuse.

Under the Dodd-Frank approach, government will determine which firms are too big to fail and which are too small to save. Under this bill, the government will determine which creditors and which counterparties of a failed firm should be bailed out and those that should not. And government will dismantle a healthy institution that they believe may pose a risk under the wording of the legislation.

This type of power will lead to a hyperpolitical environment where political pull will replace market discipline. Subjectivity will replace objectivity and the clearly defined rules of the road that have been a cornerstone of our capital markets. We need to expand the bankruptcy process and the clearly defined rules of the road that come with it, and we need to take out the ability for political manipulation in the process.

There are other concerns that I have with the approach in this legislation, in the Dodd-Frank approach, and one of the concerns I have is that it fails wholly to address one of the major root causes of the crisis. It is important to remember that one of the root causes of the crisis was in the junk mortgage market, subprime and Alt-A loans. Federal Government policies were responsible for the buildup of these loans. There were 27 million subprime and Alt-A loans in our economy in 2008 before the financial crisis. That's about half of all mortgages. Of those, 12 million were held or guaranteed by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the government-sponsored enterprises; $5.4 billion of FHA and about 2 million as a result of the largest banks making CRA commitments in order to get approval for mergers and expansions.

One of the other factors, of course, in the economic contraction that we've faced was the fact that the Fed set negative real interest rates; in other words, they set the interest rates that were measured against inflation at a negative sum, and when our Federal Reserve put that in place for 4 years running, it was followed by central banks in Europe that did the same thing. So central banks all over the world for 4 years set those interest rates at a negative rate.

Virtually every economist will tell you that this played a significant role in the crisis; and we're not looking at the fact that we have not addressed this issue either because, in essence, the Federal and the central banks threw fuel on the fire. These unusually low rates incentivized the financial sector to take excessive risk and they exacerbate the normal business cycle. Dr. Friedrich Hayek won the Nobel Prize in Economics in 1974 for explaining this phenomenon on how this causes booms and busts in the cycle.

And, of course, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and the easy money policy at the Fed were central to the housing boom and bust, and they are left unaddressed in the Dodd-Frank approach. When you add things in like excessive leverage in the financial sector and the overreliance on the failed rating agencies, you have a recipe for disaster.

And I will add that the Fed came to the Congress and suggested to us in 2004 and 2005 that there was systemic risk with Fannie and Freddie, and what they asked for was an amendment to deleverage these portfolios that were being built up in Fannie and Freddie, in our GSEs, our government-sponsored enterprises. The leveraging was in excess of 100:1. These institutions were involved in arbitrage, and it was Congress that gave them the wherewithal to do this and prevented the regulators from going in and forcing these institutions, these government-sponsored enterprises, to deleverage the size of these portfolios.

You can imagine the reaction from officials at the Fed when we turned a deaf ear in Congress. As a matter of fact, I want to point out that in the Senate, we had legislation from Senator Hagel written by the Fed that would allow that authority to regulate for systemic risk, to give the regulators the ability to deregulate these portfolios. That bill went out of committee, but Senator CHRIS DODD opposed it on the floor, opposed it coming to the floor, and, as a consequence, the bill never came up; although it passed committee, it never came up in the Senate.

On this side of the House, the House of Representatives, there was a bill that came to the floor, and I put in the amendment that Chuck Hagel had carried in the Senate. Again, the amendment that I introduced was written by the Federal Reserve in an attempt to give them the ability to regulate for systemic risk in Fannie and Freddie because they had warned that the consequence we faced was a systemic economic collapse. And certainly that's exactly where this collapse began. It was in the housing market. It was with the collapse of Fannie and Freddie, the loss of about $1 trillion in value.

Now I'm going to bring up one other issue that's missing on the Senate side that really gives me pause in terms of the way this is approached. Let me just make the point that the FDIC has no experience with these types of institutions. As I've said before, I have opposed the bailouts. I, instead, wanted to see a system devised. We have companies, major firms go bankrupt in the United States—airlines, railroads. These are handled instead by an expedited bankruptcy process through the courts, and that's what I wanted to see beefed up.

Let's go to the Senate bill. A major premise upon which the resolution authority was based is the notion that the FDIC uses a similar tool to unwind small commercial banks. In fact, last week before the Financial Services Committee, Secretary Geithner again reiterated this point. But this is like comparing apples to oranges, and I will share with you why.

The FDIC is liquidating very simple institutions primarily made up of insured deposits and made up of small straightforward loans. In fact, 98 percent of the liabilities of banks and thrifts unwound by the FDIC in the last 2 years were insured deposits. This is in stark contrast to the nondeposit-taking institutions likely to be covered under the resolution authority, which is going to end up creating this permanent bailout authority. And I would just give you some examples from the past.

Take Lehman Brothers, take AIG. Neither of these firms had insured depositors or depositors of any kind, and their complex assets and liabilities did not look anything like the simple small loans and residential and commercial mortgages that the FDIC deals with. The sheer size of these institutions trump anything the FDIC has touched. The $639 billion in Lehman was nearly 15 times bigger than the largest bank ever resolved by the FDIC, and AIG was over $1 trillion in assets.

This is another problem with this approach. Since nearly all of the liabilities of banks and thrifts unwound by the FDIC are insured deposits, there is a strong presumption of government backing behind these ''too big to fail'' institutions; and, by applying this model to the largest of our financial institutions, the legislation will signal that the government-provided safety net now extends to a much wider portion of our capital market.

And think for a minute what that means to the competitors of these large firms, for the smaller firms that are too small to save. Suddenly they face a differential in their borrowing costs that can reach up to 100 basis points. Some studies show 78 basis-point costs, some show 100 basis-point costs. That's the costs that small institutions have currently that is higher than the borrowing costs of institutions that face this implied government bailout or have been bailed out by the government.

□ 1830

You saw it with respect to the government-sponsored enterprises, how much lower their cost of borrowing was and how they were able to over leverage, and how on top of all of this, they could become a duopoly and put their competitors out of business because people presumed that the government was behind these institutions.

These are some of my concerns, and I know these concerns are shared by a colleague of mine on the committee, Mr. SCOTT GARRETT.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from New

Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 42 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the Chair, and I thank the gentleman from California who was previously speaking for his insightful analysis of where the country currently finds itself with regard to this macro issue of Wall Street reform and banking reform in this country, something which Members on both sides of the aisle agree wholeheartedly is necessary and needed to be done. We just need to make sure that we do so in a thoughtful manner so we don't do more harm than good.

When President Obama and Democrats claim Republicans are doing the bidding of big Wall Street banks and oppose all financial service reg reform, you know, you hear that over and over again by some of the commentators on TV, I have to say, you find it laughable on a number of different levels.

First of all, think about this, it is the Democrat bills that have institutionalized permanent bailouts and too big to fail. It is no wonder then that Democrats have received such strong fund raising support from the titans of Wall Street.

As I stand here, I'm not sure I have all of those numbers before me. Later on I may. Off the top of my head, those numbers stand out as something to the tune of something like around $15 million from the various titans of Wall Street, as they put it, to the President's campaign in the last cycle. I think the number I saw just the other day, and the most recent numbers out for the 2008 cycle of Congress, something like $2.9 million from these various Wall Street firms and banks going to the majority party, the Democrat Party, in the last election; twice as much as what is going to Republicans.

Maybe it is no wonder that they have received such strong support from Wall Street that they would then put in a bill that would see to it that Wall Street is taken care of in the sense of the perpetuation of bailouts at the taxpayers' expense.

Not only do Republicans support real financial service reform, the House Republicans were the first ones to come forward with a comprehensive reform plan that actually ends too big to fail. It ends bailouts, and we also don't succumb to the Democrats' urge to take yet another vast portion of our economy with government overreach and intrusion and bullying of private businesses. Think about that.

The reason I point out that Republicans came out with a proposal earlier than the majority party, earlier than the White House, earlier than the Treasury. I remember being in this Chamber talking on this floor early last year in 2009, in January and February and March saying we need to attack this problem on Wall Street, we need to attack the morass that we are finding our country in economically. We needed to get reform done. All of the while Treasury was telling us we will have something next week, we will have something next week.

Week after week passed, and we finally ended our waiting for them and we put our minds together. We listened to the American public and we listened to the experts. We listened to the people who were involved with this and the people who also would be hurt by wrong actions being taken. We took all of that advice and we came up with a Republican solution to this proposal, and actually had it done before the White House ever even came up with their white paper that they presented at the White House.

I remember going to that presentation where the President came out and said here is my solution, here is the problem, just laid it out and left the stage. Didn't take a single question from the audience. That is how it has been ever since, left the stage and has not listened to what the American public and those involved have to say about their plan.

Before I go to our Republican plan, I would like to remind our colleagues over in the Senate on the other side, who likely will be asked to vote on the Obama-Dodd-Frank plan, and they will be likely to vote on it again soon. They voted on it earlier, and I guess they will be doing it again today, if they haven't done so already. And the way it is coming down in the press reports is that HARRY REID sees it as a win/win for them to just continue to put vote after vote after vote. The last vote Republicans stood together saying they would vote ''no'' on any bill that would perpetuate bailouts to taxpayers for these financial institutions. That is a good thing. We hope they stand firm on that.

There is a whole host of reasons, in addition to that, why both Democrats and Republicans should vote against that 1,300-page permanent bailout bill.

Let me digress for a moment on that issue. We are just now learning of the ramifications, unintended and otherwise, from the health care bill; you know, that 2,000-page bill that we know no one read on this floor and understood all of the ancillary portions of it, and yet it passed in the House, passed in the Senate, and came back to the House again and passed overwhelmingly after a lot of arm twisting by the White House and others to get all of the votes they needed to get it done.

But you could see during the debate in the health care bill, when poignant questions and particular questions were raised on particular portions of the bill, there was no one on the other side of the aisle who could honestly say I have read through the bill, all of the several thousand pages, and all of the ancillary references to it and had a complete understanding of it. Yet that bill passed, and now we are seeing the ramifications from that.

A study came out this past week from this administration saying the actual cost of health care, remember President Obama said he was going to actually lower it, would go up by a percentage or so over a 10-year period of time. Remember the President also promised no one would lose their health care plan, they didn't read the bill. Because they didn't read the bill, they find out now in another study that about half of those senior citizens on the Advantage program of Medicare will be losing their plans. That is the ramifications when you try to rush something through without reading it and understanding it.

Now back to the point, here we have over in the Senate, we have a 1,300-page plus bill that didn't go through the committee process and didn't have an opportunity for vetting and hearing from the various witnesses and experts, that, too, Senator REID is trying to push through this week against all odds and truly understanding what they are doing over there.

The bill they are attempting to work on and move quickly without that understanding codifies the government policies invoked to bail out AIG, Bear Stearns, and others, and it does so, in large part, by creating a permanent $50 billion bailout fund which, I should add, can be endlessly reloaded. Let me make a point on that.

They say we are going to set up this $50 billion fund to bail out the future bank losses and what have you. Well, if the next day they need that $50 billion and it goes down, the next day after that they can go right back to the pot of money and try to raise it back up again, and go to another $50 billion. So $50 billion is really a placeholder for 50, 100, 150, 200, 250, on and on and on it could go, bailing out failing institutions, so-called too-big-to-fail institutions, and potentially also indirectly put the American taxpayer on the hook.

I should probably explain just one example of that. Look at AIG. What was the number we saw on AIG. I think it was around $80 billion needed to bail it out. Here is the seminal question which I think we put to Secretary Geithner. I don't know if we ever got a satisfactory answer from him or anyone else who proposed the legislation in the Senate. The questions was: Had you had this bill, the Dodd bill, in place prior to AIG, would the outcome have been any different?

Well, there you needed about $80 billion, all from the American taxpayers. Here they say we will have $50 billion. Obviously $50 billion is not enough; so in the short term, where will you get that money. The bill, the Senate Democrat Obama-Dodd-Frank bill basically says you can go to the Federal Government, the Federal Reserve, they can basically front end load that money to the facility so they can loan it out to whether it is AIG next time or another Lehman in the future, or what have you. The American taxpayer at that point in time is now on the hook for however much money they want to lend out without basically any limit.

Other portions of the bill that are problematic besides creating a permanent $50 billion bailout fund, which, as I said, would be endlessly reloaded, paid for by taxing financial firms to pay for other larger firms' failure. I think that is an important point. If you have a local community bank in your community, you have to ask them, What do you think about the fact that potentially, depending upon your size, you could be held liable for the egregious mistakes and failures of these huge titans of Wall Street who make absurd investment decisions. I think most of your local community banks that potentially could be on the hook would say, it is nothing good for us, it is nothing good for our local community because any time you put a tax on something, one bank or another, it hurts the businesses in that community.

Another major point that is problematic with the bill, it expands the implied government guarantee in the financial marketplace for the largest firms. Sort of along the point I was just making here, it is the biggest firms in Wall Street that are going to be able to say, Thank goodness, thank goodness we made all of these contributions to those people in Washington who are now supporting this legislation of the Dodd-Frank-Obama bill because now we know who our friends are, and of course, it is on the other side of the aisle, who are supporting this legislation that will allow for their perpetual bailout.

Another problem with the bill is it continues to place taxpayers on the hook for billions, if not trillions of dollars for bailed out failed nonbanks. I say trillions of dollars because there is nothing in that 1,300 pages of legislation that is sitting in the other House, in the Senate right now that Senator REID wants them to push right through, vote on without having full understanding of it. There is nothing in that bill that would say, American taxpayer, your liability to the big banks in New York and around the country is going to be limited at this much or this much. There is no limit. It can just go up to billions of dollars, tens of billions of dollars, hundreds of billions of dollars, or trillions and trillions of dollars potentially.

And if you think trillions are out of sight as far as the potential, all we have to look at is the GSEs, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and where is the limit on the potential loss to the American taxpayer there. I think it is around $389 billion that they have scored that it will cost taxpayers over the next 10 years coming out of our Treasury, which means out of our pockets. But there is a potential there with several trillions of dollars of potential losses on their books that we can all Americans be eventually liable for. So trillions are not out of the question when you are talking about such mammoth institutions and trading as we have seen here.

To continue, with the problems of the Senate financial services so-called reform bill that Senator REID is trying to push through the Senate as we speak without anyone really understanding or reading it, the bill continues the pattern of government overreach that we have seen throughout the Obama administration and with the Democrats controlling here in the House.

It also continues the pattern of government picking winners and losers and political bullying and deciding just who it is will succeed in this country and who it is that is going to fail rather than through the private market and rather than through the rule of law and the rule of the bankruptcy code.

Did we ever think that we would come to the day when it would be the politicians who would decide: I think that business over there should do well and thrive and succeed, as opposed to this business over here. I don't have much favor for them for one reason or another, maybe they are not a friend of mine politically or otherwise, and the politicians says, That business can go into the dust and not succeed.

Did we ever think we would get to the day when it would be Washington and Washington politicians and bureaucrats who would say, I am going to pick that one as a winner, and that one over there is a loser.

That, in essence, is basically what we find in the 1,300-page bill that Senator REID would like to see passed without any real debate or discussion or amendments or improvements upon because it allows the bureaucrats of various Federal agencies, these appointed and unelected individuals, to make those basically life-and-death decisions for industry and life-and-death decisions for businesses as well.

□ 1845

Did we ever think we would get to the point where those decisions are not made by the markets because this business actually did do a better job in deciding how it would grow, how it would invest, what sort of services it would provide? That's how the free market has always thought that businesses should thrive. And if this business over here decides that they make poor investment decisions, poor customer service, poor decisions, generally, on how it's running, then the market should say that is the business that will fail.

Well, we're going to throw that all aside now with this piece of legislation and say the market forces are not going to be it. What people decide on situations of who should win and who should lose are not going to be the preeminent decision basis anymore. Instead it's going to be politicians and bureaucrats, a sad day that most Founding Fathers would never have thought we would get to.

Another problem with the Senate bill, the Frank-Dodd bill that HARRY REID is trying to push through the Senate right now without a debate and without a full discussion and disclosure of an understanding of the entire bill, is that the bill will restrict access to credit for families and small businesses and ultimately make credit more expensive and less available.

A recent study points out that the portion of the bill, the CFPA, Consumer Financial Protection Agency, something that they want to create as a brand new agency here in Washington, as if we don't have enough agencies already in Washington, a recent study points out that the CFPA will increase the cost of interest rates that consumers pay by at least 160 basis points. What does that mean? That means if you have a 6 percent loan that you could have gotten today, well, once this bill passes, then it will increase by 160 basis points. That means your 6 percent loan will now be 7.6 percent.

Also, the study shows it will reduce consumer borrowing by at least 2.1 percent. Well, that makes sense. Right now most people, when they're out looking for a car loan or they're looking for a mortgage for the house or a home equity loan to try to make some improvements, one of the first things they do when they sit down with their banker or when they open up the paper to see what the availability of interest rates is, they look to see how much are those interest rates. And you want to get the very best interest rates you can get because every percentage point higher means less money in your pocket at the end of the day and more money in the banker's pockets.

Well, this bill, outside studies have said that when you now start looking for those car loans, student loans, commercial loans, mortgages for your house or mortgages for commercial property, under this bill, because they're adding these new impediments to the access of credit, you will see your rates of interest go up by 1 point, 1.5 points. That 1.5 points can mean a lot of money, a lot of money out of your pocket and mine every time you take a loan. And think about it, is that something we really want to do during this economic morass, these economic troubles that we find ourselves in right now?

I have so many small businesses that come to me right now, owners of small businesses, some are individuals, that say I just can't get credit as it is. I have a good credit rating, I have a good credit position, I've been paying all my bills on time, but when I go out to try to get a loan, I just can't get it. And as it is, the rates that are out there are not just really where I want to be, but I can maybe afford them if I can get those loans.

Well, here we're going to have the Senate now try to pass a bill—and we already passed a version of it in the House, unfortunately—that will say to an individual who is already struggling to get a loan or struggling to pay his current interest, you know, the next time you get this loan, the rates were

here, now they're going to be 1 point, 1.5 points, even higher; more money out of your pocket each time just because we're creating a new agency in Washington with no other real effect except to make the credit availability less than it is now.

Another huge problem with the bill that's before us in the Senate, that already passed the House and potentially will come back to the House for another vote if it unfortunately gets out of the Senate, is that the bill will also cost jobs; and it will cost the jobs at a time when the singular focus in this Congress should be just the opposite. The one main goal that we should be able to work on across the aisle in this House is how to create more jobs all across this country, all 50 States.

I know the average rate for unemployment in this country is just shy of 10 percent; but, boy, you talk to some folks in different parts of this country and you know that the unemployment rate is a lot higher than that: 10 percent, 20 percent, 30 percent, 40 percent, 50, 60 percent higher in certain portions of this country than where it is as a national average. You talk to those people where the long-term unemployment rate is around 15, 16, 17 percent and ask them, What's the most important thing that Congress should be doing right now? They will honestly answer you, Get me a job; Help turn the economy around so unemployment rates start going down again and so I can start supporting my family again.

And what are we doing? What I'm doing is trying to create those jobs. But what is Congress doing? What is the Senate doing right now? What is the Democrat majority doing right now? Well, they're trying to pass a bill over in the Senate that will cost the creation of jobs just at a time when we should try making even more.

Remember I mentioned a study earlier saying that if we pass that Senate bill out of the Senate—today, tomorrow, this week, next week—I mentioned before that if we do so, your credit costs will go up. That same study also found the number of jobs will be impacted in this country as well. And here's what they found: the study found that the CFPA, the Consumer Financial Protection Agency, which is a provision in that bill over in the Senate, will actually reduce net new jobs in the economy by 4.3 percent. Let me repeat that: if the Senate bill were to pass and that new CFPA were to be created, as the President wants it to be created, you would reduce net new jobs in the economy by 4.3 percent. So pass the Senate bill, see the net number of jobs go down by 4.3 percent.

There's another provision in the bill as well, just as an aside—without getting into the weeds, as they say, portions of the bill—it says the derivative and systemic risk portion of the bill—that's a whole other portion separate from the CFPA, that is a section that tries to regulate and address the issue of derivatives. And Republicans, by the way, as I mentioned in the earlier portion of this hour, did put in language to try to address derivatives and make sure that there is more transparency and accountability there, but the way they're doing it right now over in the Senate, that section will also likely reduce jobs as well, according to outside experts. And why is that?

Well, it's hard to get into without going through a laborious explanation of derivatives and how they all work and what have you; but just understand this, that if you create higher costs for the end users, if you create higher costs, whether it's credits or otherwise, for people who currently use the markets as they are currently configured in an honest, transparent, and open way, if you require certain businesses to say, well, instead of taking this $100,000 that I was going to use to buy some new equipment, a new truck, new manufacturing equipment, or instead of me taking this $1 million I have over here to build a new plant, to hire new employees, to create a new manufacturing base, I'm going to have to use that over here because of all the new rules and regulations that the Senate wants to impose on that business.

I'm going to have to put it over here sort of just sitting in the bank, if you will, as far as capital because of these new derivative requirements. If I can't use it to buy a new truck, if I can't use it to buy new equipment, if I can't use it to build a new building, I basically just have to set it aside as far as margin or capital requirements, what happens to job creation in that business?

If he can't buy the new truck, he's not going to hire a new driver to drive that truck. If he can't use the money to buy a new piece of equipment, he's not going to be able to hire new people in the business to run the equipment. If he can't use the $1 million, or whatever it is, to build a new plant to manufacture something, he's not going to be able to hire new people that are able to run that factory and work in the offices in that factory as well or that business as well because this legislation will basically shift that money, job-creation dollars, from that practical good use for the economy over here to, well, let's say not a job-creating use—another problem of the overall legislation that the Senate is trying to pass as we speak.

So at a time when Americans are pleading with the political leaders to stop government overreach in the economy and in their lives, well, this bill basically, again, doesn't listen to those Americans. The Senate bill basically greatly expands government authority for government bureaucrats to regulate now another huge segment of the economy, including, by the way, non-financial institutions, things like retail stores that offer layaway plans, companies that finance their own sales, and even manufacturers that ensure against their risk.

All these areas had absolutely nothing to do with the economic problems that the country finds itself in today, okay, but all of a sudden, because there is an opportunity out there to grow government, grow government agencies, create new programs at the expense of the taxpayers, as the President's Chief of Staff said—and I paraphrase him—Don't let any good crisis go to waste, we're in a crisis situation, so instead of dealing with the crisis area over here, we're going to start creating all new agencies over here to regulate all different aspects of the economy that were not part of the problem. That's exactly what this legislation that we hear is about to be considered in the Senate, that Senator REID would like to pass through without the debate, deliberation, and transparency that we would like.

So at a time when Americans are pleading with political leaders to stop the government overreach, this bill greatly expands authority for government bureaucrats, as I say, to regulate huge segments of the economy, including those non-financial institutions, such as the stores and the layaway plans and so on and so forth.

It also allows—and here's a point—it also allows government bureaucrats to take over and actually close a firm. The government, for the first time you're going to be able to say, besides picking winners and losers, as I pointed out before, which is a tremendous overreach of government authority to say for a bureaucrat someplace in Washington or New York or some other place designated by the Washington bureaucrats to say, well, we think that your business should win and your business should lose, besides just picking winners and losers, the Senate bill goes even further than that.

It allows government bureaucrats to take over and close a firm. They can say for whatever reason—hopefully not political, but who knows—for whatever reason these bureaucrats will say, well, I think that firm over there is one I think the government agency now should take over. Isn't that really too much power in the hands of the government? And doesn't it open up our economy to political bullying rather than the way it should be?

And the way it should be is it should be that a firm's success or ultimate failure should be decided by the free markets, decided by the people of the country whether they think this company is providing the services they like and this company is not providing. That's the way it has been for 200-plus years—or longer than that, actually—in this country, and now we're going to change all that and allow bureaucrats to say, you win, you lose, we're going to take over you, we're going to not take over you; we're going to provide you with a bailout at taxpayers' expense; you're going to have to do it on your own. And you the citizens out there are going to have to all pay the price of this.

Those of you who think you have nothing to do with financial services,

well, you're going to see your interest rates go up. Those of you who are out there who think that this doesn't impact you, well, you may not be able to find a job next year because the net number of new jobs is not going to increase as it would have. It's going to impact upon all of us if we are to pass this failed bill over in the Senate.

Now, several portions of the bill also are handouts to—who do you think? The trial bar. Why is that? Because it will increase lawsuits. It will benefit lawyers, but drive up costs for everybody else. Nothing against lawyers by any means, trial lawyers as well, but do we really need another piece of legislation that will just basically increase the number of lawsuits in this country? Don't we have enough lawsuits already going on? Do we need to set up a structure that fundamentally is done in such a way that most of the experts looking at it are saying, yes, the number of lawsuits is going to increase just because there is so much ambiguity that's out there?

Also, at a time when you're seeing a growing consensus that the Federal Reserve should be less powerful, let's take a look at the Federal Reserve, and isn't there a consensus now. I think we saw bipartisan support that the amount of control and authority and power of the Federal Reserve, I thought there was growing consensus in this country and also in this Congress, in this House, that maybe the Federal Reserve should be reined in a little—or some were saying a whole lot. That's not what is happening over in the Senate.

So at a time when you're seeing a growing consensus that the Federal Reserve should be given less power, not more, the Senate bill greatly expands the Federal regulatory powers. This is done despite the fact the board has a proven track record of failing to identify systemic risks before they actually occur in its overeagerness to pay taxpayers money at risk while conducting fiscal policy without accountability. It has an overeagerness to put taxpayers' money at risk while conducting fiscal policy without any accountability.

And any time we try to get that accountability, I should add just as a side note, what do we get? We get pushback from the Federal Reserve. Pushback, whether it's a Republican idea; pushback, whether it's a Democrat idea to try to put in some additional levels of accountability and transparency. And so despite that, the Senate bill is going to say we're going to give them even more and greater power and control.

Given the extraordinary government interventions into private firms we've already seen with the trampling of the rule of law in order to benefit political favorites in the auto industry, for instance, I'm very uncomfortable with any of these new sweeping powers. The auto industry, I guess, is a clear example of that. It goes back to what I was saying before: Federal Government, bureaucrats saying this company wins, this company loses, and we're going to use the taxpayers' money to prop them up and keep them going.

Let me just go back for one little point I raised before—I didn't want to go into the weeds too much on it—and that was the derivatives portion of the bill. Derivatives, I've heard them described in a number of different ways, insurance policies or such, but without going into the details on how they actually operate, remember this about derivatives, I guess, to take away from my remarks on derivatives: none of the experts that came before the committee—those who use them, those who didn't use them, those who are involved with them, those who are not involved with them, academics and the like—there was no one who said that the problems that we find ourselves in today were because of the structure or the makeup of derivatives themselves. No. I think most of the experts who came to us said it was the fact that you had trading in derivatives without adequate transparency and capital there in certain circumstances, like in the AIG situation.

□ 1900

And then similarly, with the AIG situation you had a situation where the regulators who were charged with knowing what they are doing, having the authority to do so, failed to live up to their obligation to monitor the very entities that they are supposed to be giving oversight to. Isn't it a little bit ironic that we see now in the Senate that those very same failed regulators are going to get even bigger and broader powers.

In any event, on the derivative portion of the bill, what does the Senate bill do? Well, it sets up a really, I don't know what is a good word for it—I guess a technical word would be clumsy—it sets up a clumsy new two-tiered SEC-CFTC regulatory regime over all derivative users. And that is really a huge portion of the economy.

You know, the average person says, ''I don't use derivatives.'' And the average small business might say, ''I don't use derivatives.'' But that small business begins to look one step behind its daily activities, it may find that the source of its credit does in fact use derivatives. That industry that has a particular product that they manufacture, what have you, maybe people in the company that work there don't recognize it, but you talk to the CFO, chief financial officer or otherwise, you will find out that they actually do use derivatives to protect themselves, just like other companies use risk management as mechanisms to protect other portions of their business. So they are used. They are a huge portion of the economy.

And here we have a Senate bill now saying we are going to fool around with this and set up this new two-tiered SEC and CFTC regulatory regime over all the derivative users. And in a way it goes back to my earlier point that it will probably be ripe for litigation and also confusion to say the least.

In all this, there will be some new truly heavy-handed government mandates that are likely to have major unintended consequences that could really make it more difficult for companies to hedge their risks. That's why I say a lot of businesses may not recognize how it impacts upon them. Maybe it is not the company themselves, it is other companies that they deal with, that they have to deal with. If they can't hedge their risks properly, they will find themselves at odds with being able to prosper and do as well next year as they have in the past.

So when the Senate bill tries to do this, what it's really doing is adding huge new costs to risk management. What will that do? That will needlessly tie up companies' moneys that could otherwise be used to create jobs. It goes back to that little analogy I had before saying that if you have a company that says we have X number of dollars in the bank that we are intending to use for new expansion, production, or growth, now that money may be unfortunately tied up over here through all the new regulation and otherwise, and capital margin requirements and the like. And if they can't have it over here to grow the company, prosper the company, and create new jobs and the like, and new benefits for their employees because it's now tied up, who hurts? Who pays the price? It is the employees, it is the economy, it is the community that that business finds itself in.

Now, to all that truly terrible legislation that we see sitting in the Senate that Senator REID is trying to push through without a true committee process where we could really get into the weeds and find out what is in those 1,300-plus pages and try to understand all the consequences, intended and otherwise, the Republicans do have a comprehensive substitute. It has received unanimous support from the party and those here who have worked on it, and also significant support from those players, both involved with the discussion, academics and otherwise.

And it is really also the only truly bipartisan plan that's out there. Because whether you are a Republican or Democrat, I think most in this country agree on one theme: No more bailouts. So it's bipartisan in the theme, it's bipartisan in the merits, it's bipartisan in the actual language. Its central theme, as I say, is no more bailouts. And our plan depends on an expedited bankruptcy rather than a government-run bailout fund.

Let me give you one, two, three, four points that are in it. It provides comprehensive transparency and accountability among the major traders in the derivative markets without setting up that Byzantine new regulatory regime that I just mentioned a minute ago. It allows for real consumer protection, important, without a bureaucracy that separates consumer protection from

what we call prudential regulation, safety and soundness like we saw with Fannie and Freddie.

I will digress there for 30 seconds. That simply means that you are not going to say that there is somebody sitting over here looking over an institution saying, well, I think you should do this in order to be safe and sound and prudentially run, and you are going to have somebody over here in a totally different silo, a different agency, who is going to be saying, well, I think you should have a consumer product that works this way or works that way. And if they are working at cross-purposes, which one prevails? Well, at the end of the day, the consumer is the one that hurts.

Additionally, third point, the Republican plan reins in the Fed instead of giving it vast new powers. It goes to that point I raised before. The Democrat majority plan in the House and the Senate says, ''Hey, Fed, you've been doing such a wonderful job with monetary policy, you've been doing such a wonderful job with regulation of the institutions under you, you've done such a wonderful job, Federal Reserve, with being able to see the calamities down the road.'' I say of course that all tongue in cheek. They say, ''Well, we're going to make you even larger and more expansive and grow in power.''

Well, not for the Republicans, not for most Americans. Most Americans want us to rein in the Fed. And that is what the Republican bill will do, by giving it less powers than it has right now.

Fourthly, the Republican plan responsibly deals with Fannie and Freddie, one of the biggest culprits in the entire process. Believe it or not, the Senate bill, the Dodd-Frank-Obama bill, does absolutely nothing with regard to Fannie and Freddie and the GSEs. Think about this little number right now. You hear about all the money that was spent over the last year or so out of taxpayer pockets, whether it goes to the Wall Street bailouts, whether it goes to the auto industry, whether it goes to AIG or Bear Stearns and you just name it, all those billions and billions of dollars went out the door. You know which bailout really trumps even all those combined? It would be the GSEs, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, where, as I mentioned I think earlier this evening, the number is close to $400 billion already projected to cost the taxpayer over the next 10 years. And the President's plan, the Dodd-Frank plan, is silent on trying to do anything about that.

Not only are they silent about doing anything about that, it's silent as to putting any limits to it. Right now there is no limit to the amount of money that can come out of your pocket and my pocket to bail out these institutions. Something should have been included in there. They did not.

Remember, finally, it was largely government that got us into this situation we find ourselves in in the first place. It was the implosion of Fannie and Freddie that created so many of the other problems that we see across the economic spectrum as we see it today. It was also the easy money policy of the Fed and the errors that were made over time there. It was the misplaced incentives and downright requirements in the housing finance sector that basically encouraged or forced firms to lend to borrowers that shouldn't have been buying a home in the first place. It was government regulators that didn't do their job whom the Democrats would like to further empower and provide a false sense of security and hamper the free markets.

It was all those problems that brought us to the situation that we find ourselves in today. None of those problems are addressed either at all or in a correct manner in the legislation that we see in the Senate right now.

Now is the time that we have an opportunity to do right for the American public. Now is the time we have an opportunity to do right for the economy. Now is the time we have an opportunity to create new jobs and new expansions in the economy, to make the economy of tomorrow better for businesses, for small community banks, for small communities across this country, for families as well. But we can only do that if we work in a truly bipartisan manner to go through the process and begin the discussions on what the root causes of these problems were and to come up with a no-bailout philosophy and approach to this that addresses the GSEs—Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac—that reins in the excessive powers of the Federal Reserve, and addresses the other concerns of job creation and the other concerns of regulation that I have addressed already this evening. If we do that, then we will be successful for this generation and generations to come.

I look forward to actually being able to get to that point in time. I look forward to hearing from the other side of the aisle and hearing from the Senate that the bill they are pushing right now, the Dodd-Frank-Obama bill, is being pulled and they are no longer going to force the votes, but instead they are willing to open up a true and honest dialogue to get the job done. When that time comes, I will be willing to work with them to accomplish that.

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

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. TOWNS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, May 4.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, May 4.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BILBRAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, May 4.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3253. An act to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on April 26, 2010, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 4360. To designate the Department of Veterans Affairs blind rehabilitation center in Long Beach, California, as the Major Charles Robert Soltes, Jr., O.D. Department of Veterans Affairs Blind Rehabilitation Center.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 28, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-authorized official travel during the first and second quarters of 2010, pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THAILAND, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 27 AND APR. 2, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Lorraine C. Miller	3/27	4/2	Thailand	Baht	1,0720.00	Dollar	11,642.60				12,714.60
John V. Sullivan	3/27	4/2	Thailand	Baht	1,0720.00	Dollar	11,642.60				12,714.60
Thomas J. Wickham	3/27	4/2	Thailand	Baht	1,0720.00	Dollar	11,642.60				12,714.60
Tonya L. Spratt-Williams	3/27	4/2	Thailand	Baht	1,0720.00	Dollar	11,642.60				12,714.60

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

LORRAINE C. MILLER, Apr. 9, 2010.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA, KOSOVO, MACEDONIA, SERBIA, AND GERMANY, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 13 AND FEB. 22, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Earl Pomeroy	2/14	2/16	Bosnia and Herzegovina		268.00		4,260.00				4,528.00
John Lis	2/14	2/16	Bosnia and Herzegovina		518.00		9,275.00				9,793.00
Rachael Leman	2/14	2/16	Bosnia and Herzegovina		518.00		9,275.00				9,793.00
Hon. Earl Pomeroy	2/16	2/17	Kosovo		217.00						217.00
John Lis	2/16	2/17	Kosovo		217.00						217.00
Rachael Leman	2/16	2/17	Kosovo		217.00						217.00
Hon. Earl Pomeroy	2/17	2/18	Macedonia		299.00						299.00
John Lis	2/17	2/18	Macedonia		299.00						299.00
Rachael Leman	2/17	2/18	Macedonia		299.00						299.00
Hon. Earl Pomeroy	2/18	2/21	Serbia		671.00						671.00
John Lis	2/18	2/21	Serbia		1,171.00						1,171.00
Rachael Leman	2/18	2/21	Serbia		1,171.00						1,171.00
Hon. Earl Pomeroy	2/21	2/22	Germany		232.00						232.00
John Lis	2/21	2/22	Germany		232.00						232.00
Rachael Leman	2/21	2/22	Germany		232.00						232.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. EARL POMEROY, Apr. 13, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Bonnie Bruce	3/20	3/26	Qatar	3,582.00	984.49		7,934.70	7,200.00	1,979.65	10,782.00	10,898.84
Jean Flemma	3/20	3/26	Qatar	3,582.00	984.49		7,934.70	7,200.00	1,979.65	10,782.00	10,898.84
Committee total					1,968.98		15,869.40		3,959.30		21,797.68

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II, Chairman, Apr. 13, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ZOE LOFGREN, Chairman, Apr. 12, 2010.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7199. A letter from the Regulatory Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Swine Contract Library (RIN: 0580-AB06) received April 11, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7200. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flumioxazin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0885; FRL-8810-3] received February 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7201. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Research and Development Contract Type Determination (DFARS Case 2006-D053) (RIN: 0750-AF'79) received March 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7202. A letter from the Principal Deputy, Department of the Navy, transmitting notice of cancellation of public-private competitions performed under the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 ''Performance of Commercial Activities''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7203. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's ''Major'' final rule — Electronic Fund Transfers [Regulation E; Docket No. R-1377] received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7204. A letter from the Chairman, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, transmitting the Commission's record of the public hearing on ''China's Activities in Southeast Asia and the Implications for U.S. Interests''; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7205. A letter from the Acting Scientific Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Annual Report on the National Institute of Child Health and

Human Development (NICHD) Division of Intramural Research for FY 2009; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7206. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's Vehicle Fleet Report on Alternative Fuel Vehicles for fiscal year 2009, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 13218; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7207. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, OET, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Parts 25, 74, 78 and 101 of the Rules regarding Coordination between the Non-Geostationary and Geostationary Satellite Orbit Fixed-Satellite Service and Fixed, Broadcast Auxiliary and Cable Television Relay Services in the 7 GHz, 10 GHz and 13 GHz Frequency Bands [ET Docket No.: 03-254] received April 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7208. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a legislative proposal to provide additional Flexibility to the Department of Energy Materials Protection, Control, and Accounting Program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7209. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oklahoma Regulatory Program [SATS No. OK-0320-FOR; Docket No. OSM-2008-0023] received April 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7210. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Corrections [Docket No.: 071220872-0093-04] (RIN: 0648-AS71 and 0648-AU71) received March 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7211. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Iliamna, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1036; Airspace Docket No. 09-AAL-17] received April 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7212. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Hailey, ID [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0954; Airspace Docket No. 09-ANM-11] received April 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7213. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0656; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-038-AD; Amendment 39-16056; AD 2009-22-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7214. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hawker Beechcraft Corporation Model G58 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1176; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-062-AD; Amendment 39-16226; AD 2010-06-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7215. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Low Altitude Area Navigation Route (T-284); Houston, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0878; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASW-7] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7216. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Killeen, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0928; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASW-28] received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7217. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Lampasas, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0925; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASW-25] received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7218. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Panama City, Tyndall AFB, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0249; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-22] received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7219. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Quitman, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0053; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-19] received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7220. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Mount Pleasnt, SC [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0069; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-15] received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7221. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Prohibited Area P-49; Crawford, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0921; Airspace Docket No. 09-AWA-3] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7222. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Compliance Date for Cockpit Voice Recorder and Digital Flight Data Recorder Regulations [Docket No.: FAA-2005-20245; Amendment No. 27-45, 29-52, 91-313, 121-349, 125-60 and 135-121] (RIN: 2120-AJ65) recieved April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7223. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Luverne, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1150; Airspace Docket No. 09-AGL-34] received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7224. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Notice of Availability of Class Deviation; Disputes Resolution Procedures Related to Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF and DWSRF, respectively) Reallocation Under the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act of 2009 (ARRA) [FRL-9115-1] received February 17, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Transportation and Infrastructure.

7225. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1874-DR for the Commonwealth of Virginia; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Homeland Security, and Appropriations.

7226. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's report on the Preliminary Damage Assessment information on FEMA-1875-DR for the State of Maryland; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Homeland Security, and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1300. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5013) to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for performance management of the defense acquisition system, and for other purposes (Rept. 111–467). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DELAHUNT (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 5143. A bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 5144. A bill to establish the Buffalo Bayou National Heritage Area in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5145. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the continuing professional education reimbursement provided to health professionals employed by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. TEAGUE, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HOLT, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. HARE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. HODES, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ARCURI, Ms. KILROY, Mr. WALZ, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. BARROW, Mr. POLIS, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. HILL, Ms.

MATSUI, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SPACE, Mr. LANCE, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. JENKINS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. REHBERG, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

H.R. 5146. A bill to provide that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned; considered and passed.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. MICA, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 5147. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. ISSA (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mrs. MALONEY):

H.R. 5148. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to clarify the instances in which the term ''census'' may appear on mailable matter; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5149. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Mowa Band of Choctaw Indians of Alabama, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CHILDERS:

H.R. 5150. A bill to restore Second Amendment rights in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 5151. A bill to limit the amount which may be made available for the Members' Representational Allowance for fiscal year 2011, to prohibit the use of such Allowance for expenses of official mail of any material other than a document transmitted under the official letterhead of the Member involved, and to require the quarterly statement of costs incurred for official mail by offices of the House of Representatives to provide a separate breakdown of the costs incurred for each method of mass communication covered by the statement; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. KINGSTON):

H.R. 5152. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park to include the Wallis House and Harriston Hill, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN:

H.R. 5153. A bill to amend the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site Establishment Act of 1999 to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. HIMES:

H.R. 5154. A bill to authorize public housing agencies to use public housing operating funds as collateral for financing energy conservation improvements and to freeze utility consumption levels for purposes of determining Operating Fund assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JONES (for himself and Mr. ORTIZ):

H.R. 5155. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct an aerial assessment of sea turtle populations in United States waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DINGELL, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 5156. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Clean Energy Technology Manufacturing and Export Assistance Fund to assist United States businesses with exporting clean energy technology products and services; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 5157. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for the issuance of War on Debt Bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio:

H.R. 5158. A bill to require Federal contractors and subcontractors to comply with certain reporting requirements and transparency standards; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. ARCURI, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FARR, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TANNER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. KILROY, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H. Con. Res. 268. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Women's Health Week, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PETERSON (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. GRAVES, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois):

H. Con. Res. 269. Concurrent resolution congratulating the outstanding professional public servants, both past and present, of the Natural Resources Conservation Service on the occasion of its 75th anniversary; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida:

H. Res. 1301. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Train Day; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CAO (for himself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DENT, and Mr. CASSIDY):

H. Res. 1302. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Hepatitis Awareness Month and World Hepatitis Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida (for himself, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. KIND, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 1303. A resolution recognizing the close friendship and historical ties between the United Kingdom and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LINDER, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BARROW, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia):

H. Res. 1304. A resolution honoring the members of the 48th Infantry Brigade Combat Team of the State of Georgia's Army National Guard for their service and sacrifice on behalf of the United States from 2009 to 2010; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

265. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, relative to House Resolution No. 6032 urging the United States Congress to select the Boeing NewGen Tanker; to the Committee on Armed Services.

266. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Maine, relative to House Joint Resolution 1303 urging the Congress of the United States to support a strong clean energy and climate bill; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 43: Mr. WEINER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 213: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 303: Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 333: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 616: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 758: Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 775: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 949: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. OLVER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 988: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1074: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1079: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 1175: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1430: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1578: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1587: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1625: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 1671: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. KAGEN.

H.R. 1751: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 1806: Mr. ORTIZ.
H.R. 2003: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 2016: Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 2067: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2084: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2104: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 2156: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
H.R. 2262: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. MCMAHON.
H.R. 2414: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 2417: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 2455: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Sablan.
H.R. 2575: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2597: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2753: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 2891: Mr. HEINRICH.
H.R. 2941: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 2987: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 3043: Ms. TITUS, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 3116: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 3185: Mr. HOLT, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3212: Mr. COHEN and Mr. HODES.
H.R. 3339: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 3355: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.
H.R. 3393: Mr. NYE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ROSS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. CHILDERS.
H.R. 3415: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 3421: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3441: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 3594: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3597: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3668: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 3706: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 3734: Mr. BERMAN and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 3764: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 4000: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4014: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 4128: Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. SESTAK.
H.R. 4132: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 4219: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 4223: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 4255: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 4296: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 4303: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 4306: Mr. WALZ and Mr. AUSTRIA.
H.R. 4309: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 4320: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4329: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 4502: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 4530: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 4544: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4593: Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 4638: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 4662: Mr. LATHAM, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 4678: Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 4749: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 4751: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4759: Mr. SHULER.
H.R. 4800: Mr. NADLER of New York.
H.R. 4812: Mr. SALAZAR.
H.R. 4830: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. WU.
H.R. 4844: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 4850: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, and Mr. ADLER of New Jersey.
H.R. 4856: Ms. HARMAN and Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 4866: Mr. AKIN and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 4868: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 4870: Mr. FARR and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4914: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4918: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 4919: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 4925: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 4943: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. INGLIS.
H.R. 4947: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 4953: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5012: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 5015: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 5035: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SPACE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 5040: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 5044: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 5065: Mr. BONNER, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 5078: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 5085: Mr. LEE of New York and Mr. MURPHY of New York.
H.R. 5089: Mr. WILSON of Ohio and Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 5090: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5092: Mr. MICA, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 5111: Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H.R. 5138: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 5142: Mr. TEAGUE and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 200: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. KAGEN.
H. Con. Res. 226: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H. Con. Res. 240: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H. Con. Res. 260: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BARROW, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. CARTER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. CONAWAY.
H. Con. Res. 265: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 266: Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. FLEMING.
H. Res. 407: Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. WATSON.
H. Res. 764: Mr. ROHRABACHER Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H. Res. 767: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H. Res. 1033: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. COLE.
H. Res. 1073: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. PENCE.
H. Res. 1131: Mr. MICHAUD and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE Johnson of Texas.
H. Res. 1152: Mr. LYNCH.
H. Res. 1217: Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. TONKO.
H. Res. 1224: Mr. STARK and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H. Res. 1229: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H. Res. 1240: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H. Res. 1241: Mr. SOUDER.
H. Res. 1247: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. FILNER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SHULER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. SKELTON.
H. Res. 1261: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H. Res. 1265: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H. Res. 1275: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H. Res. 1277: Mr. HOLT.
H. Res. 1279: Mr. AKIN.
H. Res. 1285: Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LAMBORN, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H. Res. 1290: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WATSON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H. Res. 1295: Mr. TERRY and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H. Res. 1297: Mr. ARCURI, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. TERRY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. BOREN, Mr. JONES, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. KRATOVIL, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. COOPER, Mr. NYE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BOYD, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. PERRIELLO.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

121. The SPEAKER presented a petition of City of Lauderdale Lakes, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 2010–05 calling upon the United States Conference of Mayors to adopt a plan for providing economic relief to the Nation of Haiti; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 2010 *No. 60*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable MARK L. PRYOR, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of Glory, let Your mercies draw us to You. Wean us from all evil and make us servants who live worthy of Your love. Energize our Senators for today's challenges, enabling them to mount up on eagle's wings, soaring high for Your glory. Help them to be devoted, confident, and obedient laborers for You. Lord, fill them with Your grace so that their lives will be like fountains of living water. We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable MARK L. PRYOR 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 the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, April 27, 2010.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MARK L. PRYOR, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PRYOR thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO OFFICER IAN DEUTCH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, 60 miles outside Las Vegas is a rural community called Pahrump. It originally had a series of artesian wells, had lots of water, and for many years they farmed cotton. But it has now become a retirement and business community with golf courses there. It is a beautiful community less than an hour from Las Vegas.

Last night a man who had just returned from Afghanistan—his name is Ian Deutch. It was his second day on the job as a police officer. He was murdered by a man who had a domestic dispute with a woman, and he was proceeding to a place of business with lots and lots of people when he shot Officer Deutch.

The officer who was with him, Thomas Klenczar, killed the gunman saving untold lives. This is a tragic story. The slain man had a teenage child, a 7-year-old, and just returned, as I have indicated, from Afghanistan in our military. It was his second day on the job—not killed in Afghanistan, not wounded in Afghanistan, killed in Pahrump, NV.

This is the way peace officers find themselves all over America every day protecting us from these criminals and crazed people. I express my condolences to the entire Nye County Sheriff's Department and especially to Sheriff Anthony DeMeo and especially to the family of Ian Deutch.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today following leader remarks, there will be a period of morning business for 1 hour. During that period of time Senators will be permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each. The first 30 minutes will be controlled by the majority. The Republicans will control the final 30 minutes.

Following morning business, we will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to the Wall Street reform legislation.

OBSTRUCTIONISM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, part of our required reading, as I was going through college, was to read George Orwell's book, ''1984,'' which was looking into the future. Of course, looking at 1984 now, it is looking in the rearview mirror. But when I was in school we looked at ''1984.'' It was George Orwell's classic book.

The main focus of the book is how societies would be in the years to come, in 1984. It appears he was fairly prophetic because one of the things that George Orwell talked about is that there would come a time when people would stand and talk, and whatever they said, the direct opposite would be true. That is what we have going on from my friends on the Republican side of the aisle as it deals with Wall Street reform, as it deals with what we have been doing legislatively.

We have a situation where people sometimes forget where we were. Let's talk about where we were for just a short time. During the 8 years of the Clinton administration, 24 million new jobs were created. During that period of time, we were paying down the national debt. We were being criticized for paying it down too fast, too quickly.

Now comes 8 years of George Bush. Let's remember where we were. Privatization of Social Security was the cry of the Bush administration. Then we had a war of choice—and, by the way, there is a new book out by Evan Thomas of Newsweek. He talks about the rush to war, and I heard him interviewed.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

That war was a war of choice. We are all glad to be rid of Saddam Hussein, but in the process we know the toll on our National Treasury and our men and women. That does not take into consideration what has happened to the Iraqi people, hundreds of thousands of them killed during this war. All of that war was unpaid for; the tax cuts to the wealthy, unpaid for. No longer was there any concern about paying down the debt too quickly.

The Bush administration turned that on its head. In fact, they got rid of all of the rules that allowed us to do that, including pay-go; that is, we pay for things as we go along.

So let's understand a little bit where we were. In the last 2 months of the Bush administration 1½ million jobs were lost. Obama came to the Presidency with this huge hole having been dug. I mean it was a hole that was a sight to behold. We have worked out of that hole. We still have a long ways to go, but we have come a long ways out of that hole.

We know we stopped a worldwide depression with the stimulus bill, the recovery bill. Now that is of little consolation for people who have lost their homes or who are afraid they are going to lose their homes or who have lost their job or are afraid they are going to lose their job. But we have stopped the bleeding. Now we have to get back to a vibrant economy, and we can do that. We are not there yet.

We have been able to accomplish a lot. We have been able to stop that worldwide depression. We were able to pass the most significant environmental legislation in more than a quarter of a century. We created more than 2 million acres of wilderness, 1,000 miles of wild and scenic rivers, hundreds of miles of trails, and many other things in that bill.

We passed the Lilly Ledbetter legislation to more equalize pay between men and women. We have passed legislation to stop mortgage fraud. We passed legislation to stop children from being addicted by tobacco companies. For the first time in the history of this country, the FDA now controls tobacco, stopping people from being addicted, as all of my family was when they were teenagers.

Credit card legislation—we were able to move forward on that and stop many of the abuses of credit card companies. National service legislation, something that Senator Kennedy wanted for 30 years, we were able to pass, and many other things, in spite of the Republicans fighting us every step of the way. We have had dozens of filibusters. They have certainly established themselves as the party of no.

Of course, we passed health care legislation, one of the most important things ever done in the history of this country. Four million small businesses across America, 24,000 of them in Nevada, are now eligible for health care. They will be able to get a 35-percent subsidy for their health care premiums—4 million of them, 24,000 in Nevada.

Children with preexisting disabilities can no longer be denied insurance if they have diabetes or other problems. We put $5 billion in that bill to allow States that already have programs to work with the people who have preexisting disabilities. Those who do not, they have that $5 billion so that adults, until we get the exchanges up, can apply to have insurance for preexisting disabilities.

We also raised the age for young men and women who are not getting married as early as they used to. They can now be on their parents' health insurance policy until they are 26 years old. We filled the doughnut hole created during the Bush administration. So that health care legislation is extremely important and good legislation and important law in this country. Each day that goes by, part of the 4 million businesses will be able to have insurance for their employees that they have never had before. People will no longer suffer as a result of the doughnut hole. People can stay on their insurance policy until they are 26. Preexisting disabilities will not be the problem it was, and we have done other things.

We are now moving to Wall Street reform. Here is where George Orwell comes into the picture. Everything the Republicans have said about what we are trying to do with Wall Street reform is just the opposite. Whatever they say is just the opposite.

I talked to one Republican Senator last night.

I said: We should get on the bill and then you can offer all of the amendments you think are appropriate.

That Senator said: No. We want all of the problems worked out before we get on the bill.

I said: You know, that is not really the way the Senate was set up 230 years ago. The Senate is to be a body where we proceed to legislation, then offer amendments, and then there is a debate that takes place.

But the Republicans have a new standard; that is, they want to negotiate. That is the new banner. I wonder when the end of negotiations takes place? The ranking member and the chairman of the committee negotiated for months on this legislation. Then when that fell through, one of the junior members of the committee stepped forward and negotiated for a month, and that fell through.

There comes a time when we have to start legislating and stop negotiating. We have a bill that is on the Senate floor. It received all Democratic votes except one, and none of the Republican votes. It is not as if we are asking anyone to approve the legislation. We are simply asking to be able to get on the legislation.

But the Republicans said no. Now we know, from looking at the newspapers and all of the accounts on electronic media, that the American people support the legislation that is now being asked to be debated. They believe being too big to fail should be in the legislation as we have it. They believe in having a failsafe method to make sure that when these big companies have a funeral, they pay for it themselves.

So I cannot understand why we cannot go to the bill, have amendments offered. The end of negotiations should terminate sometime. I was a trial lawyer by profession. Of course, it is good to negotiate, but there comes a time when you have to say: OK. We have had enough of this. Let's let the jury decide.

That is basically what we have done. The jury is the American people. They decided they want us to move forward. The American people, undeniably demand we protect them from Wall Street, which has run wild.

Two-thirds of the American people support us cracking down on big bankers' reckless risk taking. I direct everyone within the sound of my voice to read the book, the best seller—and it is a best seller for a good reason—called ''The Big Short.'' This book, written by the same man who wrote ''The Blind Side,'' talks about what has happened on Wall Street. I am from a State that is famous for gambling. But the people who come to Las Vegas to gamble do so with their own money. Wall Street gambled and caused this problem with our money. They are gambling now with our money. The rules are the same today as they were when this debacle occurred.

A majority of the American people support us asking banks to pay for their own funerals. I already mentioned that. That is the fund financed by the big financial firms to cover the cost of their liquidation—not to bail out banks that threaten the larger economy, as some characterize it, but to shut them down for good. The American people also demand that their leaders discuss these details and improve on those ideas. They have two simple requests—this is the American people: One, that their leaders look out for their economic security, and two, that their legislators will legislate. In other words, they want us to protect their job, and they want us to do our own job. Right now, Senate Republicans are refusing to do either. Yesterday, they stood together en bloc to block us from moving this bill to the floor. They did not even want the Senate to talk about legislation as part of the normal legislative process.

More than 2 years after the financial collapse that sparked a worldwide recession, Senate Republicans are claiming we are moving too fast—too fast. They are claiming that only a fully negotiated and agreed upon bill can come up for debate. That is absurd, stunning, unheard of. They want all the details to be worked out beforehand, behind closed doors, and out of view from the public. That is unprecedented in the more than 200 years we have been a Senate. As we all learned in civics

class, that is not how the legislative process should work.

We want to bring our bill to the floor so we can discuss it, debate it, amend it, and improve it. We want to do it in the open. After all, if we are not debating, if Senators refuse to let the Senate do its job, what are we doing here?

It is very interesting, Mr. President, that the Republican Senators are willing to talk about financial reform with press conferences and other media events. Why weren't they willing to talk about it here on the floor?

What purpose does the Senate serve? Why do we have rules for debate and the opportunity to offer amendments?

President Kennedy once said:

Let us not be afraid of debate or discussion—let us encourage it.

That is what he said. So I ask my Republican colleagues, why are you afraid? What are you afraid of? All we want to do is move to the bill.

If something untoward happens after the bill gets to the floor, they can still stop us from getting 60 votes. There are 41 of them. Why in the world can't we go to the floor and debate this bill? They have that protection.

The right response to disagreement is not dismissal; it is discussion. For far too long, there has been too much secrecy and too little transparency on Wall Street. The American people have paid the price in their job and their life savings, and they demand we fix what is broken. As long as Republicans insist on secrecy and resist transparency here in the Senate—and if they do not let us address the problems we were sent here to resolve—we will never fully recover.

Remember, this debacle on Wall Street took place starting more than 2 years ago. Why aren't we here debating the issue? Because the Republicans want more negotiations. They refuse to legislate.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am sorry I did not have a chance to tell the Republican leader, but I think he understands we have the opportunity to have a vote today. I think we will have it at 4:30 today.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Yes, that is fine.

Mr. REID. So I ask unanimous consent that today, when the Senate resumes consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 3217, all time until 12:30 p.m. and from 2:15 to 4:30 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the leaders or their designees, with the time from 4:15 to 4:30 p.m. equally divided and controlled between Senators DODD and SHELBY or their designees, with Senator DODD controlling the final 7½ minutes; that at 4:30 p.m., the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be agreed to, and the Senate then proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 3217.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). The Republican leader is recognized.

FINANCIAL REGULATORY REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, last night the Democrat majority forced a vote on a bill that was not ready for prime time. We know this because every day it seems another one of its flaws comes to light. And it is noteworthy that there was bipartisan objection to going forward with the bill last night in its current form.

You have every single member in my conference—from one end of the party spectrum to the other—united in calling for more bipartisan talks. We have heard from a couple of Democrats who think we should make some improvements as well.

You had the National Federation of Independent Businesses yesterday saying the bill hurts America's small business job creators. We heard from the organization that represents military officers yesterday expressing their concerns about the impact the bill will have on nearly 400,000 Active-Duty, retired, and former servicemembers, their families, and survivors. Community bankers from across the country say this bill, as currently written, hurts Main Street. The New York Times this morning reported that the maker of M&M's and Snickers is concerned about the bill's impact on the cost of sugar and chocolate. Harley-Davidson is worried about the effect it is going to have on business, and eBay is worried about the consequences for its business.

Clearly, this bill is not ready. It falls short of our constituents' demands to prevent future bailouts, and it is expected to hurt America's job creators at a time when we need jobs most. Does anyone really believe the people who make Harley-Davidsons and Snickers bars are responsible for the financial crisis? Does anyone think that? Then why would we want to punish them in our effort to hold Wall Street accountable? These are just the kinds of unintended consequences you get from rushing legislation. If we are aware of them, why wouldn't we want to address them? In many cases, all it would take is a simple fix. The Military Officers Association says all it would take is a simple tweak in the language to address their concerns. In other places, we just need to close a loophole. Unfortunately, the Democratic majority seems less interested in fixing this bill than in some political win they think they are scoring by not fixing the bill. It is a total waste of the people's time.

Americans do not understand why we would vote on a bill that does not meet the basic test of reform. They do not see the point. In what other line of work is it acceptable to show up to a big meeting with an unfinished product? Don't we have an obligation to make sure the bill we bring to the floor is in good shape before we vote on it? Isn't that just basic? This bill is not ready yet. It needs work. That is what last night's vote was about.

This morning, I saw that the junior Senator from Virginia—a Democrat and a man who knows what it is like to create jobs—is acknowledging what Republicans have been saying all along. This is what he said:

There are parts that need to be tightened.

That is certainly true. So let's stop the show partisanship and fix the bill. Let's tighten the parts that need to be tightened, as Senator WARNER suggests. Let's get back to the business of reforming Wall Street and proving to the American people that the days of Wall Street bailouts are indeed over.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half.

The Senator from Michigan.

FINANCIAL REGULATORY REFORM

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I rise today to urge my Republican colleagues—to urge the Republican leader—to drop their filibuster of the Wall Street reform bill.

I wish I could say this is the first time we have seen efforts to block moving forward to even debate a critical issue before the Senate, but, as the Presiding Officer knows, the party of no has now 171 different times either filibustered or threatened to filibuster critical legislation that is important for moving America forward. Historic—171 times; never heard of before.

With all due respect, the idea that the bill has to be perfect before we begin to debate it makes absolutely no sense. There have been numerous times, because of the importance of a piece of legislation, that I have supported and everyone on this floor has supported moving forward to proceed to a bill knowing it would need to have changes before we would support the final outcome of the bill. We do that all the time.

Personally, there are changes I want to see and will work hard for in the legislation that is before us. There are

provisions, there are amendments I will support in order to make sure this does not have unintended consequences. I would guess the majority of us are in that situation. But to simply say: No, we will not proceed to the bill—and just to make that clear for everyone, this is not a vote on final passage; this is a vote on whether to proceed to the bill—says to the American people that changing the unregulated, unaccountable practices on Wall Street is not worth even bringing up, to get to the floor to debate. That is what this says. That is what is so shocking to me.

I have to say, on behalf of the people of Michigan, who have been hit so hard by the gambling and unregulated processes, I am extremely concerned that we are seeing another filibuster. We will have an opportunity to change that today, tomorrow, the next day. I hope colleagues will decide that rather than just blocking the ability for us to fix this problem, they will join us and that many of us will join together in amendments that will make sure this bill is the right kind of bill moving forward.

But we have seen what happened when Wall Street did not have accountability and oversight. I can tell you, the people of Michigan cannot afford to go through that again. Eight million Americans, many of them—too many of them—in my great State of Michigan, have lost their jobs, through no fault of their own, because of the secret, unregulated deals on Wall Street. We have seen small business owners, who had worked so hard to build their part of the American dream for their families, forced to close their doors because they did not have access to capital. This has to stop. Families around my State have watched as money in their pension funds and 401(k)s vanished before their eyes because other people were gambling with their money. The most heart-wrenching time for us in Michigan was GM and Chrysler being forced into bankruptcy because of the economic crisis caused by Wall Street's recklessness.

So I am shocked and deeply concerned that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would choose to filibuster this bill, which puts in place commonsense regulations and puts consumers back in control of their finances. I am deeply concerned for our community bankers, who have also been victims of the crisis, who need help so they can get credit flowing again back to our small businesses and our manufacturers to create jobs. But mostly I am deeply concerned for the hard-working men and women in my State who work hard every day, who play by the rules, and who were hurt by the reckless behavior on Wall Street and who want to know this will not happen again.

The bill we have will hold the big banks accountable and put consumers back in control. It is time to stop the unregulated gambling on Wall Street of other people's money. I strongly urge colleagues to stand up to the special interests and the lobbyists, to drop the filibuster of this bill, to work with us to make sure it is done right but, most of all, to make sure we put in place rules and accountability for our families, our small businesses, and our manufacturers so they can have the capital they need and the accountability and the trust in the system they need to move forward and create jobs and create investment in this country.

Again, 171 times—unprecedented—more than any other time in our history we have seen efforts to block and to filibuster. It has to stop. Too much is at stake, and certainly the people in my State have gone through too much to allow this to continue.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I appreciate my colleague from Michigan being out here, as she has been repeatedly, to talk about how our process oftentimes breaks down and what the consequences are because there is probably no bigger consequence than what has happened to the State of Michigan, and she fights every day to make sure we are aware of what will help our economy and help Main Street. So I thank her for that. I thank her for being out here to urge us to get off of a filibuster and on to important legislation that I think will help our country.

I am here also to talk about something that I wish to make sure, as we enter this floor debate, people aren't confused about; that is, that we have made choices in the past that have helped accentuate the situation we are in, and if we are going to get out of this situation, we have to be honest with ourselves that this is a time when we need to do our job and make sure we understand the opportunity to make sure consumers are protected.

I wish to start by talking about the Commodities Exchange Act. There has been a lot of debate about what various committees have oversight and what the important issues are. For me, there is no more important issue than making sure the Commodities Futures Trading Commission, which has oversight of financial indexes, has the authority to regulate what are called derivative markets. The reason I say this is so important is because of the fact that we allowed legislation to pass in 2000—the Commodities Futures Modernization Act—that literally deregulated these derivatives. More specifically, it prevented us from regulating. We had a Commodities Futures Trading Commission Chair, a woman named Brooksley Born, who saw what damage was happening in 1998 with these derivatives because they were unregulated. She tried to do something about it. She tried to do something about it because the Commodities Exchange Act provided oversight to deter and prevent price manipulation or any other disruptions to the market and to ensure financial integrity of all transactions and avoid systemic risk and to protect participants from fraudulent or abusive practices.

That is what their charge was. When she saw in the marketplace that there were these products that were being used that basically thwarted this act, she proposed regulating derivatives. That is in the 1998 timeframe. So this problem has been around for a long time.

As we saw the demise of long-term capital management and incurred a financial crisis at that time, she said: Let's make sure we are regulating these products. What happened was, she was basically run out of town for her views. She was the Chair of the Commission at the time, and a bunch of people, basically influenced by Wall Street, came down to Washington, DC, and said: That is the wrong idea. We don't need to do this. This issue isn't going to be a problem for us. So not only was she prohibited as the Chair of the Commodities Futures Trading Commission to fulfill this act, to make sure we regulated this market—not only that—legislation was passed by the Congress prohibiting us from regulating these derivatives. Imagine that. You actually had the Chair of the Commission doing her job; you actually had her calling out a problem in the market, fulfilling her responsibilities of oversight, and not only was she told she couldn't regulate those, Congress prohibited her from doing that in the Commodities Futures Modernization Act.

How did we get to that situation? I get it because I had to live through the Enron crisis in our State and a lot of people cooked up off-book accounting and people said: Oh, it is a bunch of environmentalists not allowing us to have an energy supply. That is why we have an energy crisis—or people said: Oh, we are having an energy crisis because we don't have enough refineries. We found out it was people manipulating supply and demand with various schemes called Death Star and Get Shorty, a variety of things that all came down to this: off-book accounting. How could you fool the accountants into believing that your scheme was legitimate?

So it should be no surprise that in 1994, in a little retreat effort—some of us go on retreats and talk about our policy issues. Here, some of the titans of Wall Street went down to Boca Raton, about 80 J.P. Morgan bankers, and started to wonder if there was a way to create derivatives that could bet on whether bonds or loans would default. That is what they did. They were down in Boca Raton saying, basically: How can we do off-book accounting to figure out ways in which we can bet on these things?

So that is what happened. That was the start of this. A few years later, Brooksley Born, after she saw them,

called them out on it, said: Let's stop it and basically was prohibited from doing it.

So what happened when we prohibited the derivatives from being regulated? Well, one of the CFTC personnel, at that time, basically said all the fundamental templates we have learned from the Great Depression are needed to have markets function smoothly are gone. These are things we had put in place after the last fiscal crisis. We put them in place because we knew we had to protect things.

The other side of the aisle led the charge on that deregulation, led the charge on the deregulation of derivatives and said: Let's keep our hands off. I would say at least four times we have had votes on various derivative measures and the majority of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said: No, let's don't reregulate them.

I am all for hearing what they have to say today, but this is an important issue. Let me explain why.

When we look at capital markets, we have to have transparency. If we don't have transparency, people don't know what is going on and products can be manipulated. So after the 2000 Commodities Futures Modernization Act, basically on derivatives we had no transparency, no capital requirements, no prohibition on fraud, no prohibition on manipulation, no regulation of intermediaries. Why are we surprised we ended up in this situation? Because if we basically took what had been the fundamentals of the last fiscal crisis and put them in place in a law and then basically were warned and we deregulated them, why are we surprised we ended up in this situation? Because after deregulation, what it meant if you were doing trading, at least on these derivatives—on other products you had certainty and you had predictability, but on these products—let me be more specific.

We had what were called dark markets and that meant because you couldn't see into these dark markets, you didn't understand what was being done. I know our colleague, Senator LEVIN, is holding a hearing today, and he is going to get to the bottom of exactly what was going on in those dark markets and who was trying to manipulate them. But the fact that they were dark and not traded meant we couldn't see the price that somebody was paying and thereby couldn't understand what was going on in the market. So we had no transparency. We also had no requirement to keep records, no large trader reporting, which would have been things that the CFTC would have looked at and said: Oh, I can look at that and see whether manipulation is happening. We had no speculation limits. Another thing that happens on the stock market or on trades that happen now—we hear about it all the time—is that if somebody thinks somebody is messing around with the market, we can have limits. We can come in and on an exchange—or an agency can come in and say: We are going to stop that kind of trading because we have concerns about what is going on. We also know there was no capital behind these bets as well, which is very alarming to a lot of people. The synthetic CDOs were cooked up and had no capital behind them. I know my colleague, Senator DORGAN, has been on the floor talking about an amendment he is going to be offering on the Senate floor to make sure we close that. But what it created was just a high risk for fraud and manipulation and excessive speculation. That is what happened.

So when we deregulated the derivative market, what happened? Well, it should be no surprise, again, to find out that when we deregulated it, the market exploded. Here is where we were in 1999. There were some derivative products, but now look at it. It peaked at $700 trillion. It has leveled off now somewhere around $600 trillion. A $600 trillion market in derivatives grew because we created a dark market opportunity in which most people couldn't—not everybody could understand what was going on, and certainly the regulators who used to have a day job of overseeing this were prohibited from doing their day job. I should add, not only were the regulators prohibited from doing their day job, in the Commodities Futures Modernization Act of 2000, we also had a provision in there that said States aren't able to use their authority to look into these markets and market activities as well. So we did two things. We prevented the Federal regulators from doing anything and we prevented the State regulators from doing something as well and now we have this unbelievable—unbelievable—unbelievable market of activity.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to talk about innovation. Well, I know a little bit about innovation. I worked for a company that was a startup company. When I look at that issue, I see we have to have financial markets on Wall Street that help those companies get financing through their very early stages. That is what is so important about our financial markets operating effectively. But one can see from this chart—or maybe not. Maybe you can't see from this chart because it is so hard to see, but at the very bottom there is a little yellow line, and that yellow line represents assets. It represents the loans these banks are making, the amount of money that is in loans in capital going to businesses that are the true ideas of innovation. There is a lot of innovation in derivatives. Now we know what it is: dark market derivatives that cooked up things like CDOs and synthetic instruments to basically bet against bonds because somebody had securitized loans to banks that were risky bank loans anyway and then tried to make somebody believe it was a great way to cover them financially. So all of it was just a risky game, and that is what we are doing. So we are not helping the American economy in investing in Detroit or investing in software or investing in other things, not the way we used to. We are basically investing—and people are making a ton of money—in dark market derivatives. So that is why it is so important we fix this in the legislation.

Just to give an idea of where people are making the money—because I know some people like to say: Well, let's get out here and make sure we do something for small business. I think it is incredibly important to do that, but we are not going to get the big banks to make a bunch of loans to small businesses, as that last chart showed us, when they can make money in dark market derivatives. This chart shows the increased profit they have had since 2008. So we have actually had a decrease in lending. We have actually had a decrease in the amount of capital going out to the tune of something like $574 billion and an increase in trading profits. So we know where the money is going. Wall Street is not putting money into Main Street; Wall Street is putting money into Wall Street dark markets, and we have to get on this legislation to fix that.

So what would we do in this legislation? Well, if my Agriculture Committee colleague's mark is put into this legislation, as I believe the leader is going to do, then we have a choice of having an unregulated market or, with this legislation, a truly regulated market with exchange trading. People say: What does that mean, exchange trading? I don't understand. What is that going to solve for us? Well, just as I said how dark the market was and no one knew what was going on, when we have a product that is traded on an exchange, we actually have transparent pricing so people can see what the pricing is, just as this situation is being described right now in the Senate Oversight Committee hearing about how people didn't know what was going on or who was paying what or who was behind what bets. We have to have transparent pricing, and we have to have real-time trade monitoring. Because someone is monitoring those trades, we know exactly what is happening in the market and who is moving what and how they are moving it and we have a transparent valuation.

If my colleagues have time and they read this latest book out by Michael Lewis, ''The Big Short,'' he talks about how people didn't know exactly what was going on with the valuation of this because it was being hidden from them, so they had no way of understanding exactly what the value of these products were. That is why this scheme was able to be perpetrated on people, because they didn't know what the true valuation is. If we have exchange trading, we actually have speculation limits and we have public transparency.

So when we are on the floor debating this—and I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will support exchange trading. I heard one of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle

say: Well, I don't think that is the solution. Well, in my book, it is absolutely the solution. It is absolutely the solution, just as it is for the stock market. Who would buy stock on the stock market if we didn't have oversight of the exchange?

If you didn't have these kinds of things—transparency in pricing, real-time trade monitoring, transparent valuation, speculation limits, and public transparency—who would buy stocks? Why do you think derivatives can operate in the dark? They cannot.

The other thing we will be talking about on the floor is that unregulated trading doesn't have any capital behind the trade. If we actually had a clearinghouse—exchange trading and a clearinghouse—then you would have capital behind these trades, and people would know somebody has the ability to deal with this transaction they are betting on. These are the things we need to do. These are the things that are critical to the type of reform we need to get done.

I am concerned that we are not going to get to this legislation, that the dark market is going to continue to operate that way or that people are going to propose loopholes to basically water down this legislation. We have had a lot of conversation about loopholes. One of them is the end-user loophole. Basically, any kind of loophole in the legislation is kind of like water; the money is going to flow where it can. If it is a dark market, that is where it will flow.

We had a hearing of the Commerce Committee in 2008, 6 or 7 months before the big bubble burst, and George Soros came to testify. He said we are basically inside of a bubble and it is going to cause great concern. He knew then, because he knew what kind of activity was going on. He talked in his testimony about how important it was that you apply regulation and apply it to both the regulated and unregulated market. If you don't apply it to the unregulated market, then all the money moves over to the unregulated area.

I appreciated this New York Times editorial that said:

> If [end users] are exempted, potentially trillions of dollars worth of transactions could avoid the exposure—and stability—that comes with exchange trading.

That is what we are going to debate about, whether you are going to have that kind of oversight and make sure that we end up putting the kind of regulations we need in place.

As another New York Times editorial said:

> Strong derivatives reform is a matter of putting taxpayers first—ahead of the big banks and corporate America that are fighting hard for a return to the risky business as usual.

We don't need risky business as usual. We need to reform these markets. Let's get capital flowing again and get innovation in products and services in important areas of our economy and know that having fundamental rules in markets and capitalism is to have transparency, and the legislation we are considering will do just that. Hopefully, the Republicans will say what true reforms they are for and realize that, in the past, they have been against some of the derivatives reforms that would have stopped us from having this crisis.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CMS REPORT ON HEALTH CARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor as someone who practiced medicine in Casper, WY, for 25 years. I was an orthopedic surgeon for the people of Wyoming, as well as medical director of the Wyoming Health Fair Program, which reached across the State with low-cost health care screenings, aimed at giving people the opportunity to take more responsibility for their own health and essentially keep down the costs and get down the cost of their medical care.

Today, I come to the floor with a second opinion on what this Senate has passed, what the House has passed, and what has been signed into law by the President. I come today because I continue to believe that what is now the law of the land with health care reform is going to be bad for patients, bad for providers, the nurses and doctors, and those who take care of our patients, and bad for payers—the American people—who end up paying the bill for health care in this country—the taxpayers of this Nation, people who pay for their own care. I believe fundamentally, as this bill has been passed into law, it is going to result in higher costs for patients, as well as for taxpayers, less access to care for people all across America, and unsustainable spending at a time when we are running record deficits.

That is not just my opinion. If you ask what the public believes, in polling across the country the American people have overwhelmingly rejected this bill that is now signed into law by the President, because they believe the cost of their own personal care is going to go up and the quality of their own personal care is going to go down. Fundamentally, they believe this bill was not passed for them but for someone else.

The reason I come to the floor today to talk about it is because the report has just come out by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services Actuary, Richard Foster, the Chief Actuary. He has come out with a report to go through methodically, page by page, what is actually in the health care bill. You will remember that when the bill was in front of the House, the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, said you will have to pass the bill before you get to find out what is in it. In a rush by this body to pass the bill—which to me was irresponsible—they have missed the things the Actuary has outlined now in a very thorough report to the American people. I want to go through that with you.

Fundamentally, this says that health care costs are going to be higher, access to care is going to go down, and the spending is unsustainable. It is fascinating, because this is in light of a speech by President Obama in June of 2009, when he said if any bill arrived from Congress to his desk that is not controlling costs, ''that is not a bill I can support.'' He said it is going to have to control costs.

Well, the Actuary tells us that the bill now signed into law by the President, as well as the additional bill, because there are actually two new laws—one the initial bill and then the fix-it bill—will increase costs, raise Federal spending, threaten access to care for seniors, and will result in higher insurance premiums.

That is not a Republican Senator saying that; that is the Chief Actuary for the United States in charge of Medicare and Medicaid in a well-documented report that came out April 22, 2010.

What is actually in the report? Let's go through it page by page. The first thing is, it says this is going to bend the spending curve—the rate at which we are spending on health care in the country. The President said we want to get the spending cost curve down. This says the opposite, that the cost curve is going to go up. That is on page 2.

Turning to page 4, What about overall national spending on health care over the next 10 years? Between 2010 and 2019, national spending on health care is going to go up by $311 billion. The President said he wanted a bill that was actually going to get the cost of care and spending down on health care.

Turn to page 7. The President said he wants to make sure if you have care you like, you can keep it—keep the care you like. We all heard that. We heard it time and time again. Yet, on page 7 in this report by the President's agency, it says about 14 million people will lose their employer coverage by 2019. Again, the President said if you like what you have, you can keep it. His Actuary, who actually did the numbers on the bill, said, sorry, 14 million people will lose their employer coverage by 2019.

Let's turn to page 8. An estimated 23 million people will remain uninsured by 2019. This is at a time when the President said he wanted to provide coverage for all these people. But even 10 years out, 23 million people will still remain uninsured in the United States. Many of them are going to have to pay a penalty because of that. They will be

fined because that is how the rule and that is how the law has been written.

I talked with a lot of seniors. I was home this past weekend in Wyoming visiting with a number of seniors around the State. I was in Torrington, WY, and Casper visiting with folks. They are concerned about their Medicare.

What does the report say about Medicare? Turn to page 9: Unsustainable. The cuts we are looking at are going to become unsustainable even within the next 10 years. With the cuts to Medicare of over $500 billion, one would think at a time when we are looking at more and more seniors coming of age to be on Medicare that we would have used that specific Medicare money to keep it in Medicare, use it to save Medicare, not to start an entirely new government program.

As you work your way through this, you say: What does this mean for seniors on Medicare? That gets us to page 9 and page 10 of the national report of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. These are the people who know. They looked into the numbers. They said they did not have time to do it while the House and the Senate were rushing to pass the bill. They said we should have given more thought and time to this bill.

What happened when they actually looked at what has been signed into law? They talk about cuts to providers, to the people who take care of the patients on Medicare. They are expecting many providers, medical professionals to ''end their participation in the program.'' This is going to jeopardize access to patient care.

The report says 15 percent of all the hospitals in this country, all the nursing homes in this country, and similar providers—we are talking about home health care agencies, that link, that lifeline to people who are at home needing care; hospice, for people who are in the final days of their lives—about 15 percent of all of them, as a result of the way this bill has been put together, are likely to be operating at a financial loss by 2019.

Are they going to be able to stay open? Are they going to be able to provide care for people? Absolutely not. Are they going to close down? Very likely. Is that going to impact a lot of rural communities across this country? Absolutely.

As we go through this actuary report, it brings to light what Nancy PELOSI meant when she said we have to pass the bill to find out what is in it. What a shame it is that the American people, although they sensed what was in it, had to wait until this point so they could continue to express their concerns to those who voted in favor of it.

Let's take a look at some other provisions. Those who supported this bill said there are other Medicare savings provisions in the bill that will help save money and that will help control future health care growth. No—the report on page 13—they said those things people in this Chamber said would help control future health care costs would have a ''negligible financial impact over the next 10 years''—''Negligible financial impact over the next 10 years''—even though Members of this Senate stood on the other side of the aisle and absolutely swore that this was going to improve care, as well as get down the cost of care.

Let's turn to page 15 of the report, the CLASS Act. That is the long-term care insurance program that so many in this Chamber thought was going to be a wonderful thing, and those on my side of the aisle said: This cannot work. The numbers are not going to work for our country. They are not going to work for this bill. Who are you trying to kid?

The Democrats who supported the CLASS Act were not able to kid the people at the Health and Human Services Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. No, they saw right through it. But, of course, the report came out after the bill had been signed into law by the President.

What the report says is that the CLASS Act faces ''a significant risk of failure''—''a significant risk of failure.'' It says there is a very serious risk that the CLASS Act program will be unsustainable. People on this side of the aisle said that. We said it before the vote. We heard from the other side of the aisle: Oh, no, you have it all wrong. People who looked at it and know—and these are the President's own people—said: Unsustainable.

What about premiums for insurance? Last year the President said he expects to lower the health care premiums for the average family in this country by $2,500. That is an incredibly admirable goal, something all Americans would support because, after all, early on the President said: My goal is to get down the cost of care, clearly something he abandoned early on.

What this says on page 17 of the report from the Actuary is that the new laws, fees, and excise taxes, higher drug prices, device prices—this is all going to result in higher insurance premiums for American families, the exact opposite of what the President promised.

Let's go to page 16 because we have talked about funds allocated for the new high-risk insurance pools. I think it is important to have these pools. They work well in various States. A number of States have these pools. It is a commitment by the State. We want to involve the Federal Government, have people working together with folks with preexisting conditions, people who absolutely need care.

The CMS report says what this body has done is insufficient. It says the amount of money they decided to put in this program is going to be exhausted by the year 2012. Once again, this body who said they knew better than the folks who studied the bill, those who said we just have to pass it to get something done, have created a monster, and the American people are going to be paying the price for a long time.

Let's look now to page 20. So many of the people who are going to be covered under this program, how are they going to be covered? The President said: I want to cover all these people. What he decided to do and what this body decided to do is to cram another 18 million people on to Medicaid, a program we know right now is fundamentally flawed. It is broken. Half the doctors in the country do not want to see patients on Medicaid because the reimbursement to them is so low. Hospitals tell you they lose money when those patients are in the hospital. Doctors say they cannot keep their offices open if they take more and more Medicaid patients. The only way they are allowed to see them is by charging other patients more—the cost shifting that happens in health care in America.

What does this say about Medicaid? Eighteen million more people are going to be put on Medicaid by the year 2019. Is that going to be care? The President talks about coverage, but he does not talk about care. These people are very unlikely to get care.

This is what the report says on page 20: A significant portion of the increased demand for Medicaid services, because there are all these millions more people on Medicaid, the increased demand for Medicaid services could be difficult to meet. All these patients are going to be put on Medicaid, and they are not going to be able to get care.

I say it is hardly fair and it is misleading to the American people. Everybody in Canada has coverage. They have coverage but they cannot get care. Madam President, 33,000 Canadians came to the United States last year to pay for their own health care because even though they had coverage in Canada, they could not get care there. So they came to the United States and paid for care.

About a year ago when the President of the United States was talking about health care, he always held up the Mayo Clinic for excellent care in America, and it is a model for excellent care. The Mayo Clinic said: We do not want more Medicaid patients, because they lose too much money by taking those people, and they want to keep their doors open to fulfill their mission.

Here we have the Actuary who is looking at this page by page—and, obviously, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services knows what they are talking about. They looked at the numbers and item after item, page by page and said: This is not working.

One of the things we talked about at the Health Care Summit was the issue of Medicare fraud. I sat at the table and discussed the issue with the President. This law does almost nothing—almost nothing—to limit actual fraud and abuse.

Last year, Medicare paid $47 billion in claims that were suspect. We know in Florida, drug dealers have been moving from dealing in drugs to Medicare

fraud. One may say: Why? Why would they do that? They are doing it for a couple of reasons: One, it is more profitable; two, it is less likely they will get caught; and, third, if they do get caught the penalty is less. They say: More profit, less chance of getting caught, less punishment. I think I ought to go into Medicare fraud. That is what they are doing.

What does the Actuary say when he looks at the new bill? He estimates the fraud provision in the law will save only about 2 percent, only $1 out of every $50 of Medicare fraud.

As we look at this, it is no surprise the American people want a second opinion about this bill. It is no surprise the American people are saying it is time to repeal and replace the bill. That is why I come to the floor of the Senate with my second opinion, with 25 years of practicing medicine.

On the way over, I picked up USA Today. It is so interesting, a big story in the paper today: ''Next Phase In Health Care War: Applying The Law.'' The subheadline is ''Cabinet''—we are talking about the President's Cabinet, the Cabinet of the United States—''Cabinet Braces For Lobbying Blitz By Industry Advocates.'' The Cabinet is bracing for a lobbying blitz. I thought the President of the United States said he did not want lobbyists in the White House, did not want lobbyists impacting on his Cabinet. They are weighing right in. Absolutely.

The President did have them in the White House, obviously behind closed doors, cutting the deals. That is the way we ended up with a health care bill that is bad for patients, bad for providers, and bad for payers, the American payers, the taxpayers of this country, and the people who are paying for their health care. That is why I come to the floor to say it is time to repeal this legislation and replace it with legislation that is actually patient centered, that gives more responsibility and opportunities for individual patients, just what I tried to do through the Wyoming health fairs where we give people more information so they can use that information to get their cholesterol down, get their blood pressure under control, find out if they are diabetic and if they are, get their blood sugar under control, give people incentives to stay healthy and keep down the cost of their care.

We need a patient-centered health care bill. We sure do not have one. We need a health care bill that allows people to buy insurance across State lines. That increased competition will drive down the cost of care.

The University of Minnesota did a study: 12 million more Americans would have insurance today without this bill if all we did was allow Americans to buy insurance across State lines and allow small groups to join together to get better opportunities to buy insurance to get the cost down.

Then, of course, we need to deal with abusive lawsuits that exist in this country which drive up the cost of care for patients because all the tests that doctors routinely order are not to help the patient get better but to make sure the doctor does not miss something.

That is why I come here today to tell you, Madam President, that there are things that will work to get down the cost of care. There are things that will work to provide additional treatment for more people in America; more patients, better care. But they are not in this health care bill that passed the House, passed the Senate, and was signed into law by the President.

That is why today I offer my second opinion that it is time to repeal this bill and replace it with what will work.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

RESTORING AMERICAN FINANCIAL STABILITY ACT OF 2010—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 3217, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 3217, a bill to promote the financial stability of the United States by improving accountability and transparency in the financial system, to end ''too big to fail,'' to protect the American taxpayer by ending bailouts, to protect consumers from abusive financial services practices, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all time until 12:30 p.m. and from 2:15 to 4:30 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the business we have in front of us here in the Senate, financial regulatory reform. But I did want to note that we meet in an hour of real economic trauma for many families across America and across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I know the Presiding Officer sees this as well in his home State of New Mexico. We have lots of people out of work. And although there is no question in my mind that our economy has begun to recover, and has recovered substantially, we still have a way to go. So even as we debate financial reform and the intricacies of that, it is important that we remember there are still a lot of people out of work.

The latest numbers nationally are that 15 million people are without work across America, and in Pennsylvania it is 582,000 people. I was looking at the numbers for the month of March, region by region in Pennsylvania. We have 14 labor markets, the numbers of which are charted on a monthly basis. Looking at the areas of the State where it is above our unemployment rate, we have several parts of Pennsylvania where, if it is not 10 percent, it is very close to that. In Erie, PA, up in northwestern Pennsylvania, it is a 10-percentage point unemployment. I realize for some States they have been in double-digit figures for a while, but for places such as Erie, it is 10 percent.

The Lehigh Valley, on the eastern side of our State, is getting close to 10. It is 9.8. My home area of northeastern Pennsylvania is 9.8. Johnstown's numbers, an area in southwestern Pennsylvania, which has always had higher numbers of unemployment, are getting close to 10. So throughout our State the numbers are very high.

When people in any State see those high numbers and they see the joblessness, they see people who have lost their homes or job or both, when they see that people have lost their hopes and dreams in this process, when they see all that around them, either in their own lives or the lives of their families and neighbors, they look to Washington to see what we are doing about it. They want to know: How can you respond to that? How can you take action to help us?

I think we have, in some measure, but this Wall Street reform is going to be part of it as well. We passed the Recovery bill, which is having an impact. We passed the HIRE Act a couple of months ago, and that is having an impact, and will have more of an impact as time goes by. So there have been a series of jobs bills that have helped substantially, and will continue to help, but one of the most urgent priorities and questions most Americans have is, who is going to be on our side? Who will fight for us when it comes to whether we will empower local communities to create jobs and have some security?

Will we continue to empower Wall Street and the dealmakers, the scam artists who have ripped people off to make a profit? And not just a profit, what we used to think of as a lot of money—$1 million. We are talking about profits we cannot even begin to comprehend. A very small number of Americans, a very small number of institutions, such as these megabanks, are getting these profits purely out of greed and purely out of a willingness to cast aside people's lives and their futures, without worry as to whether the actions they take on Wall Street will

cause people to lose their jobs. That is what people across the country, who are not on Wall Street, are asking us to consider.

Of course, part of that is happening in this debate. But I think it has become more apparent to the American people on this question of whose side we are on, that there is one side—this side of the aisle—that is trying not only to get the policy right and get a bill prepared, but that we are trying to move that bill forward. One of the ways we move a bill forward is to have a debate. Why shouldn't the Senate be having a debate, unless there is a question about whether you are on one side or the other?

I think our friends on the other side of the aisle are going to have to ask themselves whether they are on the side of the people; if they are on the side of communities and small businesses, who are telling us to get something done about these Wall Street problems that have caused 15 million people to lose their job—and in Pennsylvania we have lost 582,000, as said I before. People are wondering, whose side are you on? If you are not on the side of debate and getting the bill passed, then you are on the side of Wall Street. It is very simple. I know some of the policy gets complicated, but this isn't complicated at all.

If you are on the side of the megabanks and Wall Street, here is what you are on the side of: You are on the side of continuing what has happened for a generation now, with our usual and more familiar banking system that has been altered in a way so that it has become almost unrecognizable to people who used to walk down the street, figuratively, but almost literally, or walk or drive not too very far in a community and go to a bank. They knew the institution. They knew the people who worked there. They knew who was in charge. They dealt with a banker in a very personal way.

A lot of that is gone. If we do the right thing here, I think we can bring some of that sense back. But at a minimum, put the brakes on, put rules in place to govern what the scam artists on Wall Street do every day of the week to make a profit, to rip people off, and to destroy our economy and to cause record-high unemployment.

In that scenario I talked about before, what we used to have was that people knew their bankers. They knew each party was invested in the other. The banker wanted to make a good loan, obviously. That was part of his or her business. But he or she knew that making that loan had to be on good terms, in a way that borrower could pay it back. Obviously, the borrower—going to the local bank as a local business, to people they knew—was invested in their success as well. The borrower wanted the bank to do well. It was part of their community. But now we have a system where, if you enter into a mortgage transaction, that flies off to Wall Street, and then on Wall Street they slice and dice it so a lot of wealthy people make record profits, and they laugh—laugh all the way to the bank, not worrying about whose life was destroyed back in that community.

These megabanks have prospered in ways we cannot even begin to describe or appreciate. We continue, so to speak back home, grappling with the results of that, the aftermath of that: high unemployment—record-high numbers—and a ballooning deficit. Why are we even having a debate—trying to have a debate, I should say, if our friends get to the point of allowing us to have a debate—why are we having this debate? Because Wall Street put the American people into this position.

We need to reinvent this megabank model, change it substantially, and move it toward a system of smaller banks and more competition. I thought that is what our friends were for. I thought they were in favor of competition.

Many people know community bankers. The Independent Community Bankers of America say there are almost 8,000 community banks operating across the country. Even with this problem we have with megabanks and Wall Street, those 8,000 community banks are still 97 percent of our banks. That is the good news, that that number is high. These institutions, as we know, have boards of directors made up of people in the community, as it should be, who are invested in the community and the success of those borrowers. They are also institutions that are a lot smaller in terms of size. In terms of asset size, 91 percent of community banks have assets of less than $1 billion. They are nowhere near a big bank and nowhere near, obviously, a megabank.

The largest of our megabanks is Bank of America, which, by September 2009—and I am sure the number is much higher today, but as of September 2009, it had assets of $2.3 trillion. It is hard to describe that. That is most of the Federal budget. We have a Federal budget that is several trillion. That is a big share, if you equate it to the entire Federal budget—not the full budget but certainly a big share of it, $2.3 trillion.

Consumers do not reap huge benefits from these banks. We know that. If anything, they are harmed by the unchecked power of these banks.

As I said last week, three of our largest megabanks have cut participation in a key Small Business Administration lending program by between 85 percent and 90 percent from one year to the next. Just at the time we have a bad economy—that they caused, in large measure—and just at the time we need help for small businesses, these same big banks that got the benefit of all of that wealth and all of that scam artistry and fraud, in some cases, are not helping us create jobs in small business. To say that is perverted and disturbing does not even begin to capture the sentiment. But I will not dwell on that.

Then we get to the question of fees, bank fees. We have heard a lot about these. We all have experienced it. Fees for checking accounts and other services are lower at community banks than at the megabanks, the big institutions. According to research by the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, in one quarter last year, the four largest megabanks raised fees related to deposits by an average of 8 percent. In the same period, community banks lowered their fees by an average of 12 percent. So in one quarter last year, the four big banks raised their fees by an average of 8 percent and the smaller community banks lowered those same fees. That is another reason community banks make a lot more sense for most Americans.

The reason for the big difference in fees charged by the smaller community banks versus the big mega Wall Street banks is not just that they want to try to be consumer or customer friendly, it is because there is competition injected into the system of community banks. Economist Simon Johnson said:

> With low interest rates, the [big] banks could raise money from depositors virtually for free; they could borrow cheaply from each other; they could borrow cheaply at the Fed's discount window; they could sell bonds at low interest rates because of FDIC debt guarantees; they could swap their asset-backed securities for cash with the Fed; they could sell their mortgages to Fannie and Freddie . . . and so on.

It is like dot, dot, dot. We have heard all about this. They had all the opportunities in the world. Their plate was full: I am a big megabank, and I need a little extra help here to make some more millions for this guy or that guy or to make billions for the bank or for individual bankers. I need a little help, so I will go to the Fed discount window. That was one option. I just charge a little more over here.

They had all these options to make more money—because of the generosity of the Federal Government, by the way, in large measure. The Federal Government helps a lot of institutions every day of the week, including banks. The same folks who complain about government want bankers to get all the help in the world from government.

The big banks had all these options at their disposal if they got into a period where they needed a little extra help. What about the borrower who got into a bad mortgage because some local scam artist or maybe a scam artist on Wall Street put them into a mortgage they couldn't afford? What happens when they can't pay their mortgage? What happens when they lose their job and then can't pay the mortgage and lose health care? Do they have a menu, a list, a full plate, or a full table of options? No. They have very few options. For a lot of Americans who lost their job because of Wall Street or who lost their house because of what Wall Street was doing or lost their livelihood because of some fraud

on Wall Street or some scam artist on Wall Street, they have very few options. But the big banks have lots of options.

This is not just about what is fair and what is right and making sure we have competition in our banking system. It is more than that. It is about a gross disparity of power residing on Wall Street and injuring the ability of people just to make ends meet, just to have a job, or just to be able to borrow money in a way that will allow them to purchase a house or do something else in their lives.

What this means is, despite offering better and cheaper consumer products, our community banks at the local level are struggling to get by, while their big brothers, their megabank brothers are on Wall Street making more money than we can even compute or comprehend. The community banks, which used to be the foundation of our system and the place where people could go to borrow, are having trouble, are struggling to get by.

One of the ways to confront this is not just to pass a bill that sounds good here and there and looks like reform but to have a final product after debate. Again, I hope our friends will get to the point of debating this bill. It makes sense that if something is very important and the American people say do something about it, you ought to debate it and pass it—just a little free advice to the other side.

But we have to do more than just pass something; we have to pass something that works. We have to pass something that will be meaningful in the lives of real people. If we allow these megabanks to retain their power and their influence and their wealth, to the detriment of working families, small businesses, and our economy in general—if we allow them to have that power, it will be nice to pass a bill, but we will not be getting to the root cause or one of the root causes of our problem.

That is why I and Senator KAUFMAN, Senator BROWN, and others are supporting the SAFE Banking Act. I thank those two Senators for their work on this over a long period of time. This will be an amendment to the act we are working on, the Restoring Financial Stability Act of 2010. This part of it, this will be a new element to it if we can get the amendment agreed to—I think we can—to the SAFE Banking Act. This is what it will do—basically, four things. I will go through them quickly. First of all, impose a 10-percent cap on any bank share of the total deposits of government-backed depository institutions, so placing a cap on that. Place a 2-percent-of-GDP limit on all nondeposit liabilities, so limiting and circumscribing what these megabanks can do. Third, place a 3-percent-of-GDP limit on all nondeposit liabilities, including any off-balance-sheet provisions as well as any systemically significant nonbank financial institution. Fourth, we would put into law a 6-percent leverage limit for bank holding companies and selected nonbank financial institutions.

So instead of leaving size limitations in the hands of regulators—and I know regulators work hard and they always try to do the right thing in almost every instance—this amendment would at long last put some clearly defined rules in place about the size and the leverage of financial institutions. We can't just say: OK, megabank, you can do whatever you want, you can get bigger and do whatever you want, and after the fact we will have some regulators try to mitigate the damage you are causing or try to rein you in a little bit. Sometimes that works, but our recent history tells us it is not going to work the way it should. So we need some clearly defined rules that apply to these megabanks and would only impact a handful of institutions, a very small number of institutions—these large megabanks that are at the heart of the problem.

The alternative to placing these limitations on the big banks, on their size and the leverage they have, is a continuation of the system we have right now, the so-called too-big-to-fail system. So a bank gets so big and has so many tentacles out into our economy and across the world that we say: Gosh, if they are in trouble, we can't let them go. They are too big and have too much of an impact if they fail. We have to help them.

In addition to passing a law that ends bailouts, we also have to end this too big to fail. It is kind of a straitjacket our system has been in: it does not allow us much freedom, but it gives a soft landing to a lot of these megabanks that really should be cut down in size. We know we need to change that.

I commend the efforts to increase the ability of regulators to oversee and enforce discipline, but candidly—and I think our history shows this—it is not enough. It is not enough to just give regulators more power or more resources. We need to pull apart or deconstruct in some measure these megabanks because they are too big, too powerful, and they have caused too much damage. Having a regulatory system in place will not be enough. That is why we need the SAFE Banking Act.

We also need to take other steps to address this root cause as well as other root causes. We know community banks are banks that are better for families and for small businesses—the two parts of our society, the two parts of our economy, our families and our small businesses. They are saying to us: Do something that is real. Do something that not only makes sense in terms of policy but will help at the local level in terms of improving our economy.

So more banks mean more competition, and they also mean more customer-friendly products. It also means more loans for small businesses that get them from community banks and will continue to if we do the right thing. It means a retail banking system that more closely resembles our Nation's community banks than the Wall Street model that has indeed failed us—and that is an understatement—and failed us significantly.

So that is why I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the SAFE Act amendment to our financial reform legislation. It is about that we took a step that has real meaning and real impact on one of the biggest problems we have in America, where you have megabanks that are doing quite well, and if we allow them to continue to do well, they will have a few individuals in a few institutions across America who will benefit from that.

But most of the rest of us, most people, especially those out of work, most small businesses, will not benefit from these megabanks. We need to change this, and we need to do it in the course of this debate.

I would once again say to my colleagues, if we debate it, it will tell us very clearly whose side we are on. If you continue to hold up debate, I think the American people know whose side you are on. It is not their side.

I ask unanimous consent that any time in quorum calls on the motion to proceed to S. 3217 during today's session be divided equally between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. 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. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 3217

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any time spent in quorum calls on the motion to proceed to S. 3217 during today's session be divided equally between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the Chair.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:33 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BEGICH).

RESTORING AMERICAN FINANCIAL STABILITY ACT OF 2010—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I wanted to rise to speak further about this financial reform bill. Yesterday, I talked at some length about the problems I saw with the bill relative to section 106 in the derivatives language. Today, I want to talk about things that are not in the bill that should have been in the bill.

The reason I am rising to talk about this bill, which is a very complex bill, and intricate, is because we on our side feel very strongly that we should be involved in the negotiations of a better bill. We are not asking that there be no bill; just the opposite. We are saying there is a lot in this bill that just plain needs to be improved.

For example, in the area of too big to fail, we have to make absolutely sure, if a company is large and it gets into trouble and it overextends itself, that it fails; that the American taxpayer doesn't come in and support that company in the financial sector, or anybody else, as a matter of fact, such as the automobile sector. So that language in the bill needs to be tightened up. It doesn't accomplish that as effectively as we think it should.

The derivatives language has some serious problems. I talked yesterday about one of them, but there are a whole series of problems. The purpose of the derivatives part of this bill should be, No. 1, to reduce systemic risk and make sure that, prospectively, we do everything we can to make these instruments—which are critical to the ability of the economy to be liquid and produce credit—are as safe and as sound as possible, while at the same time making sure we do not overreact and create a situation where this market—which is so crucial to manufacturers across this country and especially to Main Street, which basically benefits from the credit generated by derivatives—doesn't artificially contract due to excessive regulation, or that it doesn't go overseas. So we lose the fact that we are today at the center of capital and credit. We want to be the best place in the world to create capital and to create credit, and we should have a bill that accomplishes that.

I have been outlining concerns I have in the derivatives area—yesterday I talked about section 106—and I could highlight a number of other areas. For example, the immediacy with which derivatives are pushed from a clearinghouse into an exchange situation, which I don't think will work under this bill. I think, basically, it would contract the market dramatically.

But what I want to speak to specifically are the things left out of this bill that should be addressed in order to make sure we don't have happen again what happened in September of 2008 and on into the rest of that year, which was that tremendous trauma that our Nation went through and is just now coming out of—and for some people it is still a trauma because they don't have a job, which is the worst trauma of all for somebody. That trauma was caused by some very distinct and specific events that occurred, and a lot of them were the responsibility of the Congress.

If we want to look for who is the cause of the downturn and the crisis in the subprime market, we can look at ourselves in the mirror and say: We are, to a large degree. Easy money was also a problem. But I think right at the center of the problem was the collapse of underwriting standards in this country.

It used to be, up through the 1990s, you couldn't get a loan for much more than 85 percent of the value of the home. You had to put some money down, and you had to be able to show to the person who was lending you the money—the mortgagor—that you could pay the money back. Well, we went into this huge expansion in lending which was driven in large part by two things: One, the monetary policy of the Fed, which basically allowed for easy money to flow out there very quickly into the market; and, secondly, the Congress, specifically insisting everybody should be able to have a home whether they could afford it or not or whether the home was properly valued. Those two factors lead to an explosion in home ownership, equally leading to an explosion in mortgages which, first, did not meet the value of the underlying asset and, in fact, in some instances were actually valued at more than the asset even at the time they were issued.

Almost all these subprime mortgages presumed there would always be an appreciation of real estate prices, so they could loan at 100 percent and at some point you would be down to 85 percent or 90 percent of the value. That didn't happen, of course. The value went down, and so the mortgages went underwater in terms of their basic value. Secondly, the monies were lent to individuals who, because of the way they structured these loans for the first 2 or 3 years, could pay the interest or the mortgage payment, but as soon as these loans reset to a realistic interest rate, they couldn't pay it. Everybody knew it when they did the loan.

Now, why did people do that? Why was there this collapse in underwriting standards? Well, there were a lot of reasons. I happen to think probably the primary one was that we separated the owner of the loan from the actual loanmaking process. Therefore, the people who were originating the loans weren't interested in the underlying security. They were not even interested in whether the person could pay it back. They were only interested in the fees they were generating. So we had a collapse in the underwriting standards. We had an inverted pyramid, with this person down here borrowing money from this entity over here on a piece of property which wasn't worth the value at which money was being borrowed. The person borrowing the money couldn't pay it back, but nobody cared because that loan was then taken and sold and securitized and subdivided and syndicated and sometimes put into a synthetic instrument, or had a synthetic instrument mirroring it. So we had this loan down here, and this massive structure from the churning of that loan on top of it, and the loan wouldn't support all that structure over it. So it all collapsed on us in late 2008.

This bill, however, doesn't address that issue of underwriting standards in any effective way. Senator ISAKSON and I have spoken about this on the Senate floor a number of times, and we are going to offer what we hope is a bipartisan proposal. But it will improve the bill because it will basically be taking us back to the underwriting standards that used to be in place in the 1990s, not only for the origination of the loan but also for the securitizer of the loan. This is critical. If we are going to fix this problem—and the purpose of the bill should be to fix the problem that created the crisis and make sure it doesn't occur again—if that is the real goal, then there should be underwriting standards.

The second issue in this bill that is not addressed is Fannie and Freddie. These two entities have trillions of dollars of outstanding liability, outstanding notes, and it is estimated that the taxpayer has a $400 billion to $500 billion—that is $½ trillion—of liability because a lot of these notes aren't ever going to be paid back. Yet Fannie and Freddie are still operating almost in a business-as-usual mindset, pushing money out the door, buying up bonds and notes and mortgages, and doing it almost as if there is no end to the taxpayers' pocketbook.

In fact, we don't even put Fannie and Freddie on the Federal balance sheet. We know, since we own 80 percent of those companies that the taxpayer is on the hook for this debt—this $400 billion to $500 billion of debt. This bill acts as if it doesn't even exist, and yet that was one of the primary drivers of the economic collapse of 2008, from which we are all suffering and have suffered. So this bill should have at least an initial step into the arena of how we are going to handle this issue of straightening out the GSEs, as they are called.

The first step is that we ought to bring their liabilities onto our books so that the taxpayers aren't being lied to; so that we are telling the truth to the American people as to how much it will cost to straighten this out and we have started thinking about how we are going to straighten it out. Yet this bill doesn't do that. That is a place where we, as Republicans—and I think a lot of other people—would like to see this bill improved, and that is why we are opposing going forward with the bill in its present form until we are allowed to participate in the negotiations on improving it. That is what this is all about.

The third issue, of course, is the credit rating agencies. We know without

any question that the credit rating agencies failed miserably, and people relied on their information, their credit rating of varied securities. That is one of the primary reasons people were willing to buy a lot of the instruments that were floating around. They believed, generally, when the credit rating agency said it was a triple-A rated security, that they had done their due diligence and it was a triple-A rated security. It turned out it wasn't, in many instances.

As a result, it was sloppy underwriting again, by people or financial houses that were willing to buy these securitized products, the CDOs and various other products. They didn't do the heavy lifting of everyone going and looking at the actual assets which were backing up these products. They relied on the rating agencies, and the rating agencies didn't do their job either.

So we have this serious issue with rating agencies that needs to be addressed. It is not effectively addressed in this bill. But we cannot correct the problems which created the 2008 crisis and caused this very severe recession and put this country through this tremendous trauma unless we address that issue, along with underwriting standards, GSEs, and credit rating agencies. So Republicans are saying: Let's look at that and try to fix that. That is why we don't want to go forward until we are brought to the table and allowed to address that issue.

Another question: They have filled this bill with all sorts of extraneous things that had absolutely nothing to do—absolutely nothing to do—with the housing crisis and the economic meltdown that followed. A lot of corporate governance rules that have been kicking around this city for a long time and that are the agenda of certain groups in this city that have a political agenda dealing with wanting to have control over corporations—a lot of it influenced by organized labor—have been thrown into this bill willy-nilly. They had nothing, and they have nothing, to do with the overarching issues that affect protecting the market and making and giving us a sound financial system. Yet they are in this bill. They shouldn't be in this bill or, if they are going to be in the bill, they should be significantly adjusted.

So these are some of our concerns. People ask: Well, why are the Republicans stopping this bill at this point? Because we want a better bill, and we have specific proposals for accomplishing that. We want language which does accomplish too big to fail and ends that policy. We want language which makes the derivative market not only safe and not a systemic risk but a sound and strong force for credit in this country. We want language which addresses better underwriting standards. We want language which addresses the issues of the GSEs. And we want language which addresses the failures of the credit rating agencies. We don't want a lot of extraneous language which is simply brought along because the train was leaving the station and it was thrown on it, and which, in many instances, in my mind at least, undermines rather than becomes a constructive force for a better financial system in this country.

So those are our concerns, and that is why we are continuing to insist that we be allowed to be at the table to negotiate these very critical issues on this very complicated bill.

I thank the Senator from North Dakota for showing me the courtesy of allowing me to go first, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, change is very hard in this country and in this Chamber. Change is always hard. I was thinking, as we have been blocked from proceeding on the Wall Street reform bill, which is a very important issue, about what probably was the case on another big change at the turn of the last century, when Upton Sinclair wrote about the meatpacking houses in this country.

He wrote a book called ''The Jungle'' and described his visit to the meatpacking houses in Chicago and the unbelievably unsanitary conditions in those meatpacking houses—rats all around those meatpacking houses. But that was all right because they poisoned the rats. They took loaves of bread and soaked them in poison, laid them around and then there were dead rats and all the other things that existed in those meatpacking houses that went down the same chute, and out the back side came meat right to the grocery store and to the American people, an unsuspecting public—the most unsanitary conditions in the world.

As a result of publishing the book, ''The Jungle,'' there was a public outcry demanding that something be done. The Congress finally, at last, at long last, beat back the opposition of a very strong meatpacking industry and passed safe food laws, creating the Food and Drug Administration. Change is so very hard. But people knew then something had to be done about that, and the American people know now something has to be done about this.

It is interesting to hear people come to the floor of the Senate and say: Well, we are blocking a motion to proceed to go to a Wall Street reform bill because we want to make it better. Does anybody really believe that? They want to weaken it. They do not even want it in the first place, to the extent they can avoid it. That is why they didn't do anything in the committee. There were negotiations for weeks in the Banking Committee. I was not there, but I am told by all involved there were negotiations for weeks in the Banking Committee. Then they had a markup, and the Republicans didn't offer one suggestion.

If they have a whole backpack full of suggestions on how to improve the bill, why was there not one amendment offered in the committee? So now we have the spectacle of the desperate need for reforming Wall Street finance in this country and the entire Republican caucus in the Senate votes no—every single one of them.

Well, let me describe what we are facing, if I might. This economic collapse is not a stranger to most Americans. Somewhere around 15 or 16 million got out of bed this morning jobless, looking for work and can't find work. They understand the cost of this economic collapse.

Here is what it has cost the taxpayer. By the way, we don't have all these numbers. This was from an enterprising reporter at Bloomberg who did good work. But the Federal Reserve bailout commitment, $7.8 trillion; FDIC, $2 trillion; Treasury, $2.7 trillion; HUD, $300 billion—that is $12.8 trillion, think about that, the amount of money lent, spent or committed on behalf of the American taxpayer to try to get out of this deep hole.

Even as we found ourselves in this deep hole—here, by the way, is what has happened to the biggest financial institutions in the country. Going back 10 years ago, the Congress decided—in my judgment without any wisdom at all because I voted against it—to say let's homogenize all our big financial institutions. Congress said let's put them all in one big basket, investment banks, FDIC-insured banks, real estate, securities, throw them all into one big old holding company and things will be great. It will allow us to compete with the Europeans and others much better.

They created these giant houses of cards. This is what happened the largest financial institutions in the country got bigger and bigger. In fact, that is what has happened even during this collapse. Even in the greatest recession since the Great Depression they have continued to grow.

Let me again describe some of the origin of this, this cesspool of greed that has existed in recent years, resulting in one person—I have talked about him in the past—making $3.6 billion in just one year, betting against America, selling short.

By the way, if you are wondering, that is $300 million a month or, if this person's spouse asks: How are we doing, sweetheart, he can say we made $10 million a day every single day.

This is on the Internet right now and this is the origin of all this greed. It goes up from here, to a security, to a hedge fund, to an investment bank, and they are all making obscene profits right on up through the collapse. By the way, they are doing it again today. This is on the Internet. This is a company called EasyLoanForYou:

Get the loan you seek fast and hassle-free. Our lenders will approve your loan immediately regardless of your credit score or history.

You need a loan? It doesn't matter how bad your credit is. Here is one on the Internet. SpeedyBadCreditLoans. It says: Bad credit, no problem. No credit, no problem.

How about bankruptcy? That is not a problem either. Come to us, ''Get a guaranteed bad credit personal loan today.''

Yes, this is on the Internet today. Bad Credit Personal Loans, ''a Christian Faith Based Service.''

Previous bankruptcy? That is all right. No credit, bad credit, recent divorce, need more money? No problem.

This is the origin of what was going on in this country and it is still going on. By the way, you don't have to make interest payments or principal payments for the first 12 months, we will make them for you, and you don't have to document your income to us.

We wallpapered this country with this sort of nonsense, fundamentally ignorant banking practices, and then turned them into securities and sold them up, up, up the chain. The fact is, everybody was making big fees. The rating companies were with their pompoms, approving everything with AAA. Meanwhile, they were creating an entire house of cards. Unbelievable.

Today, there is a hearing going on and one of the largest investment banks is under siege at that hearing because our friend, Senator CARL LEVIN, actually has the goods. He has the memos, the internal memos. He subpoenaed them. It shows that investment banking company is making record profits now but actually was betting against its customers, was actually selling short, betting against the American economy. So the question is, When all that was going sour and the American taxpayers were told these companies that are doing that are too big to fail, that we have a moral hazard here, we have systemic risk with grave consequences to this economy and therefore the American taxpayer has to be told you bail them out. The Federal Reserve, on behalf of the American taxpayer, decides we are going to provide unlimited funding and unlimited money and a new loan window for the first time in history to investment banks. Then we go to the Fed and say: How much did you actually put out there? And they say: You have no business knowing. We don't intend to tell you, and we don't intend to tell the American people. That is where we find ourselves right now. It is unbelievable.

There is an old country saying: The water is not going to clear up until you get the hogs out of the creek.

This issue we are trying to get to the floor of the Senate on a motion to proceed so we can actually do Wall Street reform is all about getting the hogs out of the creek. But we will vote again today at 4:30—I believe it is 4:30. We voted yesterday. We will vote, I suppose, tomorrow. Every single Republican has said we don't intend to even allow you to proceed because we want to strengthen the bill. Really? When two of the top Republicans go to Wall Street about 19 days ago to meet with two dozen Wall Street executives in a closed session and then come back and say we are going to stop Wall Street reform because we want to strengthen it—I don't think so. It doesn't sound to me like that is the case.

If you want to strengthen it, I say to my colleagues—you say it is not strong enough in too big to fail—I am going to be offering an amendment on ending too big to fail. But you can't offer an amendment unless you get the motion to proceed to get the bill on the floor. But I am wondering how many Republican votes I will get for an amendment that says if you are too big to fail, if you pose a moral hazard, systemic risk with grave consequences to our economy, it seems to me we should back you away through divestitures to a point where you are not causing that moral hazard, if that is the case.

Those who say they are trying to strengthen this bill—and I doubt it—I wonder if they will join me on that.

They come to the floor and say: We haven't had a chance to negotiate or discuss this, when, in fact, there were negotiations for months in the Senate Banking Committee, and before that there were hearings that went on for a year in the Senate Banking Committee. When they finally got to the point of writing the bill, the Republicans decided we don't have one suggestion for an amendment, not one, not any. Now they are saying: We are going to take a stand. We are not going to even allow the Senate to consider Wall Street reform because we think it needs to be improved. Oh, really? I think they think it is too strong. I think they have a lot of friends who want them to weaken it. That is my belief.

The question is, Will we be able to see, at some point, perhaps at long last, the other side stop making excuses and allow us to begin legislating? Is there any American who has suffered the consequences of this deep decline in our economy, the deepest decline since the Great Depression—is there any American who says: You know what. Hands off the big investment banks. Hands off the big finance companies. Yes, we know they were trading things we don't understand. They were trading things such as credit default swaps that were naked.

I asked the other day: How did that get naked? A credit default swap that is naked means it has no insurable interest in any case on either side. It is not investing, it is simply waging. I said before: Why pretend? Why not put a keno pit or a craps table in the lobby of those institutions because all it is, is making wagers or bets.

We have a couple of very large communities and many other areas of America where you can do that, Las Vegas and Atlantic City. But in the last decade, and especially with the growth of these unbelievably exotic instruments, we have seen that happening increasingly in the lobbies of some of America's biggest financial institutions because they have decided, if they bet and lose, at least the record is the American taxpayer going to be standing behind them to pick up the tab.

No more. The legislation brought to us by Senator DODD and Senator LINCOLN dealing with financial reform and derivatives is not perfect. Senator DODD is on the floor. He would be the first to say that. But none of us can offer any amendments unless we have a motion to proceed to get to the bill. I think the work done by Senator DODD and the Banking Committee is work that needs to be commended. It stretches my imagination, and I think others', for the excuse for voting against the motion to proceed to allow us to get to the floor on this and actually have a debate and offer amendments, to allow as an excuse that the other side truly wants to strengthen this.

You know what. We are going to get to the bill at some point, somehow, over the opposition of a determined minority that wants to protect Wall Street's interests here. Even as we are holding these hearings today and discovering some pretty pathetic behavior on behalf of some big economic players, we are going to get to this bill. When we do, we will see who is on the floor of the Senate on the side of the American people. We will see who truly wants Wall Street reform that does the right thing.

There are many things we need to do. Let me just say I mentioned too big to fail—I am going to introduce an amendment that bans naked credit default swaps that have no insurable interest. Again, that is betting, not investing. So there are a lot of things for us to do, but we cannot even begin to do that until we get a motion to proceed, and we would expect, perhaps even by accident, we would get one vote or perhaps two votes on the other side. We will see. Maybe this afternoon will be the time.

The American people deserve much better. As I said when I started, I know that change is hard and big change is exceedingly hard. But this is a big issue. This isn't some small potatoes. This is trillions and trillions of dollars. The American people lost $15 trillion in wealth when the economy hit rock bottom. So they require us, they demand of this Congress to take action—not to take action just for the sake of having done something but to take action for the sake of fixing this, to make sure this sort of nonsense and behavior cannot ever happen again in a way that threatens this country's economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me begin by commending my friend from North Dakota, expressing my agreement of virtually everything he said. I

also commend Senator DODD for the very hard work he has done in bringing forth a very strong piece of Wall Street reform legislation which is long overdue.

Let me also say that my good friend and neighbor from New Hampshire, Senator GREGG, took to the floor yesterday to express his outrage that 10 Senators on the Budget Committee voted for an amendment I offered—which lost, by the way, 12 to 10—to begin the process of breaking up too-big-to-fail financial institutions that pose a catastrophic risk to our economy. Frankly, after listening to Senator GREGG's statement, I wonder, with all due sincerity, what planet he is living on. Apparently, he has missed the fact that due to the greed, the recklessness, and the illegal behavior of Wall Street, the American people continue to suffer through the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. The damage done by Wall Street in bringing this economy to a grinding halt is incomprehensible—millions of people having lost jobs, their homes, their savings, young people trying to go out into the job market to begin a career in their lives unable to do that because of the greed of Wall Street. The fact that just yesterday we could not get one Republican vote to proceed to begin the debate on how we finally reform Wall Street is beyond my comprehension. This debate needs to be going forward, and we need to pass strong—underline ''strong''—legislation that makes sure that what happened a year and a half ago never, ever happens again.

I also find it interesting that we have some of our conservative Republican Senators, such as Senator GREGG, who day after day tell us how much they dislike big government—they don't like Social Security, don't like Medicare, don't like big government—but apparently have no problem with huge financial institutions which control a very significant part of our economy. In the last 15 years, the six largest banks in this country have more than tripled in size and now have combined assets equal to 63 percent of the gross domestic product. Let me say that again. The six largest banks in this country now have combined assets equal to 63 percent of this Nation's GDP.

I ask all my conservative friends who come down saying: Oh, government is too big, government is awful, what about banks that have trillions of dollars in assets? Why aren't we talking about that reality? The truth is that today what we are seeing with these huge financial institutions is not only the ongoing problem of what happens when they fail and whether the taxpayers will be having to bail them out again, but when you have that kind of concentration of ownership, you have a very dangerous situation.

The four largest banks in this country, four banks, issue two-thirds of the credit cards. What do we think about that? Everyone in the world has a credit card. Four banks issue two-thirds of that.

How does that tally with the rhetoric I hear from my conservative friends about a competitive economy? Competition is what drives prices down.

Well, maybe one of the reasons millions of Americans today are paying 25 or 30-percent interest rates on their credit cards is you have got four banks that issue two-thirds of them.

The four largest banks in this country provide half of the mortgages in America. I think that is a real problem. The four largest banks control nearly 40 percent of all bank deposits in this country.

Over 100 years ago, we had some good Republicans, William Howard Taft and Teddy Roosevelt. When they saw the concentration of ownership and wealth that existed in their time, they, as good Republicans, said: Let's start breaking it up.

I think what they did over 100 years ago is a lesson we should learn today. If a financial institution is too big to fail, that financial institution is too big to exist and the time is now to start breaking it up.

This idea of starting to break up large financial institutions is not just an idea that BERNIE SANDERS has, it is not just an idea, an amendment offered by Senators BROWN of Ohio and KAUFMAN are going to speak to. It is an idea that is spreading all over this country.

I would point out to you that the presidents of three regional Federal Reserve Banks also support the need to start breaking up large financial institutions. These are: James Bullard, who is the president of the Fed in St. Louis; Thomas Toenig, the president of the Fed in Kansas City; and Richard Fisher, the president of the Fed in Dallas, TX. They are all in agreement that we have got to start breaking up these large financial institutions.

Senator DORGAN made this point, and I want to make it again; that is, that during the bailout, the Fed decided it was going to lend out trillions of dollars in zero or almost zero-interest loans. When Chairman Bernanke came before the Budget Committee, on which I serve, I asked him what I thought was a pretty simple and straightforward question: Mr. Chairman, can you tell me and the American people who received these loans?

I mean, we are talking about trillions of dollars in loans. I do not think it is too much to ask who received the loans and what the terms were of those loans. Well, Mr. Bernanke disagreed. I offered an amendment that day that begins to bring transparency to the Fed. That amendment is called the Federal Reserve Sunshine Act. I am happy to say it has 32 cosponsors. Interestingly enough, 22 of them are Republicans, 10 are Democrats. They are: Senators BARRASSO, BENNETT of Utah, BOXER, BROWNBACK, BURR, CARDIN, CHAMBLISS, COBURN, COCHRAN, CORNYN, CRAPO, DEMINT, DORGAN, FEINGOLD, GRAHAM, GRASSLEY, HARKIN, HATCH, HUTCHISON, INHOFE, ISAKSON, LANDRIEU, LEAHY, LINCOLN, MCCAIN, MURKOWSKI, RISCH, THUNE, VITTER, WEBB, WICKER, and WYDEN.

That is quite a cross section of political views in favor of bringing transparency to the Fed. What my amendment will do—and we intend to bring that amendment to the floor during this debate—is, in fact, it would require the Federal Reserve to release all of the details about the more than $2 trillion in zero-interest loans the Fed provided to large financial institutions. Also it would call for a GAO audit of the Fed.

The bottom line there is it is imperative that the GAO conduct an independent and comprehensive audit of the Federal Reserve within 1 year. That is what our amendment does. It requires the Federal Reserve to disclose the names of the financial institutions that received over $2 trillion in virtually zero-interest loans since the start of the recession.

This is an amendment that I think millions of people want. What is interesting about it is if you talk about bipartisanship or tripartisanship, this amendment, both in the House and the Senate, brings together some of the more conservative members and some of the more progressive members. In the House, this language is supported by my former colleague RON PAUL. I am introducing it here in the Senate. That, my friends, is a very significant disparity in political views. But we do agree that the Fed needs transparency.

Let me conclude by simply saying this: The time is now for the Senate to begin to deal with the greed, the recklessness, and the illegal behavior on Wall Street. The American people have demanded action since this crisis began, and we owe it to them to deliver. As we proceed with Senator DODD's piece of legislation, which I think has many very positive attributes, I think our goal is as we debate it, to make it even stronger.

In that regard, as I mentioned, I will be bringing forward an amendment dealing with Fed transparency. I will be bringing forth an amendment which will put a cap on the interest rates that banks can charge. I think it is not acceptable, not moral, that banks are now charging 25, 30-percent interest rates. We are going to have a cap similar to what exists for credit unions.

As I mentioned also, we are going to have legislation, an amendment dealing with Fed transparency. So my hope is our Republican friends will join us in beginning this debate and, in fact, going forward so that finally, finally, we can hold Wall Street accountable and bring forth the legislation to make sure that never do we see a repetition of the disaster we saw a year and a half ago.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I understand I have 10 minutes in which to make my remarks. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. I appreciate that.

Over the past 2 years, Americans have seen an unprecedented government reach into the private sector, some of which may be necessary. They are angry about it, as they should be.

For many, the overreach of government began with the bank bailout or TARP. The $700 billion TARP that I opposed was passed in the fall of 2008 when every day we awoke to see a new financial crisis headlining the front page.

TARP was initially intended to purchase troubled assets and get them off the books of the troubled banks. Yet, over time, the program evolved into a fund—some would call it a slush fund—to include bailouts for the auto industry and the housing market. The term ''bailout'' will never be the same again.

I think the American people are right to demand that they are never again put on the hook to bail out a failed company. They are right to demand that those who got us into the financial mess not be allowed to do so again. Unfortunately, the financial regulatory reform bill that the Senate is set to take up and debate does not achieve these goals.

I know both sides are now involved in discussions, and the next 48 hours are going to be absolutely crucial to determine if, in fact, we can get a bipartisan bill. But with any business, if it is mismanaged, if its leaders make poor decisions, the business should be allowed to fail. Success and failure have, until recently, been the cornerstone of what has made our economy one of the strongest in the world. The bailouts of financial and auto companies have turned that philosophy on its head. I think it is a dangerous road to go down. We need to set a new course. It is what the American people want.

This bill does not end bailouts. Instead, it allows some of the largest financial institutions to contribute to a bailout fund, to be used if a company were again to fail.

Well, this does nothing to deter companies from taking risks that could lead to failure and the need for a future bailout. In fact, it sends a signal that the government will bail out institutions, just as it bailed out Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the two troubled mortgage giants that have received $125.9 billion, might as well make it $126 billion, in direct government funding and now have an unlimited U.S. credit line.

Yet there is no mention, no mention, of Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac in this bill. Failure to deal with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac keeps taxpayers on the hook for more bailouts of these entities.

The bill also allows the FDIC and the Federal Reserve to come to the aid of failing financial firms, which means that financial markets will be fully aware of the government's authority and inclination to prop up large failed financial institutions.

The very existence of this authority undercuts the claim that the government will actually ever wind up with such firms. Those firms, along with their creditors and shareholders, will take more risks and, yes, put the financial system into even greater danger.

There has also been much attention paid to the creation of something called a Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, BCFP. I would hate to try to pronounce that acronym.

This sounds like a good idea at first. We all want, everyone in this Senate wants, to ensure strong consumer financial protection. That is not the issue. Yet, rather than working with regulators to strengthen existing consumer protection rules and crack down on unfair deceptive and abusive practices, this provision adds another layer of bureaucracy and financial regulation that will ultimately be harmful for consumers, and I mean all consumers, by raising their costs for financial products, and eliminating the types of financial products and services that are available to choose from.

Not only that, this bill increases the regulatory burden for banks, including our community banks, that are already subject to 1,700 pages of regulations in the consumer area alone. Under this bill, our community banks would have to comply with an additional 27 new or expanded regulations, including new burdens on small business loans. No telling how many pages these new regulations will add or how much they will increase the cost of lending to small business. Finally, this bill harms the very innovation and entrepreneurship that has made our country so successful and created one of the strongest economies in the world. It does this by limiting the ability of small startup companies to raise seed capital. Currently, angel investors—that is quite a name—but angel investors, those higher income individuals who wish to invest in a promising startup company, to take the risk, must have a net worth of at least $1 million or income of $250,000.

This bill increases those requirements to $2.3 million and $450,000, respectively. Estimates are that this provision, along with a provision in the bill that would subject startups and investors to 50 different sets of State regulations, would disqualify about 77 percent of current investors.

In 2007, these individuals invested $26 billion in more than 57,000 ventures across the country. We are talking about companies such as Amazon, Google, Facebook. All benefitted from angel investors. Yet this bill makes it harder for promising young companies to get the capital they need to get started to grow and become successful.

At a time when the unemployment rate is 9.7 percent, I think the last thing Congress should do is to make it more difficult for small businesses to start up and be successful. Small businesses are, as the President has acknowledged, the leading job creators in the country.

Everyone—everyone—all of us agree we need better regulation of our financial system. However, the financial regulatory reform bill that came out of the Banking Committee does not achieve that goal. I dearly hope the chairman of the committee and the ranking member can reach some accommodation to produce a better product.

It does not address the problems, as written, that led to the financial turmoil but, instead, imposes additional regulatory burdens on our community banks and financial institutions that did not contribute to that turmoil.

It does not discourage risk taking by large financial institutions. It does nothing—nothing—to address Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac, which had a central role in the collapse of the housing markets that helped trigger the financial crisis.

It does not ensure that taxpayers never again have to bail out a failed company. However, it does increase the Federal bureaucracy and make it more difficult and costly for consumers to obtain credit for their families and small businesses.

This approach will not benefit consumers or community banks or our economy. We need to work to improve this bill. It is vital for our economy we get it right when addressing financial regulatory reform because the consequences will be seen for years—for years—to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. GILLIBRAND). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I will take a few minutes, if I can, recognize myself for 10 minutes, if I may, and ask the Presiding Officer to notify me when that time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will do so.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I have great affection for my friend from Nebraska and I appreciate his comments about the bill. He wants to fix the bill. That is a noble goal. And the way to fix the bill, of course, is to begin debating the bill. So I am delighted to hear he would want to fix the bill. The problem I have is I cannot seem to get enough people on the other side to get us to the point where we might give them an opportunity to do exactly what they claim they want to do.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, will the chairman yield for a second?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield, just for a second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. I am very privileged to represent the State of Kansas.

Mr. DODD. Kansas. Excuse me. I am sorry.

Mr. ROBERTS. Nebraska is fine, but they——

Mr. DODD. I apologize to my colleague.

Mr. ROBERTS. I mean, their football teams are a completely different——

Mr. DODD. But in basketball, you do very well, so it is OK.

Mr. ROBERTS. So it is Kansas.

Mr. DODD. Kansas, not Nebraska.

Mr. ROBERTS. I appreciate it.

Mr. DODD. I thank my friend.

Anyway, my point is, we want to get to the bill. And whether it is my Senator friend from Kansas or Nebraska, we want to get to the bill, if we can. That is all this is about now. I am going to talk about the bill a bit here in the brief moments I have before we actually get to the vote this afternoon on this matter.

The American public is sitting there in sort of stunned disbelief. Here we all acknowledge this huge problem that needs to be addressed for the 8.5 million people who have lost their job, the 7 million who have lost their homes, their retirement income. We know from all of the statistics what this financial crisis has caused.

Over the last year and a half, we have been busy trying to come up with the answers on how to solve this problem in the future. Here we are, with about 14 weeks left to go before the close of this Congress, with a bill on the floor of the Senate that we put together over many weeks and months—on a bipartisan basis, I might add. Here it is, Madam President. Now we are being told, despite the fact that 58 of us believe we ought to at least begin the debate—I am not asking anyone to vote for the bill. I am not asking you to vote for an amendment on the bill. All I am asking you is, Can we begin discussing this bill here? It is the job of this body to do so.

So I am delighted to receive all the lectures I have received from people from about whether they like the bill or do not like the bill or what they want to add to it or subtract from it, and that is all very interesting conversation. But the fact is, until we actually move to the bill—which will be the matter once again before us this afternoon—all that talk is nothing but talk.

If you have an idea on what you want to change in this bill, tell me about it. But, more importantly, let's debate it, discuss it, and then vote on whether to add it to this piece of legislation, or to take anything out you wish to take out as well. But I cannot even begin that process if, in fact, you continue to object to us getting to a debate.

So that is what this is all about.

I guess it does not pay to get your hopes up in this town, but I was still disappointed yesterday when we ended up coming up short with the votes necessary to proceed to the bill.

To be honest, I am still mystified by the reaction of our colleagues. Yes, we have heard all the rhetoric from the minority leadership. We have seen the thundering horde of Wall Street lobbyists descending on this community, having been paid millions of dollars to do everything they can to stop this, including the motion to even proceed to debating the bill. They had a victory yesterday. Congratulations to the Wall Street lobbyists. You had a great day yesterday. The American people do not even have a chance to hear a bill discussed that might avoid the kind of catastrophe that has befallen them over this past year and a half.

And, yes, we are all familiar with political considerations that seem as inevitable as the sunrise in this community. But still, I cannot bring myself to believe that every single member of the minority caucus wants to stand with the large Wall Street financial institutions that are the major objectors to this bill going forward.

This morning, as Goldman Sachs executives were testifying—including this afternoon—before a Senate committee, we all got another chance to understand why they feel so deeply wronged by this legislation.

As Frank Rich said in the New York Times this weekend—and I quote him—

> [S]omething is fundamentally amiss in a financial culture that thrives on ''products'' that create nothing and produce nothing except new ways to make bigger bets and stack the deck in favor of the house.

Our prosperity in the country was built on the hard work of generations of Americans. It was grown in the cornfields of Nebraska and Kansas, engineered in the laboratories of Massachusetts, forged in the foundries of Chicago, and manufactured, if I may say so, in textile plants such as in my home State of Connecticut.

It is deeply ingrained in the American ethos that, in this land of great opportunity, you build wealth by creating something: an idea, a product, a service.

This economic crisis was not caused by the creators, the producers, the small businesses, and the working men and women who abide by that guiding principle. It was caused by some on Wall Street who wanted to get rich without contributing a thing, by executives who simply come up with ways to circulate money around in a large circle, taking a piece for themselves every time that circle spins.

Operating in the shadows of our economic structures, in the places where regulators were not equipped to do their job, firms such as Goldman Sachs found ways to game the financial system, reaping unheard of profits and rewarding their executives with huge bonuses.

Understand exactly what these bankers were doing. They were not just trying to predict the future; they were betting on the failure of the mortgage market, a failure they themselves were in a position to cause.

Earlier this month, National Public Radio and the nonprofit journalistic organization ProPublica reported on another firm, a hedge fund named Magnetar. This hedge fund, according to the report, saw the housing market begin to decline in the year 2005, bought up enormous amounts of doomed bonds composed of bad mortgages—thus, keeping the market artificially inflated—and then made huge bets on the failure of the very bonds they had bought, now knowing how worthless they were.

Thanks to this scheme, the housing bubble grew bigger and collapsed harder. Magnetar walked away with billions of dollars in profits. Other institutions saw an opportunity to run the same scheme. The American people ended up paying the price, of course, as we all painfully are aware.

I am the chairman of the Banking Committee. I believe in the vibrant financial sector of our Nation. Small businesses need capital and credit. There are many honest people on Wall Street who, I believe, have helped others to build wealth in our country. So the problem is not that these executives got rich without contributing to America. The problem is that these executives got rich betting against America. They did it in secret where no one could see what they were doing, let alone stop them, until it was too late. They took outrageous risks with money that did not belong to them because they could, in their view. By the time anyone realized what was going on, they had managed to destroy much of the prosperity Americans had built over the course of generations.

Maybe I am naive, but I do not believe any Senator wants to be on their side in this debate. And do you know what. I have seen firsthand that there are Republicans who deeply want to get to this bill and get it done. That is why the legislation we want to bring to the floor reflects broad bipartisan agreement. This bill was not written by this Senator alone or a handful of Democrats on the committee. This bill was written in large part with the cooperation of my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans.

The bill creates an early warning system so we can see and stop the next wave of dangerous financial products and practices before it threatens the economic stability of our Nation. It brings derivatives out of the shadows and into the sunlight so that Wall Street is held accountable for its actions. And finally, it puts a cop on the consumer protection beat so Americans can make smart decisions based on full information when they are planning for their financial futures and those of their families.

To listen to the minority leader, the main point of contention, over the last week or so, the reason he has given for his caucus to try and kill this bill as a bloc, is a disagreement over the provisions of our bill that end too-big-to-fail bailouts.

But I have to tell you, I do not believe that is the case. No fair reading of this bill allows you to claim with a straight face that it perpetuates taxpayer bailouts. It is not true. I have debunked that idea before on this floor, and I will do it again.

The morning after the minority leader made that claim, McClatchy Newspapers wrote:

McConnell—

Speaking of the minority leader—

had accused Dodd of drafting partisan legislation, even though the Banking Committee chairman has worked for roughly half a year with key Senate Republicans and incorporated many of their ideas into his bill. McConnell also said the bill continues controversial bank bailouts, but it doesn't.

If you do not believe the press reports, here is what our friend, the head of the FDIC, Sheila Bair, had to say. She, as I said, is the head of that organization, the Federal Deposit Insurance Organization—former legal counsel to the minority leader Bob Dole, a Republican in good standing, I might add, as well. She shuts down, by the way, failed banks for a living. She is a Republican. She said:

The status quo is bailouts. That's what we have now. If you don't do anything, you are going to keep having bailouts.

Further, talking about our bill, she said:

It makes [bailouts] impossible, and it should.

Sheila Bair says:

We worked really hard to squeeze bailout language out of this bill. The construct is you can't bail out an individual institution—you just can't do it.

Madam President, I will speak a little bit more. I know my other colleagues will want to be heard. I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes, if I can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. How in the world the minority leader can come up with that argument does not make any sense at all. He quoted, of course, from the infamous Frank Luntz memo. The memo, of course, by Frank Luntz was written before the bill was written. Frank Luntz's political memo said the following:

The single best way to kill any legislation is to link it to the Big Bank Bailout.

So he provided political recommendations and strategies even before this bill was written. The memo, of course, confirms that because of the date of it. So no matter what he wrote, that was going to be their political argument here. So the minority leader blindly followed the political memo here: Make that argument. Whether it is true is irrelevant, just say it often enough. And the old adage goes: If you repeat it often enough, people will begin to believe it, despite what the facts are. So again, that is the language of others.

But let me, if I can—because sometimes talking about it is not enough—let me quote from sections of the bill.

Section 204 of the bill says:

(1) Creditors and shareholders will bear the losses in the financial company;

(2) Management responsible for the condition of the financial company will not be retained.

Let me translate: You get fired.

(3) The Corporation and other appropriate agencies will take all steps necessary and appropriate to assure that all parties, including management and third parties, having responsibility for the condition of the financial company bear losses consistent with their responsibility, including actions for damages, restitution, and recoupment of compensation and other gains not compatible with such responsibility.

Section 206 of the bill:

In taking action against this title, the (FDIC) shall determine that such action is necessary for the purposes of the financial stability of the United States, and not for the purposes of preserving the covered financial company; ensure that the shareholders of covered financial company do not receive payment until after all other claims and the Fund are fully paid; ensure that unsecured creditors bear losses in accordance with the priority of claim provisions in section 210; ensure that management responsible for the failed condition of the covered financial company is removed—

Again, fired, if you didn't understand those words—

and not take an equity interest in or become a shareholder of any covered financial company or any covered subsidiary.

Lastly:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Corporation, as receiver for a covered financial company, shall succeed by operation of law to the rights, titles, powers, and privileges described in subparagraph (A), and shall terminate all rights and claims that the stockholders and creditors of the covered financial company may have against the assets of the covered financial company or the Corporation arising out of their status as stockholders or creditors, except for the right to payment, resolution, or other satisfaction of their claims as permitted under this section. The Corporation shall ensure that shareholders and unsecured creditors bear losses consistent with the priority of claims provisions under this section.

We seem to agree on the problem, and we seem to agree on how to solve it. So, again, I quote from the legislation.

Let's get to this bill. We have written the provisions that stop too big to fail forever. There are other very important provisions in this bill that deserve consideration.

Again, I am not asking anyone to vote for the bill at this juncture or to vote for the amendments that come up. For the life of me, I don't know how we explain to anyone in this country, in light of what we have been through, that we can't even begin the debate and the discussion.

By the way, no two Senators are going to write this bill. There are 100 of us who serve here, and every single Member of this body has a right to offer amendments and be heard. As chairman of the committee, I will insist upon that. Every Member who has an idea and has an amendment will be heard. But, please, let's get to it.

With that, I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Chair will notify me when I have reached 7½ minutes so I may come to a blazing close.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, it has been over 2 years since Bear Stearns failed. It has been over 18 months since Wall Street collapsed and the economy teetered on the brink of depression. It has been almost a year since the administration offered a detailed proposal to reform Wall Street. It has been 4 months since the House passed its version of Wall Street reform. Yet, unfortunately, the minority party, the Republicans in the Senate, still want to delay any Wall Street reform. They want to put off Wall Street reform for another day.

Yesterday, the Republicans in the Senate had a chance to vote to end their filibuster on Wall Street reform so that we could start to debate this issue and consider amendments from both sides of the aisle, almost the way we remember learning about the Senate in school: a real place where there is a real debate, differences of opinion, votes, winners, losers—an amazing concept. We don't see much of it anymore, do we?

There are a lot of empty chairs here. There is very little actual debate leading to a vote. So yesterday we said to the Republicans: After all this time since this started, after 2 years since Bear Stearns failed and all we have been through, isn't it about time for us to roll up our sleeves and get down to work? Shouldn't we bring some reform and transparency to Wall Street so we don't have to go through this ever again? Wall Street got away with murder and the taxpayers ended up holding the bag, remember?

The previous administration asked us to send almost $800 billion to Wall Street to save the institutions that made some of the greediest, stupidest decisions in the history of American business. I was in those meetings. I can remember sobering moments—I will bet the chairman of the Banking Committee can remember them as well—when the Treasury Secretary, Mr. Paulson, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Mr. Bernanke, looked us in the eye and said: If we don't put $85 billion in AIG today, it will fail and the American economy will fail with it. It takes your breath away. We do a lot of important things here but nothing like that. Then, it wasn't 2 weeks later that they came back and said: It is not enough. We need up to $800 billion to buy toxic assets with something called TARP.

Well, let me tell my colleagues, I am a liberal arts lawyer. I have spent a lifetime in politics. I can't really start

quibbling and arguing about puts and calls and derivatives and CDOs and all the rest of it. At some point, you take the word of the people who are in charge, and I voted for it. The alternative was unthinkable.

So where are we today? Sadly, some of those same firms we rescued with taxpayers' dollars sent us a thank-you card which had a postscript that said: Incidentally, we have just declared that we are going to give one another $10 million bonuses for our wisdom. How do you buy that? How do you sell it to the American people?

So we have come here with the leadership of Senator DODD on the Banking Committee and Senator LINCOLN on the Agriculture Committee, which has a piece of this, and said: We are going to change this story. We are going to have more accountability, we are going to have more transparency, and, frankly, we are going to put a cop on the beat when it comes to Wall Street. We are going to make sure they don't get involved in this mess again.

I don't often come to the floor to plug a book, but I am going to: Michael Lewis, ''The Big Short.'' I recommend it if you can stand it. He tells the inside story of what happened on Wall Street. These so-called great, wise men didn't know what they were doing other than making a lot more money every single day. They were building this house of cards, and eventually it fell. He tells the story about the folks who profited when it fell. They were completely out of favor for years. People said: Shorting the housing market? Are you crazy? There is no way to go but up when it comes to housing. Well, they made a lot of money, shorting the market, and the folks who came up with these crazy vehicles to package all these mortgages left us and America holding the bag.

This recession we are in took $16 trillion to $17 trillion out of the American economy. I don't need to tell anybody about it. If you look at your savings account before and after, you know what I am talking about—savings, retirement, the business down the street that closed, the neighbor who lost his job. You know the story, as we all do. It took $16 trillion to $17 trillion. That is more than the total value of all of the goods and services produced in the United States of America in any year—the total value—yanked out of the economy because of the stupidity of these folks.

Now we come before the Senate and say: Do you want to risk going through that again? Shouldn't we learn something in the process here that avoids that problem? The Republicans yesterday said: No, thanks. We don't care to vote on this.

Well, in an hour they are going to have another chance. I hope they have come to their senses. I hope the people they represent have led them to their senses. We have given them ample opportunity, and will, to offer their amendments. Let's hear their ideas. I am going to be open to them. I certainly don't want to water down this bill. I think it is a good bill. I want to try to make it stronger. If they want to water it down, we will have a vote, debate and vote, almost like the U.S. Senate. It will be amazing.

There is a second provision in here for consumer financial protection. Right now, strung out across our government are all of these agencies that are supposed to be watching out for us. We have agencies that make sure the toaster you bought over the weekend doesn't explode, catch fire, and burn down your house. We expect that, don't we? That is the Consumer Product Safety Commission. But we don't have an agency that makes sure the mortgage you signed doesn't explode and you lose your house. That is what happened: stuck in mortgage provisions.

Have you ever been through a real estate closing? There is a stack of pages turned at the corner; sign as fast as you can; at the end of 15 or 20 minutes, you have writer's cramp; a check; a key to the house, and you are out the door. Oh, you didn't check that line, the middle of the page, the 35th document that you signed? It had a prepayment penalty in there for your mortgage. Prepayment penalty, so what? Well, it just says that when the interest rate goes up, you can't refinance it. Oh, I didn't know that. Of course you didn't. Lawyers don't catch those things.

So we want to create the strongest consumer financial protection law in the history of the United States not to create a massive agency—it won't be—but to empower consumers so that when you sit down at that closing or you decide to take out a credit card or a student loan or an auto loan, you know what you are getting into. The basics are in front of you in plain English. Wall Street hates this idea like the Devil hates holy water. The notion that there would be some agency there looking over their shoulder sends fear into their hearts. I think it is a good idea. If someone wants to come here and debate it, I am ready, but I think we ought to have a debate. What are the Republicans afraid of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 7½ minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me go to my blazing close.

Let me just say that at the end of the day—currently, lobbyists are being paid $120,000 a day by Wall Street to stop this bill. So far, they have Republicans on their side and they have been successful. In an hour, I hope that all changes. Let them join us in a bipartisan effort to make this economy stronger, make the rules work for average people, and to put some protection in there for the consumers of America.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I am told there are others who want to be heard, so I would at this juncture note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. I see my friend and colleague from Oregon. I will yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I thank the chairman of the Banking Committee for the time to address an issue that I think is essential in this bill and for all of the good work he has done to bring this reform bill to the floor of the Senate.

It is time that we have an open debate on the floor of the Senate about provisions that affect the financial foundations of our entire economy. I know the chairman has been working hard. We held the vote yesterday to try to proceed with an open debate. We will hold another vote today and one tomorrow to say let's have this conversation about reforming Wall Street.

Today, I wish to address a particular point, which is limiting the ability of high-risk investments to blow up our economy.

My colleague and friend, Senator LEVIN, did a monumental service to this institution today by holding a hearing with the executives of the large investment firm Goldman Sachs, discussing practices that misled clients and bundled huge risks into our financial system.

The SEC currently has an investigation underway. The courts will determine the merit of that case. But today I want to address what the SEC could not charge Goldman Sachs with: they could not charge them with the clear conflict of interest for holding a financial stake in a position completely opposite to the very security that they themselves put together and were selling to their clients. The reason the SEC could not address this issue is because there is currently no law that says such a conflict of interest is unacceptable.

This gets to the heart of what is wrong on Wall Street today. The executives at Goldman Sachs are insisting up and down that they were not making high-risk bets themselves; instead, they were only ''market makers'' underwriting these deals. Well, no matter how often someone repeats something, that doesn't make it so. As others have said, facts are stubborn.

Goldman was holding positions for its own benefit—large positions. They were betting the market would go one way or another. But that is not making a market, where you bring buyers and sellers together; that is proprietary trading, plain and simple.

Proprietary trading, or high-risk investing, cost investment firms and commercial banks billions of dollars in losses because they bet big on housing securities, and the bets went bad.

Those losses were eventually covered, in large part, by the taxpayers through TARP. This isn't a side issue to the financial meltdown; it is a core issue. That is why we need to begin debate on Wall Street reform right now. We cannot let Goldman and other firms continue to pretend they weren't placing high-risk bets. We cannot let financial firms continue to get away with selling bad products to unsuspecting clients while betting against those products.

This issue goes to the heart of the integrity of the system, and integrity is essential for folks who have capital and want to put that capital at risk. They need to know they have a fair market into which they can invest that capital. This goes right to the core of the role of Wall Street in aggregating capital and allocating that capital to the places where it would have the highest return.

The bill before us is a very good bill. I think we can make it even stronger by including an amendment that Senator LEVIN and I have sponsored on high-risk investments and conflicts of interest. But to consider that amendment, we have to begin the debate; and that debate should begin now.

Let's not let lobbyists confuse the issue. They will try to argue that high-stakes investing was not implicated in this crisis, or that the sky will fall if we move high-risk investing outside of the banking system—I am talking about those banks that take insured deposits and make loans—but that is not the case.

I wish to read from a letter sent to me and Senator CARL LEVIN by John Reed. John Reed is former chairman and CEO of Citigroup. He speaks to those false arguments. This is what he wrote:

I write to support your efforts to rein in the high risk activities that helped cause the collapse of the world's financial system. The recent financial crisis demonstrated all too clearly the twenty year deregulatory experiment in combining critical commercial banking with equally critical, but riskier investment banking, failed.

In 2007 and 2008, losses from risky proprietary trades in the major financial firms quickly decimated the availability of credit and seriously damaged the economy far beyond the concrete canyons where those bets were made.

When a firm is focused on market gain through proprietary trading, it too often will employ every available device to achieve those gains—including taking advantage of clients and putting the firm at risk. As recent cases in the media demonstrate, risk management and conflicts of interest systems do not alone accomplish those goals.

John Reed, the former chairman and CEO of Citigroup, concludes with this:

I strongly support your efforts to put the provisions that Chairman Paul Volcker has advocated firmly into law. I believe that the PROP Trading Act (S. 3098) and your proposed Floor amendment based on that does that. The legislation provides reasonable exceptions for client-oriented services while including the necessary safeguards to protect against the dangers of high-risk assets and high-risk trading strategies. Putting these restrictions firmly into law will be good for our economy and good for our financial services industry—even though they may now argue to the contrary. Refocusing our financial firms on client services will help them restore the global leadership position that has been seriously undermined by the recent crisis.

Certainly, we need many other important reforms, including creating a strong consumer protection agency, imposing the duty of care to customers on financial providers, and reestablishing a well-regulated market for derivatives. But a strong Volcker Rule is one of the most important provisions to prevent ''too big to fail'' financial institutions, stop conflicts of interest, and support credit in our economy.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter from John Reed be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 23, 2010.

Hon. JEFF MERKLEY and Hon. CARL LEVIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS MERKLEY AND LEVIN: I write to support your efforts to rein in the high risk activities that helped cause the collapse of the world's financial system. The recent financial crisis demonstrated all too clearly the twenty year deregulatory experiment in combining critical commercial banking with equally critical, but riskier investment banking, failed.

In 2007 and 2008, losses from risky proprietary trades in the major financial firms quickly decimated the availability of credit and seriously damaged the economy far beyond the concrete canyons where those bets were made.

When a firm is focused on market gain through proprietary trading, it too often will employ every available device to achieve those gains—including taking advantage of clients and putting the fine at risk. As recent cases in the media demonstrate, risk management and conflicts of interest systems do not alone accomplish those goals.

In fact, the incentives of management and traders at today's massive, publicly traded banks are geared towards short term profits—both the firm's and their own—and not towards the long-term well-being of their employer or their clients. Boards of directors have obligations to maximize shareholder value, and no matter how much they and management attest to the contrary, they too naturally focus on short term performance. As one competitor's risky trading boosts its earnings and relative short term performance, others will be pressured—by the markets, and their own economic self-interest—to follow suit.

Without strong rules on risk, leverage, and conflicts of interest, we will see another race to the bottom, as traders, management, directors, and even shareholders will seek to attain the supersized rewards made possible by high risk investments. The incentives need to be more properly aligned—which can only best occur if proprietary trading is out of the banks, and restricted at the systemically critical non-banks.

I strongly support your efforts to put the provisions that Chairman Paul Volcker has advocated firmly into law. I believe that the PROP Trading Act (S. 3098) and your proposed Floor amendment based on that does so. The legislation provides reasonable exceptions for client-oriented services while including the necessary safeguards to protect against the dangers of high-risk assets and high-risk trading strategies. Putting these restrictions firmly into law will be good for our economy and good for our financial services industry—even though they may now argue to the contrary. Refocusing our financial firms on client services will help them restore the global leadership position that has been seriously undermined by the recent crisis.

Certainty, we need many other important reforms, including creating a strong consumer protection agency, imposing the duty of care to customers on financial providers, and reestablishing a well-regulated market for derivatives. But a strong Volcker Rule is one of the most important provisions to prevent ''too big to fail'' financial institutions, stop conflicts of interest, and support credit in our economy.

I congratulate your efforts and urge others to join you.

Sincerely,

JOHN S. REED.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, it is very helpful to have a former CEO of a company such as Citigroup weigh in on the challenges before us. John Reed, as former chairman and CEO of Citigroup, is in a position to reflect on the deregulation and the combination of the roles of lending banks and investment houses and how it contributed to creating the economic catastrophe that became the great recession.

I speak now to my colleagues to say that we need your help in creating a firewall between highly risky proprietary investments and the basic lending functions of banks. It is like storing fireworks in your living room. Fireworks are wonderful, and there is no problem with utilizing them on the Fourth of July or New Years. But you don't store them in your living room where they might end up burning down your house.

Second, we need clear conflict of interest rules that make sure that the investment houses maintain integrity with their customers, so that if they are promoting a security to their customers, they are not doing so while separately and secretly betting against it. These reforms are important. They are an important part of the financial rules of the road that will be healthy for Wall Street and for the foundation of our economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I yield 5 minutes to our colleague from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, yesterday afternoon, we attempted to bring a bill to the floor that finally holds Wall Street accountable. It is a bill that includes the strongest protection for consumers that has ever been enacted. It is an end to taxpayer bailouts, and it gives tools to individuals, the resources they need to make smart financial decisions. It is a bill that ends Wall Street's ''anything goes'' rules that have meant everybody else pays.

Unfortunately, the ''no'' vote from the other side yesterday told us they

don't want strong new protections that can't be ignored. It appears they don't want to hold Wall Street accountable for years of irresponsibility and taxpayer-funded bailouts. Instead of fundamentally changing the financial rules of the road, the other side wants to build a speed bump and pass a bill that neither reforms Wall Street nor protects Main Street.

I fear that the obstruction and unwillingness to allow us to bring a bill to the floor is simply their push to get a watered-down bill that big banks can simply step aside from and ignore. It has been rubberstamped by Wall Street lobbyists and special interests. This is just an effort to figure out how they can preserve the status quo and talk their way out of change.

I fear the delay is about allowing special interests in Washington and bankers on Wall Street and big money donors to write a compromise bill. I worry that just about everybody has been invited to the table to write that bill—except the American people. That is because the vast majority of Americans want to see the strong Wall Street reforms we have put forward pass.

In fact, just yesterday, the Washington Post released a poll that shows 63 percent of Americans want to see stronger regulations of Wall Street enacted. But do you know what. There is still a widely held view on Wall Street—as yesterday's vote shows—with many in this Chamber that the voices of the people can be drowned out by big money and twisting words about the truth about what is in this bill. Wall Street thinks they can get away with highway robbery because, unfortunately, they have. They think they can pull a fast one on Main Street. I am here to tell you they cannot. They are flatout wrong. I know because I got my values from Main Street. I grew up in Bothell, a small town of 1,000 people. The values we learned on Main Street are good ones that are also good for your business and for your customers.

We learned that an honest business is a successful one. We learned that our customers are not prey and businesses not predators. We learned that personal responsibility means owning up to mistakes and making them right.

We believe these values are strong throughout our country today. Those values exist in such small towns as the one I grew up in and big cities in every State. Everyone who voted against moving forward with this bill yesterday is going to hear from people who hold those values today. I am sure they will tell you in no uncertain terms that it is time to pass a bill with strong reforms for a system that is out of control. It is time to protect our consumers, time to end bailouts, and time to restore personal responsibility and bring back accountability.

I am very hopeful in the coming few days all of those who voted no will move forward and listen to the hardworking men and women in this country so we can put forward a strong reform bill on Wall Street and protect the American people and the millions of people who have lost their jobs and their security and homes in the last few years from ever having this happen again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Let me thank my colleague from the State of Washington. I appreciate very much her comments and her leadership.

I see my friend, Senator BROWNBACK, as well. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the last 7½ minutes be reserved for myself before the vote. Is that the correct time; 7 or 7½ minutes? 7½ minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Madam President, may I inquire how much time remains on our side on the debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-five minutes.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I thank the Chair, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my colleague from Connecticut, whom I think the world of. He is a wonderful family man, whom I saw out walking this morning. He is a great human being, a great Senator, and of great lineage. I am sorry to see Senator DODD leaving.

I have one particular area of this bill about which I wish to raise a point. Auto dealers are in town today. We have a series of auto dealers from across the country who are here and they are deeply concerned about the consumer financial products piece of this particular legislation. They are concerned because it is going to hit them. I would point out to my colleagues about this that I have purchased a car—I presume everyone in this body has purchased a car—and probably a number of us on credit, although maybe not everybody. But nearly everyone has gone into a dealership and bought a new or used car and asked for financing on that new or used car and have gotten it from the local dealership. Ninety-four percent of those cars that are financed that way, that paper is actually from some relationship the dealership has upstream. It is from a bank, a major consumer auto lending entity or from somebody else who does the financing. The local dealership just has the paper there, and they are the ones that originate it. They sell the car and arrange for somebody else to do the financing. They don't do it—or 94 percent don't do that. Six percent of car dealerships do their own local financing.

I have an amendment that I will put forward, if we get a chance—or I would prefer this actually be built into the base bill—where the local auto dealership that doesn't loan their own money isn't required to comply with the consumer financial products requirement of this bill. It will add another level of regulation onto auto dealers that are already struggling to try to get cars to market so people can purchase and they can provide financing for individuals.

If we add another level of regulation, it will just mean more cost, and they are already regulated. This product would be regulated upstream already. The financial institutions that are writing the note and the paper are already regulated under this bill. Why would we do the double regulation in the bill on top of the local regulation they already have?

That is why the auto dealers are here in town today, saying they didn't cause the financial crisis, they are not banks, and they do not think they ought to be a part of this. They are quintessential Main Street auto dealers. They are part of the Main Street fabric. We have lost a lot of auto dealers across the country during this financial downturn. We spent $3 billion trying to support the auto industry and now we have this heavy-handed regulation that will cost auto sales. It doesn't seem to make sense that we would penalize Main Street for Wall Street's problems. They are small businesses, the auto dealers are, in cities and towns throughout the country. We should be talking about how we can support them and extend credit in the marketplace rather than regulate and tamping down on their business.

My amendment is simple. It keeps these new banking regulations from touching auto dealers that do not loan their own money. That is all it does. If they loan their own money, they are subject to it. If they do not loan their own money, if some other major bank, financial house or institution does it, that financial house or bank or institution is subject to the regulation. But the auto dealer that is simply there trying to get a car sold and providing this instrument that comes from somebody else, they are not regulated, so they do not have the extra cost. So it is not double regulation from the same bill.

If an auto dealer does lend that money, as I mentioned, they will be regulated. This amendment applies only to auto dealers that facilitate loans from larger financial companies. Why should we have to amend this? If I am hearing anything across my State—and I am traveling a lot across Kansas—people are fed up with heavy-handed, big government. They have had it up to their necks and beyond with heavy-handed, big government. Why would we do this on top of everything else?

These auto dealers are the retail outlets. They are the storefronts that process the paperwork for various well-known brands with large finance arms. Under my amendment, these finance arms would still be regulated, but the dealers that process the paperwork wouldn't. But it is still regulated upstream. The auto dealerships themselves have been crippled from sales

this last year, crippled from the financial crisis we hit. We have been trying to help and support them. This is a break in the cardinal rule that if you want less of something, tax and regulate it. That is what this bill will do. We will have less auto dealerships if you are going to tax and regulate them. It doesn't make any sense.

Under my amendment, auto dealers would still be regulated by the FTC and various State laws, so consumers would still have protection to ensure that truth in lending still applies. So if you are concerned about auto dealers and what they are doing, the writing and the paper retailwise, they remain regulated by the FTC and various State laws and consumer protection laws that are currently in place. I think those are things that should remain in place, and they do remain in place. We don't need another level on top of that. Why do we need to create a duplicative regulation for auto dealers, where we regulate each dollar of each auto loan twice? This is what frustrates people so much.

I have people raise the concern about what happens outside military bases and auto loans outside military bases. We have several major military bases in the State of Kansas. We are very proud of our military bases and our military. They are saying: OK. We want to get at auto loans and dealers there. Well, they are regulated. They are currently regulated. They are currently regulated under the FTC and various State laws.

If somebody is concerned about a small auto dealer that sits right outside a military base and tries to get financing for military members and they do not like what the financing is, that is currently regulated. It is already in many States, where a State's attorney general can go at these right now. They know where they are located. It is not as if they are hiding and moving around. They are located right outside military bases. If you want to hit them and regulate them, go to the State attorney general, go to the State consumer products agency, go to the State consumer finance agencies and have them address it. Why on Earth, with the big financial problem we have had that was created by Wall Street and international traders, would you want to hammer the local auto dealers?

As I put this amendment forward, it was interesting to me that we had a number of groups say people who sell recreational vehicles are also interested in being brought into this amendment and being excluded or motorcycle financers or any number of groups because they are seeing the same problem. They are small businesspeople. They are going to be regulated by this enormous Federal entity that was targeted at Wall Street and, instead, as small businesses in their local communities, they are going to get hit. They are going to take the hammer, and they are not set up to handle it. They do not have huge staffs in these areas. They have small staffs to take care of this, and now we are going to put a big regulatory entity on top of them when it is already regulated upstream.

This makes no sense, and it will do no good. It will cost a lot more, it will make financing less available to individuals, and it will hurt these businesses. It will hurt car sales, it will hurt motorcycle sales, and it will hurt the economy for no good reason. I ask my colleagues to focus in on what is happening in this area of the consumer products and their financing. Do we want to hit auto dealers? I don't think so. I don't think that was the target of this bill. It certainly wasn't the cause of the financial crisis we had.

Why would we have to hit them? We don't. Listen to your local auto dealers. They are here in town today. Hear their story about what is taking place. Let's help the auto dealers, as we have been trying to do, and let's not hurt them with a heavyhanded regulation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Madam President, let me begin, first of all, by complimenting my colleague from Kansas, who has been indefatigable in the argument and the cause that he was espousing just now. He has talked to all of us about this problem, and he has made it very clear this shouldn't be an intention within this legislation. We shouldn't be trying to expand the reach of a bill—that was supposed to deal with Wall Street—all the way to our local car dealers on Main Street. I appreciate the fact that sometimes legislation sweeps with too broad a brush, but this is something we can fix and we need to fix it.

In fact, it is not just the auto dealers. The National Federation of Independent Businesses, which bills itself as the voice of small business, and frequently does represent small business causes, has written a letter to us, on April 26, describing this unduly large reach of the legislation before us.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the letter I have just referred to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KYL. Madam President, another word about what is said in this letter. They point out the fact that the consumer protection part of the legislation goes far beyond protecting consumers from Wall Street. It essentially goes to anybody who lends money on an installment basis where you have more than four installment payments. Let me quote from the letter.

> NFIB is concerned about the overly broad reach of the new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Providing consumers with clear and accurate financial information is an important goal, but because of the reach of the Bureau's authority many small businesses will find themselves subject to its regulations. In addition to the many new and duplicative regulatory burdens placed on community banks, the Bureau is charged with regulating any retailer or merchant that finances a purchase subject to a financing charge or written payment plan with more than four payments. Many small business retailers and merchants—such as medical professionals, hardware, electronics, and jewelry stores—struggling through the current economic climate would be subject to these new regulations.
>
> These small businesses had nothing to do with the Wall Street meltdown and should not be faced with onerous new and duplicative regulations because of a problem that they did not cause.

The first concern I have with this legislation is this overbreadth in the consumer protections. Wall Street can take care of itself. It's fine to provide protections against Wall Street, but surely we can reach an agreement that we don't intend this legislation to reach into Main Street, to the extent it does. I would urge my colleagues to listen to the concerns expressed by the NFIB and let's try to deal with those concerns in a way that would enable us to be more supportive of the legislation.

The second point I would like to make has to do with the so-called too big to fail or taxpayer bailouts. There are different ways of talking about this. I find it interesting that some of my colleagues have apparently a great reverence for a pollster and wordsmith by the name of Frank Luntz. Frank Luntz is a person whom I know, and he is very good with words. He is a good pollster and so on. At one time, he apparently wrote a memo that suggested that one way to attack a bill such as the bill that is before us—I think my colleague, the chairman of the committee, has noted this memo was written by Luntz before there even was a bill—was to use bailout language. I haven't seen the memo, but I understand that is what it said.

No. 2, Republicans have used this bailout language; therefore, No. 3, we are blindly following Luntz. Well, if I suggested that to my professor in philosophy 101, I would get flunked out of the course for the basic failure in logic. This is a logic fallacy—something followed something else; therefore, it was because of it. The law that is the famous saying—post hoc ergo propter hoc—obviously, a fallacy.

So I defend those of my colleagues who have used language that may be somewhat similar to Luntz on the basis that just because they used the language didn't mean that Luntz caused them to use it. It may be Luntz figured out the same thing the rest of us figured out—this bill does not end taxpayer bailouts. That is the problem. Taxpayers are still on the hook.

I can understand the sensitivity of those who helped to write the bill who are subject to the criticism in this language. But the solution to it is obvious: Get the taxpayers out of this so they are no longer on the hook for any bailouts and then the argument will not last anymore, whether Luntz likes it or not. That could be done through a

process of negotiation. The bill was supposed to stop additional taxpayer liability. Let's make sure it does.

In this regard, I have to object a little to some of the pejorative language used by some Democratic Senators.

We have rhetoric about Republicans' motives. I am not going to suggest which Senators are talking about it, but one of them spoke specifically with respect to the Republican leader by name.

When you are questioning the motives of someone, suggesting the only reason they did it is because they read somebody's memo or because some lobbyist from Wall Street has been visiting them or suggesting it was because of campaign contributions, that gets very close to a violation of Senate rules. Senators can take responsible positions on bills irrespective of what a lobbyist might have said or somebody might have written in a memorandum.

I would like to have an honest debate about the bill rather than suggesting the motivations of Senators with respect to the positions they have taken.

One of my colleagues—in fact, it was the Senator from Illinois—asked the question, with regard to the vote we are about to take here, What are Republicans afraid of? In effect, are we afraid of going to the bill and then having votes on amendments? Let me answer that question very specifically.

One thing at least I am concerned about is that we will not get to have votes on amendments. We were promised, in the health care debate, this 2,400- or 2,700-page bill, that we would get lots of amendments to try to deal with the concerns we had. I believe it was seven—after seven amendments, once the leader got his 60 votes, there were no more votes. There was no more amendment process. There was no more debate. At that point, cloture was filed, the vote was taken, and he had his 60 votes. End of discussion.

There is nothing to suggest that if we go to this bill, we are going to have a fair amendment process. If that were made very clear by the majority leader, by the distinguished chairman of the committee, and Republicans had some sense that we would fare better than we did during the health care debate, then that would be one thing. But with the experience of the health care debate behind us, I think you can understand why we would be a little bit wary of ''just trust us, go to the bill, and we will let you have all the amendments you want to try to fix the bill.'' That is the first point.

Let me get back just a little bit to this issue about the bailout because I made an assertion and I need to back it up.

I really don't think any of us want to continue to have taxpayers on the hook. But this is complicated, and it may well be that the continuing authority, for example, of the FDIC that is specifically written into the legislation, while not intended to result in taxpayers being on the hook, it nevertheless does.

Let me refer to a couple of articles. One is by a visiting professor, a Georgetown University business school professor, Phillip Swagel. The head of the article is ''Yes, It's a Bailout Bill.'' He says:

. . . [T]he discretion given to the government in the Senate proposal opens the door to undesirable actions such as allowing the administration to write checks to favored parties. This concern is not theoretical: such mischief took place in the bankruptcies of Chrysler and General Motors, as the two auto companies were used as conduits to transfer billions of dollars from TARP to the president's political supporters.

He is talking there about labor unions.

A better approach would be a resolution regime centered on bankruptcy.

There is a lot of debate about exactly how to do this liquidation process, unwinding process, quasi-bankruptcy process, and so on. There are a lot of good arguments. It is difficult to do, and I appreciate that the chairman of the Banking Committee has had to deal with a lot of different ideas from different Senators about how to do it, as well as a lot of columnists, and so on.

But it is a fact that under the existing legislation, there is still liability for taxpayers here that concerns some of us. We would like to see a genuine discussion about taking that out. If it is a concern of all of us and we all agree that should not be, let's have a little good faith here and get it out before we come to the floor and have to try an amendment where there are 41 Republicans, 59 people who organize with Democrats, and we are not at all assured of being able to get it out of the bill.

Here is another article. It is in the National Review Online, April 26. The article is entitled ''The Case Against the Dodd Bill.'' They make several points in here, but one of them is this resolution authority.

But the resolution authority designed by the Dodd bill might actually create more moral hazard than it would eliminate, because it would give the FDIC too much flexibility in how it resolves a failed firm.

It goes on to say:

As structured, this authority would allow the Government to bail out nonbank creditors, and worse, to play favorites among them, just as we saw when the Obama administration gift-wrapped large stakes in the automakers for its union allies at the expense of secured creditors.

My point here is simply that there are a lot of people who have looked at this and have come to the conclusion, as I have, that the bill is not tightly enough written; that, as written, it has too much in it that would allow various Federal entities, including the FDIC, pretty unlimited authority to use taxpayer money to resolve or liquidate or deal with companies that are deemed necessary to deal with. I won't say ''too big to fail'' because allegedly we are eliminating that.

Surely we can get together and try to resolve this issue in a way that leaves no doubt that the ultimate conclusion is there is no more taxpayer liability. I think we would all like to see that. It is a legitimate debate to have, and I don't think we should criticize those of us who are raising these questions as somehow doing so because some lobbyist told us to. I don't care about the lobbyist or Wall Street here. What I care about is my constituent taxpayers being on the hook for a bailout of one of these entities or the creditors of these entities or the shareholders of these entities.

This is the final point I wish to make. This is like the Sherlock Holmes story of the dog that didn't bark. There is something missing from this legislation. If you look through the entire bill—and probably the biggest reason for the failure of our financial system was the fact that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were allowed to go whole hog, take on a bunch of bad loans, and end up with an implicit guarantee that ultimately became an explicit guarantee by the taxpayers of America. You won't find any resolution of that problem in this bill.

Why is it that, when everybody knows this problem began with a lot of loans being made to people who could not afford them—those loans then being acquired by Fannie and Freddie and then sold off in fancy, esoteric instruments on the market here—why is it that there is nothing in here about the risk of Fannie and Freddie and the risk they still pose? It is way north, apparently, of $400 billion—I have heard in the trillions of dollars—and this would be a taxpayer liability. If that is the case, shouldn't we be focusing reform on the entities that actually created the problem, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac? Why isn't that being done?

The former chairman of the Banking Committee has explained. The Senator from Alabama, when he was chairman of the committee, tried to get more regulatory authority over Fannie and Freddie. Members of the then-minority, now-majority party stopped him and said: No, we don't need any more regulatory authority. I especially remember a quote from the chairman of the House banking committee that was especially colorful in this regard, that he thought we could give them a little bit more latitude here, that he didn't think any more regulation was necessary.

So the question is, If we knew there was a big problem a-brewing here, we didn't do anything about it at the time and after the fact discovered, of course, that is exactly what the problem was, why wouldn't we want to make sure that it will never happen again and that we somehow resolve the problem?

One of the answers given is that it is an awfully big problem to try to tackle. This is an awfully big bill. If we can reach into Main Street, to your local car dealer or dentist because your kid's orthodontia takes more than 4 months to pay on installments, surely we can

deal with Fannie and Freddie, the biggest culprits of all in this deal. Why aren't Fannie and Freddie dealt with here? Let's not think we will do that next time. I think it is pretty clear that whatever we do here, we are probably going to be stuck with for a long time, and the failure to deal with this is a glaring omission in the legislation.

Nor do I think that if we grant the motion to proceed to the bill and one of us offers an amendment to cover Fannie and Freddie, that it would fare too well in this body. I will not specifically ask the chairman of the committee or anybody else whether they would support such an amendment, but the reality is that it is unlikely this body would actually regulate Fannie and Freddie. That is a reason why some of us oppose the legislation.

Unless there is some ability to negotiate something in advance of the bill actually coming to the floor, with very little likelihood that it would be done on the floor, it seems to me that this is another reason why those of us who have opposed cloture have every basis for coming here and saying that until we get some satisfaction, some suggestion that this problem is going to be dealt with, why would we want to proceed to legislation which obviously isn't even going to fix the biggest part of the problem that was created in the first place? That is a third reason why I think at least up to now Republicans have said we are not prepared to go to this legislation.

EXHIBIT 1

NATIONAL FEDERATION
OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, April 26, 2010.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB), the nation's leading small business advocacy organization, we urge the Senate to vote against cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 3217, the Restoring American Financial Stability Act of 2010. The current bill is too far reaching and imposes major new costs on small businesses.

After the near collapse of many financial firms and the impact this had on the overall economy, small business recognizes the need to ensure that our laws address the problems that can arise from such excess and to protect the broader economy from the failures of one sector. But these changes to financial services industry should be focused on the specific problems caused by Wall Street and the lessons learned from these events. New laws that target industries and businesses on Main Street that did not create the problem would not solve the problems and potentially creates new ones.

NFIB is concerned about the overly broad reach of the new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Providing consumers with clear and accurate financial information is an important goal, but because of the reach of the Bureau's authority many small businesses will find themselves subject to its regulations. In addition to the many new and duplicative regulatory burdens placed on community banks, the Bureau is charged with regulating any retailer or merchant that finances a purchase subject to a financing charge or a written payment plan with more than four payments. Many small business retailers and merchants—such as medical professionals, hardware, electronics, and jewelry stores—struggling through the current economic climate would be subject to these new regulations.

These small businesses had nothing to do with the Wall Street meltdown and should not be faced with onerous new and duplicative regulations because of a problem they did not cause. Further, as the most recent NFIB Small Business Economic Trends (SBET) survey shows, small businesses continue to struggle with lost sales and such regulations could make these problems worse—stifling any potential small business recovery. Placing more restrictions on the ability to attract and keep customers to small businesses will inhibit a strong recovery.

NFIB also has concerns with a provision in the bill that reduces the pool of angel investors that can provide start-up capital or invest in a small business. The provision sets higher wage and asset minimum requirements on angel investors, thus eliminating many highly qualified angel investors from providing needed financing. This provision would hamper the entrepreneurial opportunities for angel investment opportunities for many small and start-up businesses, thus adding another road block to finding alternative capital financing when bank lending and other sources of financing remains hard to get in this economy.

Small business still has not recovered from the economic downturn and has paid the price for the bad decisions and subsequent bailout of many large financial institutions. Addressing problems in the financial services sector makes sense, but such regulations should not overreach to include small business or leave small business owners paying for the excess of companies deemed too big to fail.

Thank you for taking into consideration our concerns, and we ask the Senate to oppose the motion to proceed to the current bill.

Sincerely,

SUSAN ECKERLY,
Senior Vice President,
Public Policy.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, might I inquire how much is remaining on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURRIS). There is 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KYL. There is 10½ minutes on our side? I will yield to the chairman of the committee for a moment.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from Arizona. My intention was—let me say a couple of things.

Mr. KYL. What I might do is yield the floor and reserve the remainder of the Republican time. In that way, if one of my colleagues comes and I have to leave, that time will be remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. DODD. I have reserved the last 7½ minutes. I think otherwise we might run out of time, I say to my friend from Arizona. I will just take 1 minute, if I may.

I want to tell him and say this to him. I have been here 30 years. I have chaired bills on the floor. I never chaired a committee before 36 months ago when I became chairman of the Banking Committee under our system. But I want to say this to my friend from Arizona and I want him to convey this to his colleagues through this vehicle: I would never deprive another Senator of the opportunity to offer amendments on the floor. I revere this body. I began my service in this body sitting on those steps over there as a page. And how the Senate works is because we all participate in the debate.

I know there are those who have this concern and fear. Obviously, you do not have unlimited debate forever. But the point is, amendments ought to be offered. I have colleagues on my side, politically, of the aisle who want to make this bill stronger, in their views. I know there are people who think I have gone too far with the bill and want to water it down a bit. That debate can only occur if we are on the bill. But I want my colleague to know, as one of the leaders of the minority, that I would never deprive another colleague of the opportunity to be heard, offer their amendment and their thoughts in that process.

Secondly, on the too big to fail, this goes back and forth. Senator SHELBY and I have worked on this. I see the possibility that—if there are some workability amendments that tighten that up, I am all for that. Senator BOXER of California has an amendment that would say that nothing in this bill can ever allow taxpayer money to be used. I am for that amendment. I don't know how many different ways we can say it. I think all of us agree we don't want to see our country go through that again. So the only limitations here are, do we think we are finding additional language here that will satisfy us that we have done the job we think we have intended to do? Senator SHELBY and I talked about how to do this. Again, if that is the holdup, that should not hold us up because we are both committed to that.

Thirdly, I want to say that there is a document circulating with some ideas of a Republican alternative that includes getting into the government-sponsored enterprises. I say to my friend, it is a huge issue, the GSEs. It is not just Fannie and Freddie; there are others. It needs a lot of work.

But this proposal I have read—and it is not legislative language—a lot of it, I don't have any problem whatsoever. I am not sure who the author of this is, but it has been circulated. Again, I am not endorsing everything here because it is just a concept, but if that is an amendment, the better part of what I have seen, about 90 percent of what I have seen here, I have no problem with at all. That can be an amendment included as part of our bill. But, again, I have to get to it. The difficult problem I have is everybody is coming with things they would like to add to or subtract from the bill, but, as my colleague knows, having been a leader around here for a long time, you have to get to the product. That is my frustration here.

Lastly, I am not going to bore him with too much detail here, but in section 1027—and I won't read all of it—the last lines on limitations, because of

the concerns people have about dentists or other people being drawn into our consumer protection section say:

Notwithstanding subparagraph (B), the Bureau may not exercise any rulemaking, supervisory, enforcement, or other authority under this title with respect to a merchant, retailer, or seller of nonfinancial goods or services that is not engaged significantly in offering or providing consumer financial products or services.

And, again, to insulate against the very worry you would have, and others have talked about, the NFNIB, someone who has four installment payments—it may be your local grocer, people who show up and buy food and do not pay for it, but usually at the end of the month or the end of 6 months, you have to be in the business of financial services or products to be affected by the legislation.

Now, again, I know there are Members who have problems with that part of the bill. People on my side who want to strengthen it think I have not gone far enough on the bill. One of the difficult jobs is trying to reconcile differences that exist. But I cannot even begin to do so if we cannot even talk about it.

So that is my frustration as the chairman of a committee, trying to get us to a point where all of us want to be, I am sure. We do not want to leave here having said we did not really deal with this problem that everyone in the country—I know, Arizona, what you have been through in your housing issues is staggering. Florida, California, Arizona, I think Nevada probably rank in the most difficult States where housing prices have declined and foreclosures have occurred.

I know my friend from Arizona feels as strongly about this as I do. But I assure him, I will not deprive anybody of an amendment to be offered at all in the process. Secondly, we will try the workability issues on too big to fail and, again, language we have worked on on the consumer protection, and we think we took care of those dentists and others who were worried about it.

But, again, others may have amendments and ideas. I will have to consider them on the Senate floor, and all of us will have to vote on them. But I appreciate him giving me a little time to express my thought.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. If I may respond very briefly, I appreciate the Senator's comments. I am sure the chairman would acknowledge the basis for some Republican concerns about the ability to offer, not an unlimited number of amendments for the purpose of filibustering the bill, but, rather, enough to try to solve what are perceived to be the problems of the bill.

Part of the problem is a lack of trust. There are some on the Democratic side who have said they believe the intent of the Republican leadership, or Republicans, is to filibuster this bill so there would be no bill. It is hard to prove a negative, but I do not know how many times Leader MCCONNELL and I or Ranking Member SHELBY have said that is not our intention. Everybody acknowledges that there is work to be done in the regulatory regimes that govern the trade in these very esoteric instruments, the derivatives and others, and regulating financial institutions and dealing with the problem when some of them become financially troubled. Everybody acknowledges the need to do that.

I firmly believe at the end of the day there will be legislation passed that deals with that. I do not think there is anything the minority could do, even if it wanted to, to stop legislation from ultimately passing. So to those colleagues on the other side who believe it is the Republicans' intent to stop the legislation, to have no legislation, all I can say is, yet one more time, that is not true.

I do not know of a single Republican who believes that, of a single Republican who does not want to see legislation. Nor do I believe this is analogous to health care in that there was a strictly partisan approach taken there. The lines were drawn, and we do not have to debate how we got there. The reality was, at the end of the day, Republicans were trying to do everything we could to stop the legislation, and the majority did everything within its power to ultimately get it passed.

That is not the same situation I see with this bill because, first of all, I think Members are a little closer than was the case on health care. Secondly, there has been at least a negotiating process between the chairman and the ranking member and others that has suggested ways to at least approach some of these problems.

Republicans are suffering under no illusions that with a 59-to-41 Senate lineup we should get 100 percent of the way or even 60 or 50 percent of the way. Senator SHELBY has made it clear he understands he needs to compromise because the majority has more votes than the minority does, but to try to get at least a proportional or representative sample of Republican ideas in here.

Moreover, as my colleagues' conversations just revealed, there is a lot of overlap in intent. I do not think we intend the bill to reach into Main Street to the degree that some of us are concerned it still does. I do not think there is the intention to see taxpayers still on the hook to the extent some of us think the bill still does. And to the extent the chairman of the committee says there have to be ways to ensure that does not happen, and we can do that, I accept what he says in good faith. I also accept in good faith his view that amendments, within reason, should not be limited.

Again, there is no intent on the Republican side to filibuster the bill to prevent a vote from ever occurring. I do not think we would have that ability even if we wanted to do that. So we have to get over this problem of trust. Another way to do that is to lead by beginning to make a difference in the way that the—not the legislation is discussed, but the Senators are discussed, the motivations for different Senators.

It would be easy to come to the floor and talk about motivations. It would also be wrong. I think the leaders in the debate, starting with the leadership and then the chairman and ranking of the committee and on down, perhaps have had some responsibility to take the lead in making sure in the discussions on the merits of the bill—when I raise a particular issue, as the chairman just did, to say: Well, let me go to the language and see if I think we do have it already covered, rather than: I know why you are saying that, Senator from Arizona. You have some ill motive. The Senator would not say that. So perhaps we can begin to reach a better sense of trust where we can begin to work through these things in a much more constructive way by taking the leadership and getting a more civil conversation.

When I say that, I point to nobody in particular as in violation but rather point to myself and the other leadership as the place to start with setting that tone. All of these things could begin to build the trust that might enable us to begin to engage each other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority's time has expired.

Mr. KYL. How time flies when you are having fun.

And to conclude a process that will be constructive and helpful to the American people.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, let me thank the distinguished Republican leader for his comments. Part of what he just said is worthy of note. This institution suffers. We operate on unanimous consent. That is the way it works. And inherent in unanimous consent is trust. It is the only way this institution has ever operated.

There has been, I think we would all have to acknowledge, a breakdown for a lot of different reasons. We have to get back to it. This is an opportunity to do that.

Senator SHELBY and I have a very good working relationship. We trust each other. We talk to each other. We spent an hour together. We are meeting again at 5:00, after this vote today, to talk about one way or the other where the bill is. There has to be a return to that comity and understanding, while we have differences of opinion.

If the American people believe we cannot trust each other, when I say I will—I was asked at our conference lunch, again, the very question that my colleague from Arizona raised: Will I be allowed to offer an amendment, Senator DODD? Absolutely, you will.

So it is a concern I know that everybody has about whether they can be heard on these matters. I would never,

as a person who reveres this institution, want to deprive anybody of an opportunity to be heard on a matter as important as this.

We have amendments I know are offered. I heard them—the cosponsors—one Senator today listed the cosponsors of an amendment he wants to offer. There are more Republicans than Democrats on the amendment dealing with the Federal Reserve System. I have some concerns about that amendment. But the fact is, it has bipartisan support for an amendment they want to offer. There are a lot of these ideas. I know within the Republican circle there are divisions as well as to what ought to be in this bill. We have them on our side as well. It is not as if there is some bright line here, and there is one solid thought process over here, and an alternative one over here. We have about as many different views on this bill as there may be Members in this body.

But all I ask for is to get to this bill. Let's get to this debate. Again, the leader got up and said this was a partisan bill. I have worked very hard to avoid that. Back in November when I introduced the bill, there were objections on the minority side as well as on the majority side. We put it aside. We have spent from November up until just a few days ago trying to put a product together that would reflect all of this different thinking. It is a vastly different bill from the one I introduced in November. I know it is not yet to everyone's satisfaction, but we need to debate this bill, in my view.

It will take a long time. This is not going to be a short debate. I know that. But we need to allocate the time talking about what is in the bill or not in the bill rather than questioning each other's motives as to why we are not on the bill, it seems to me.

So my plea is, again, as Senator SHELBY has said, I think we are about 80 percent in agreement. I believe that to be the case. If we are 80 percent in agreement, that ought to be enough of a basis upon which to move forward. If we were all in disagreement about everything, well, I might still believe we ought to debate it. So, again, I see my colleague—I realize he has to go, and we are going to vote in a couple of minutes. But I thank him for spending the time with me and to hear me out on these points. I am grateful to him for that.

Mr. President, those are sort of the points that I intended to make in these closing minutes of this discussion, once again. We had it yesterday, and here we are again this afternoon. With all of the things that people are going through in the country, it seems to me, again, this bill, which has been the product of a year and a half of work—this was not drafted over a weekend or some short period of time trying to reflect the interests of my colleagues—is deserving of our consideration.

I am not asking to vote for this with this next vote. No one will be asked to vote for this. No one will be asked to vote for any of the various amendments I am sure will be offered, and I will welcome, as part of this debate, and that Senator SHELBY and I as managers of the bill will consider them.

All we are being asked to do, in the next 7 minutes or less, is to give this product a chance to be discussed. This product reflects a year and a half of effort to answer the question: What went wrong that caused our economy and our Nation to go through the worst economic crisis since the early part of the last century? That is a legitimate question being asked. What are the gaps? What steps are we taking to fill in those gaps? Are there cops on the beat to protect us? Do they have the authority and the resources to do the job? Is there an early warning system? These are all issues upon which I suspect, based on my conversations over a year and a half—or more than that now—on which we have a lot of agreement.

I do not know of anyone in this Chamber who wants to support a bill that does not end too big to fail. If they exist, I have not heard their voices. I do not think there is anyone here who does not believe we should not have an early warning system so we can identify problems before they become the large ones that cost us as much as it has over the last year and a half.

I think all of us—I have heard my colleagues say they are for a consumer protection agency. I believe them. We have a consumer protection agency in this bill. There is a debate about how much authority we want to give them, the interface, the interaction with prudential regulators. Those are all arguments within the context of whether we ought to have a consumer protection agency.

There is not a position over here that I know of—maybe some have it—that they are just flatout against a consumer protection agency. Senator SHELBY has told me, and others on the Banking Committee: We are for a consumer protection agency. They have differences about what ought to happen within that. That is the purpose for having the debate. We are told again, we heard it a moment ago: We ought to have the bright sunshine on derivatives, these exotic instruments that were used, went from $91 billion in 1998, to close to $600 trillion—that is with a T—11 years later.

That shadow economy contributed significantly to what we went through. Based on what I have heard, everyone thinks we ought to do something about that and not leave the situation as it is today, as it was 18 months ago, because nothing has changed since then, putting our Nation at risk once again. So we agree on that as well.

Let's have transparency. Let's have accountability. There are differences; I would be naive and foolish to suggest otherwise. But everyone seems to agree we ought to do something about it. So if we look at the major thrust of our bill—end too big to fail; set up an early warning system to avoid the problems we saw in the past; deal with these exotic instruments out there and have some agency that at long last might keep an eye out for the average citizen in this country, that watches their credit cards, their mortgages, and so many other financial activities they engaged in that became deceptive and fraudulent, that they suffered terribly.

So we all agree on the basic goals outlined in this bill. Differences exist, at least in one or two of the years. Too big to fail, I do not think there is any real disagreement. I do not think there is any disagreement on the early warning system, as I have heard the debate. The differences exist in what happens inside the consumer protection agency and what happens in the area of the shadow economy and dealing with the derivatives and other items, but not whether we want to do something.

So that is what we ought to be doing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority's time has expired.

Mr. DODD. I ask unanimous consent for 30 additional seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. We have spent the last day debating whether we ought to have this. Let's vote to invoke cloture and begin the long debate we need to have. I urge my colleagues to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the motion on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 3217 is agreed to, the motion to reconsider is agreed to.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 3217 upon reconsideration.

The yeas and nays are ordered under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 126 Leg.]

YEAS—57

Akaka	Dodd	Kohl
Baucus	Dorgan	Landrieu
Begich	Durbin	Lautenberg
Bennet	Feingold	Leahy
Bingaman	Feinstein	Levin
Boxer	Franken	Lieberman
Brown (OH)	Gillibrand	Lincoln
Burris	Hagan	McCaskill
Byrd	Harkin	Menendez
Cantwell	Inouye	Merkley
Cardin	Johnson	Mikulski
Carper	Kaufman	Murray
Casey	Kerry	Nelson (FL)
Conrad	Klobuchar	Pryor

Reed	Shaheen	Udall (NM)
Reid	Specter	Warner
Rockefeller	Stabenow	Webb
Sanders	Tester	Whitehouse
Schumer	Udall (CO)	Wyden

NAYS—41

Alexander	DeMint	McCain
Barrasso	Ensign	McConnell
Bond	Enzi	Murkowski
Brown (MA)	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Brownback	Grassley	Risch
Bunning	Gregg	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Sessions
Chambliss	Hutchison	Shelby
Coburn	Inhofe	Snowe
Cochran	Isakson	Thune
Collins	Johanns	Vitter
Corker	Kyl	Voinovich
Cornyn	LeMieux	Wicker
Crapo	Lugar	

NOT VOTING—2

Bayh	Bennett

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 57, the nays are 41. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to upon reconsideration.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, is it appropriate for me to speak on the bill for a few minutes, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to proceed is pending.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you very much.

Mr. President, on a big bill, I find this a very puzzling situation where for the second time the other side of the aisle has essentially said, We won't let you go to a vote on a motion to proceed to debate until there is agreement on the bill. How can there be agreement on the bill if there isn't debate and if the majority at least isn't allowed to present its position? I find on a bill of this size and the complexity of the bill, to refuse to go to a debate on the bill to be an amazing thing. I hope the other side of the aisle will begin to see that and relent.

I had a chance today to listen to some of the questions being asked in the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of Goldman Sachs, and if anything should show the need for this bill, it is what is going on in a Subcommittee of this body. Yet, out here, we cannot even begin the debate on the bill. We cannot hear from the chairman of the committee. We cannot hear from the ranking member. We cannot understand both points of view. We are prevented essentially from debating one of the most important bills this Congress will pass.

I wanted to come to the floor today to say that, as well as to speak in support of the derivatives position put forward on Monday by Chairman LINCOLN and Chairman DODD as part of the financial and commodities market reform package.

I think it is fair to say I have long advocated for more aggressive regulation of derivatives which, in the main, are very complex financial instruments exempted from Federal oversight through loopholes in the Commodities Futures Modernization Act of 2000. In other words, prior to the year 2000, we could regulate these. After the year 2000, they floated free, nontransparent, no audit trail, no antifraud, no antimanipulation oversight whatsoever. The Dodd-Lincoln bill is the most aggressive and comprehensive proposal to regulate the out-of-control derivatives market that has been offered yet in this Congress, and I strongly support it.

The Dodd-Lincoln bill will require robust Federal oversight. It will establish transparency. It will reduce systemic risk. I believe this bill is the best chance to tackle these unregulated markets that were responsible for bringing down Enron, AIG, Lehman Brothers, with terrible repercussions for the American economy and millions of hard-working families. This bill will also rein in reckless traders who lack a moral compass.

Today there is nothing more important than restoring faith in the American economy, and we cannot do it without this bill. To do that, we have to restore America's faith in our ability to take strong corrective action against the bad actors who perpetrated this crisis. Yes, this is our moment to act, yet we cannot. The other side of the aisle will not let it happen.

Derivatives were exempted, as I said, from regulation in the Commodities Futures Modernization Act of 2000. That law created massive regulatory loopholes such as the Enron loophole which prohibited the Commodity Futures Trading Commission from overseeing electronic exchanges; the London loophole, which allowed for unregulated trading of U.S. commodities on overseas exchanges, and the swaps loophole, which allowed for unregulated bilateral trades through brokers, swap dealers, and direct party-to-party negotiations. Together, these loopholes have been responsible for some of our Nation's worst economic crises. They must be closed.

I first became aware of the problem of unregulated derivatives during the Western energy crisis. The years were 2000 and 2001, when Enron traders fleeced Californians for approximately $40 billion in artificially inflated electricity and natural gas prices.

Without Federal oversight rules in place, it took us some time to realize what was going on in California, and then when we did, the party in power would not believe us. We learned the hard way the dangers of having no paper trail, no one to raise the alarm, no cop on the beat to enforce penalties.

Some experts told us this was just supply and demand. I even remember going to the White House and hearing these exact words. We didn't know that traders were in it just for greed.

That is why I will never forget the day Senator CANTWELL, another longtime champion for derivatives reform, handed me a copy of the taped conversations between Enron traders. These tapes from Enron's west coast trading desk demonstrated beyond a reasonable doubt that energy traders would do anything to make a buck.

When a forest fire shut down a major transmission line into California, cutting power supplies and raising prices, Enron energy traders celebrated. Here is the quote:

> Burn, baby, burn. That's a beautiful thing.

That is what a trader sang about the massive fire, which threatened homes and lives.

The tapes also confirmed that in secret deals with power producers, traders deliberately drove up prices by ordering powerplants shut down.

When California regulators tried to get money back from Enron, their traders joked this way:

> They're . . . taking all the money back from you guys? All the money you guys stole from those poor grandmothers in California.

That was the mentality. Another trader responded:

> Yeah, Grandma Millie, man.

This was an eye-opening experience, to say the least.

In 2002, 2003, and 2004, I offered four separate amendments to restore regulation to derivatives markets, and each time the President's working group on financial markets advocated against the amendments, and they went down.

Our Nation's financial experts argued that private parties would protect the public interest by looking out for their own interests, and Congress trusted our experts.

But the experts were wrong. They ignored the growing risk these products posed to our financial system.

In 2007, finally, the Senate took action to close the Enron loophole when it approved bipartisan legislation that I authored with Senator SNOWE and others. That legislation brought regulatory oversight to electronic commodity exchanges such as the IntercontinentalExchange, and it established antifraud and antimanipulation standards for our Nation's electronic energy futures markets. But then they went offshore and traded on the London exchange to avoid the law. We learned that soon there were other loopholes that remained open.

Beyond the reach of Federal oversight the derivatives market swelled to the size of $600 trillion. There were no rules to prevent systemic failure, fraud, or manipulation. No one ensured that these products served any commercial function beyond gambling, and no one worked to make sure traders understood the products they traded.

It turns out traders often use the stockholder value of major financial institutions to gamble in markets they did not understand—with bets large enough to put the entire financial system at risk.

They bet on oil. They bet on natural gas. And with the creation of the credit default swap, they began to bet on each other's demise.

New exotic financial products were dreamed up, such as the recent one to trade movie box office futures, which was proposed by Cantor Exchange this

year. What public benefit is served by trading box office futures? All it does is create a huge problem for the motion picture industry.

In 2008, AIG and Lehman collapsed under the weight of unregulated financial derivatives. But this time it was not only Western energy consumers who suffered. The unregulated derivatives market brought our entire economy to its knees.

That is why it is so vital that we learn from this experience and implement the derivatives reform proposals that have been put forward by Senators LINCOLN and DODD.

Let me take a few moments to describe some of the bill's key positions.

It will require every trade to be reported in real time to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, so regulators will know for the first time what is actually going on in these markets. They will be transparent; they won't be dark markets. Everyone will know.

It will require standardized high-volume trades to be cleared through a regulated clearinghouse. This will ensure that everyone in the system gets paid even when one trader defaults. Had we had this system in place, AIG's collapse would not have posed a systemic risk.

Swap dealers who sell uncleared contracts to end users, which are more risky than cleared trades, will be subject to significantly higher capital requirements enforced by the CFTC in cooperation with bank regulators.

The bill helps small commercial end users such as utilities or trucking companies hedge their risks, but major financial institutions and mutual funds will have to conduct their trading in regulated markets. That is a good thing.

It will require all cleared contracts to be traded on an exchange or on a swap execution facility. Trading on exchanges or execution facilities provides for pretrade transparency—again, light—which is necessary to fully understand and manage the risks being taken by market participants, to provide more efficient and accurate pricing, and to facilitate more cost-effective risk management.

It will require speculative position limits to be set in the aggregate for each commodity, instead of contract by contract. Position limits provide an important restriction on market manipulation and the amount of risk that can build up in any one market participant.

For the first time, the CFTC will be able to prevent speculators from assembling massive positions in a particular commodity, such as oil, by assembling large positions in multiple contracts. See how they do that.

Traders can now simply buy positions in Brent Crude Oil when they have exceeded limits in West Texas Intermediate crude oil, and that makes no sense. See, it is a way to hide the size of your trading position.

Aggregate position limits will prevent manipulative practices, such as those deployed by the defunct hedge fund Amaranth in 2006, which assembled massive positions in two separate natural gas contracts and manipulated one in order to profit on the other. Let there be no doubt about this, Amaranth settled and paid a huge fine in substantial millions of dollars.

Further, the bill will close the London loophole so they can't go around American law, by requiring that Foreign Boards of Trade adhere to minimum standards comparable to those in the United States and report all trading activity to United States regulators on a timely basis.

Finally—and perhaps most importantly—the bill will prevent FDIC-insured retail banks and banks with access to the Federal Reserve discount window from engaging in the extremely risky practice of swaps dealing with a government guarantee. That is important.

This innovative and important provision effectively implements the Volcker rules and protects taxpayers. So you can see what a big provision this is—remember, it was derivatives that brought the house of cards down. Now there will be transparency, clearing, and position limits. I very much thank the chairman of the Banking Committee for negotiating with Senator LINCOLN and achieving this. It is a monumental gain.

I very strongly believe that all swap activities and commercial banking should be distinct, so that taxpayers do not supplement, subsidize, guarantee, or insure the riskiest activities of large financial institutions.

There is no denying that opponents of the bill are trying to come up with new and creative ways to block this bill.

With so much at stake, it is not surprising that allies of the big banks and Wall Street lenders have already launched a multimillion dollar ad campaign to frame the debate and fight these changes. They are cynically twisting the facts to assert that this legislation will perpetuate more bailouts in the future. Nothing could be further from the truth. The big Wall Street firms that caused this crisis have hired lobbyists to portray Wall Street reform as something that is bad for taxpayers.

The loudest detractors of financial regulatory reform claim that it will be another government intrusion in the free market. Well, we have found out that the free market is not self-regulating.

Recently, the Wall Street Journal reported that opponents of regulatory reform have adopted talking points distributed by a messaging firm whose clients include Bank of America, Chase Card Services, and UBS. The memo suggests that the best way to kill the bill is to link it to the big bank bailouts.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have adopted these talking points and are doing everything they can to block this critical bill. This is both dangerous and absurd. If we have learned anything from the recent past, it is that the disorderly failure of massive financial institutions is extremely destructive.

For the first time, with the passage of this bill, we will have a process in place to ensure the most minimal disruption necessary in order to wind down failures on Wall Street. That is what this is about. And the $50 billion is not government money. The $50 billion is a fund that the companies contribute to, which is held in escrow by the government so that if it has to be used, it can be used.

I stand behind Chairman DODD when he emphasizes the level of bipartisan negotiations that have gone into the bill before us. But bipartisan compromise does not mean withholding support until you get everything you want. Financial reform is not a zero-sum game. We need solutions, not threats to block meaningful reform of our financial markets. Without strong reform, every American who has been blindsided by the profit-above-all-else mentality of Wall Street will lose, lose, lose, and that is what is at stake in these cloture motions.

Anyone who has taken basic economics knows markets only function when market participants have good information—in fact, perfect information and when the transactions occur free of fraud, abuse, and manipulation. Handing control and oversight of financial markets to the biggest Wall Street banks does not produce a free market with good information, free from abuse, as has been painfully illustrated over the last few years.

Accusations of fraud against Goldman Sachs, announced the Friday before last, underscore the need for financial reform. Goldman Sachs will have their day in court, but the allegations against the firm cry out for greater transparency at giant Wall Street banks.

Let me return to where I began. I was 1 of the 40 Senators on the telephone in September of 2008, when both Secretary Paulson of the Treasury and Ben Bernanke of the Federal Reserve talked to Senators and said—and I am paraphrasing, but this is the sum and substance of it—we are a hair's breadth away from a major collapse of the entire financial marketplace of our country, and it will be worse than the Great Depression if it happens.

I never expected to hear that. I never thought these market activities could do that. To some extent, I believed the market was self-regulating, but it isn't. We found that out in spades. I think we are deleterious in our duty if we do not address this, if we do not fully debate it on the floor, if everybody who hears the debate doesn't understand what the evils are that are out there; that naked swaps, that credit default swaps need oversight, that hedge funds without any regulation must have transparency, must be regulated, and that trading must go over an

exchange. This bill accomplishes that. This bill protects the American people.

I can't understand why anyone would not support this bill. If truly what we believe in and what we came to this office for and what we took our oath of office for was to protect the American people, this bill is mandatory. Not to do it is malfeasance of duty, in my view. Not to let us move forward with a robust debate, to waste time with cloture votes day after day—and it looks like they will continue—I believe is improper. To demand that a bill has to be agreed upon by both sides before it is even debated on this floor as a major bill is something that in this day and age, with the economic troubles of this Nation, I thought we would never ever hear.

So the bottom line is: Now is the time to act. Now is the time to close the gaps in regulation. It is time to hold the big banks accountable to the people they serve. It is time to put a moral compass into trading. It is time to ensure that taxpayers will never again be forced to bail out big banks because they are too big to fail. No bank is. That is what Wall Street reform will achieve. That is why I feel so committed to making it happen and why I am asking for the support of all our colleagues.

Senator DODD and Senator LINCOLN have assembled the strongest provisions of each of their respective bills into a proposal to reform the bilateral swaps and derivatives market that is more effective than any proposal to date. So I wish to thank both of them for their leadership in bringing this bill to the floor. I am very proud to stand with them, along with my long-time colleagues in this effort, Senator SNOWE, Senator CANTWELL, Senator DORGAN, Senator HARKIN, Senator BROWN of Ohio, and Senator NELSON of Florida. They have worked for a long time to bring about strong regulation of the derivatives market.

So the question remains: What will happen? Will this bill be allowed to see the light of day? Will this bill be able to regulate fraud and manipulation? Will this bill be able to see that the American taxpayer is protected so we can say, truly, in good conscience: Never again will this happen in the United States.

So I say to the other side: Stop this nonsense. Let this bill come to the floor. Come down to the floor and debate it. Vote against it, if you don't like it. That is the American way. I don't believe that when a bill comes out of committee by a majority vote, regardless of how that majority is achieved, whether it is bipartisan or the product of one party, that it should be refused debate on the floor. We have a chance to change that. I hope the Republicans will. I hope we will debate and pass this bill.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HAGAN). The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I rise for a second to talk about the financial services bill. I do want to say something in advance of that, and I am sorry Chairman DODD is not on the floor.

This Friday is the last day Americans can go under contract on the first-time homebuyer tax credit and the move-up tax credit. I had the privilege of working with the banking chairman on that legislation in the fall of last year—and its extension—and I felt a sense of reward today when the announcement came out that for the first time in 36 months home values in the 20 test markets in the United States actually went up by six-tenths of 1 percent. That is not a lot of money, but it is the first time in 36 months. The chairman created an environment to allow that debate to take place, and this Senate voted 100 to 0 to pass it and the American people have benefited from it.

As I tell so many who call me, it is not going to be extended because credits such as that are designed to do what it has done; that is, to bring the marketplace back and hopefully stabilize values and move forward. I commend Senator DODD for setting up the environment where that could take place.

That brings me to my point on the bill before us. Senator FEINSTEIN did an excellent job of talking about Wall Street and some other people who certainly need to be held accountable where there wasn't any transparency, contributors to the problem, and the terrible problem the derivatives caused in the whole mess. But there is another story out there I wish to bring up, because when we do get to the debate on this bill, it is my hope we will truly have a debate and an amendment process because there are some things not in this 1,407-page bill that ought to be.

What I specifically want to talk about is Freddie Mac, Fannie Mae, Moody's, and Standard & Poor's. When the market began to collapse, a lot of those derivatives that were talked about were bets, one way or another, against the housing market, which in many ways had been overheated in America because of the approval of something known as a subprime mortgage. But the devil in those details that caused us so much problem is that there was originally no market for subprime mortgage. They were B, C, and D credits. They were downpayment assistance loans. They were higher risk loans by their definition, but they got securitized and two things happened: First, Moody's and Standard rated them as investment grade, AAA investment-grade securities; secondly, Freddie and Fannie, at the behest of the U.S. Government and its Congress—us—started buying those securities to meet the desire to have more affordable housing in America, a noble goal but a goal that was being achieved by loaning people money who could not pay it back, by loaning them the downpayment they didn't have, by not validating their credit, their employment or anything else.

So when this thing did collapse, when everything went down and went down fast, it was, in large measure, because Freddie and Fannie created the marketplace that started the buying of these securities around the world, these mortgage securities, No. 1. Equal with that is Moody's and Standard's rating them as investment grade when they obviously were not.

I would think that as we move toward a debate on this bill, when that time comes, and it will come, that it will be a bill that includes Freddie and Fannie and includes Moody's and Standard. I do understand there are some references to Moody's and Standard, but I will submit to you that the best accountability on Moody's and Standard is for them to be paid by the purchasers of the securities, not the creator of them, because then they are accountable to the people who actually get stuck holding the bag, not to the guy who created them and dumped them and ran, which is some of what Senator FEINSTEIN was talking about.

I also wish to talk about the quality of lending. There are provisions in this bill that talk about shared risk and risk retention. There are provisions for a mortgage banker to retain 5 percent of the risk in a loan. That is a well-intended move, but as I said the other day on the floor and as I reminded people in this body, when the savings and loans collapsed, when the RTC, the Resolution Trust Corporation, was created—and that crisis cost the American people $¾ trillion—savings and loans in America didn't have 5 percent of the risk, they had 100 percent of the risk. They made those loans with deposits they had of their depositors and they were paid back over time. But when we took away their preference for deposits on $10,000 or less against the banking industry, and when—because they began losing money—we allowed them to form service corporations and get into businesses they didn't know anything about, they finally collapsed and imploded with 100 percent risk, not just 5 percent.

So I would submit another thing that needs to be incorporated in this is for us to put in some underwriting standards—minimum standards—so anything that doesn't meet them has to be an insured mortgage by an MGIC or a PMI. We should go back to the good old days of the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, where you had to have a job and a verification to borrow money, where you had to get a credit report, where you didn't have a windshield appraisal, where an appraiser drove by on the street, but a legitimate appraisal, where they valued a property, and where you couldn't borrow money that would cause you to spend more than 25 or 30 percent on your monthly payment as a percentage of your gross income or a total of 38 percent on all debts you had, including that payment, for at least a year or more in duration.

The real estate industry, the housing industry in America, with those very standards—which were the standards of the 1960s, 1970s, and part of the 1980s—ended up having a vibrant housing market, with 65 percent home ownership—the largest of any country in the world. But when Wall Street got greedy, when our idea of forcing Freddie and Fannie to be purchasers of resort, when all those things were created, the rush came to make the mortgage, to sell the paper, to produce the income that the investor wanted, and the quality of the house, the qualification of the buyer, and the legitimacy of the loan came in question.

So I look forward to the point in time when we get to this debate that we will talk about three things: No. 1 is that Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae were, in fact, government-sponsored institutions and today are a lot more government sponsored than they ever were. No. 2, if we exempt them, we leave the potential and the temptation for them to be used as a dictated purchaser of certain kinds of paper that will get us right back into the same situation. If Moody's and Standard do not have an accountability to their rating standards, when something such as the subprime loans happen, we will be leaving open the opportunity for most of what happened that was the principal cause of the collapse to happen again. I think we have a responsibility not to do that.

I hope to become a part of a debate on that part of this legislation that closes the loophole, that takes away this idea that if you just have a 5-percent shared risk, it is a safe loan, and instead make sure the underwriting to the borrower is what we count on because, after all, that is going to be how the money is paid back. We know for a fact that Freddie and Fannie were a major part of the problem, and we know that lack of quality underwriting was a major contributor to the quality of the security. Somewhere it ought to be addressed. But in these 1,407 pages, to the best of my reading and looking, it is not. That is unfortunate and it is a mistake. I hope, when we get to the final debate, we will correct that error or else we will not have addressed a major contributor to the problem for our taxpayers and our voters and our citizens.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, while the Senator from Georgia is still on the Senate floor, I want to say it is great to have him back. He has been back for a couple of weeks, but he had some pretty serious health challenges and it is good to see him back on his feet and in full voice.

He mentioned in his remarks for the first time about 3 days ago the home buyers tax credit, which actually expanded a little bit the second time through, is coming to a halt, and we are seeing this enormous volume in terms of sales of homes in this country in no small part because of his leadership on this issue over the last year or two. I was pleased as a former member of the Banking Committee to be involved in that and encourage my colleagues to support what was a very good idea.

The other thing I want to say while he is still on the floor is, he and I don't agree on everything, but we agree on a lot of stuff. I would like to invoke the 80–20 rule, which Senator MIKE ENZI from Wyoming talks about. I used to say to him: Why do you and Ted Kennedy—when he, Senator Kennedy, was with us; they were senior Democratic and Republican on the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee—I would say to MIKE ENZI, he is one of the most conservative Members of the Senate, and Ted Kennedy, arguably one of the most liberal Members of the Senate: How come you and he can get so much done in a very productive committee, regardless of whether Ted Kennedy was the chairman or MIKE ENZI was the chairman?

MIKE ENZI used to say: Ted and I believe in the 80–20 rule; 80 percent of the stuff we agree on, 20 percent of the stuff we don't agree on. What we decided to do is focus on the 80 percent on which we agree, set aside the 20 percent we don't agree on, and we will come back and worry about that another day.

I think, hopefully, at the end of the day we will decide to do that. There is a whole lot more on which we agree than we don't agree. My hope is we will have an opportunity to bring this bill to the floor and do what we used to do in the Senate; that is, we have people actually offer their amendments, we have a chance to debate those amendments, and we vote them up or we vote them down; that one side wouldn't line up all together to vote against those amendments, and the other side line up to vote for them.

I think with a lot of amendments Republicans and Democrats have actually gone across party lines, and it will depend a lot more in some cases on geography, in some cases on the business climate in a particular State or the nature of their businesses.

We will have a couple of days voting not for cloture, not to bring the bill to the floor; I would say to my colleagues I will be voting with them, working with them on some of their amendments, and my hope is they will do the same on some of mine. But I hope we can get past this sticking point and actually do what we are sent here to do; that is, to legislate, to govern, and I know that is what is in their hearts as well. I wanted to share that.

Mr. ISAKSON. If the Senator will yield, I thank the Senator for his good wishes. I always enjoy working with the distinguished former Governor, now Senator from Delaware, and I look forward to that moment where we are finding that 80 percent common ground.

Mr. CARPER. It is out there. I thank my colleague. I want to take a minute or two to have us step back and think about how we got into this mess with the housing bubble and all that literally led us almost to the brink of disaster in this country.

Part of what happened is market forces were not allowed to work. Regulation was not enforced. The regulators were in many cases, too many cases, asleep at the switch. But I will talk a little bit about the housing markets.

I am a guy, as a Governor and as a Senator, I always pushed real hard—and as a Congressman before that—pushed real hard for home ownership. I love the idea that people own their own home, own a piece of the rock. For a lot of people the biggest part of their life savings is the home they own. They use that not just as shelter but to help send kids to school and borrow against for all kinds of things and at the end of their lives to live off of, in some cases, the equity in their homes. That is a good thing.

That is not to say everybody ought to be a homeowner. In some cases there are some folks who ought not to be.

As the housing market heated up and the housing prices were going up, folks assumed they would go up forever. They didn't. Few things go up forever, and that includes housing prices.

We had a number of folks looking around at other people who wanted to become home owners. People who did not have the ability to become a homeowner, didn't have the financial wherewithal to become a homeowner, were sucked in or duped into buying homes. They took on exotic mortgages in the hopes they would somehow be able to pay for those and the value of the homes would keep going up over time and people would come out whole. It didn't work out that way.

I think part of what went wrong, aside from the assumption that housing prices would go up, is the fact that regulators were asleep at the switch. The other thing that went wrong is kind of a basic concept that to make markets work, for there to be some market discipline, there has to be skin in the game.

Others have talked about this even today on the Senate floor. We had, in some cases, mortgage brokers who would say to people who did not have the ability to be homeowners: Don't bother telling us what your income is or showing us what your income is. You tell us you are OK and your income is good, we will take your word for that.

In too many cases that happened, and the regulators allowed that to happen. We had mortgage brokers originate a mortgage and pass the customer on to a bank or mortgage banker. They would write the mortgage, allow the mortgage to be done, and the person ended up with a home. They ended up with a mortgage. The mortgage was passed on, maybe bought by Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac, and they bundled

them together, a bunch of mortgages together, and created an investment instrument through securitization. Those securities were then kind of blessed by the credit agencies.

The credit agencies, the mortgage brokers, made their fee, and they were out of it. The bankers made their fee, and they were out of it. Fannie and Freddie got some kind of fee, as I recall, for securitizing the loans, and they were kind of out of it. The credit agencies made their fee and they were out of it. We ended up with folks owning these securities, in some cases, all around the world.

We sliced and diced these securities and they were acquired by different investors. Too many of the players in this business didn't have any skin in the game. At the end of the game, when folks started defaulting on the mortgages, not making the payments, those investments in mortgage-backed securities which were out there owned by different bunches of investors turned into what I call Swiss cheese. They had a lot of holes in them, holes created when folks stopped meeting their mortgage payments and eventually, instead of turning into Swiss cheese, they in many cases became illiquid, unmarketable, and they gathered, in some cases, on the books, the balance sheets of financial institutions.

Despite all these tricks we tried to create and gimmicks we tried to create or financial tools we tried to create to deal with the risk, they didn't all work. In the end it came tumbling down.

Among things we want to do, we want to make sure in the legislation we are working on regulators actually regulate. Second, one of the things we want to make sure of is we actually, when we are asking somebody what their income is, we want to verify it so some people don't end up taking on risks they obviously can't meet. We want to make sure people have skin in the game, the banks, the financial institutions have skin in the game; that the shareholders of those institutions are at risk; otherwise, what reason should they have—why should there be any discipline? There will not be in too many cases.

There are some people who think we ought to mandate capital standards and risky activities, raise the capital standards, and we should do that by mandates or legislative fiat. I don't know if that is a smart thing to do because we are working in this international marketplace, and our financial institutions, if they have certain capital standards that are dramatically different from the capital standards or requirements for liquidity different from other countries, that sort of puts our institutions at a disadvantage, a competitive disadvantage. We have to make sure our regulators are coordinating with other regulators around the world and we actually do have standards so financial institutions, when they are involved in risky behavior, the capital requirements are higher and the liquidity requirements are higher.

The last point I want to make, today somebody gave me some—I don't know if you call them talking points, if you will, what our vision is as Democrats, the idea we are on the side, not so much of the financial institutions, certainly not necessarily on the side of Wall Street, but we are on the side of regular people, many of whom have been damaged by all this.

Among the points I would want to leave us with in terms of the things we are for is, we want to have in place strict new regulations to stop Wall Street from gambling with money, our money, in the end. We are not interested in more taxpayer bailouts. The idea of creating this $50 billion fund that will be paid for by financial institutions themselves, to contribute to that so later on when these big institutions get into trouble, we actually have the money literally there, available to use to shut them down and retire them in an orderly way that doesn't disrupt the financial system, that is one of the things we are for.

We are going to try to end too big to fail. We want to put a new cop on the beat in terms of consumer protection for consumers, at least working with the largest 100 or so institutions that have over $50 billion in assets among the bankholding companies, and we—I think this is important, too, a reminder in the course of this debate—we want to put consumers in control with information in plain English.

As I listen to this debate and a lot of folks coming to visit with us and talk about the issues before us, we can probably use more plain English on the Senate floor than not. Sometimes I hear my colleagues, certainly our staffs and folks who visit with us, talking about stuff that reminds me of the old saying—remember Albert Einstein's Theory of Relativity? Somebody once asked Mrs. Einstein: Mrs. Einstein, do you understand your husband's Theory of Relativity?

She said: I understand the words but not the sentences. That is what she said: I understand the words but not the sentences.

I hear some of the debate on some of what is presented to us. I understand the words, but some of the sentences I understand but not all of them. I want to make sure at the end of the day when we are finished and we bring the bill to the floor and offer amendments, we actually understand the sentences and not just the words of the amendments and actually write defined legislation, go through conference with the House, and actually do understand not just the words but the sentences, the paragraphs, the pages, and the whole kit and caboodle so at end of the day we will have taken some big steps to greatly reduce the likelihood we are ever going to have to go through this again—certainly not in our lifetimes and certainly not again ever.

I know the things I mentioned that serve our Democratic vision—I hope the Republicans would share that. I think in many cases—maybe on an 80–20 basis—they probably do. If we ever get a chance to get a bill to the floor, we will find out. In the end, I think we will find out there is a lot on which we agree; that we will find common ground, we will address this issue and move on to other important issues and challenges that face our Nation.

Madam 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. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of Colorado). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, again today, for the second day in a row, we have failed to break the Republican filibuster on the Wall Street reform bill. The votes are very clear. With one or two Democrats out—one who is opposed to breaking the filibuster and the other absent—there was not a single Republican vote in support of moving to the debate on the Wall Street reform bill.

Tomorrow, there will be another opportunity, and it appears the other side, the Republican side, of the aisle is deciding they do not want to debate this issue. The Senate as an institution is designed to give people a chance to express themselves, both by votes and amendments they might offer. That is what we have offered.

It is interesting to me, this bill which is before us, the Restoring American Financial Stability Act—I am just checking on how many pages it is; we count pages around here now—is 1,400 pages. OK. And I am not being critical of the size of this bill. It is a big challenge to make sure we pass the laws that are necessary to promote financial stability.

But it was not but a few months ago that the Republicans were arguing that the health care reform bill was so big that we had to have it right out here in front of us and we should not be negotiating behind closed doors with secret negotiations on the bill; it ought to be right here on the Senate floor; let's have the amendments. Now comes this bill on Wall Street reform, and the Republican position is exactly the opposite. They say: We do not want to have an amendment process on the floor; we want you to agree ahead of time behind closed doors on what the bill is going to say. I do not know if they have noted the inconsistency of their position, but it is fairly clear.

I think they probably have some good ideas to change this bill. I am anxious to see their amendments. I think we have some good ideas to improve the bill. I would like to offer a few amendments. It is almost sounding

like the U.S. Senate, isn't it—amendments on a bill and votes and speeches and debate. It really sounds like the good old days here. But we do not have the good old days anymore. We just lurch from one vote to an empty floor to the next vote to an empty floor to the next vote. People who are following this debate on the outside have to be wondering what we are trying to achieve.

Unfortunately, for some, what they are trying to achieve is absolutely nothing. They want to stop the Senate from acting. They believe it is in their best political interest—maybe in the best interest of the country, from their point of view—that we do nothing.

How could you take that position when it comes to Wall Street after what we have been through as a nation? How could you take the position that we should do nothing when it comes to the Wall Street banks and financial institutions? These banks and financial institutions got away with murder when it came to corrupting our economy and leading us into the most painful recession in modern memory. How could you take the position, as some Republicans have, that we should not debate or vote on a bill to try to avoid that catastrophe from recurring? That, to me, is so basic and fundamental.

It strikes me that the American people have it right. They understand what we have been through. They understand that after the great minds of Wall Street made the greatest mistakes in modern economic history, they came whining and crying to the Federal Treasury to bail them out. They asked for hundreds of billions of dollars from hard-working families across America to get through their individual economic crises at their banks and their financial institutions. I will concede that I voted for that idea because the alternative was a disaster in our economy.

Well, after sending the money to Wall Street, they showed their gratitude by giving one another bonuses, multimillion-dollar bonuses, for their bone-headed stupidity that led us into this mess and then deciding that once they were solvent again and moving forward, they would stop loaning money to businesses across America that are trying to survive and get out of this recession. It is the ultimate in irresponsibility, and it is what we have come to expect from some of the people on Wall Street.

I mentioned earlier that many of us have been reading this book, ''The Big Short'' by Michael Lewis. He tells the story of how we got into this mess, how these people dreamed up ways to create these financial instruments, which almost defy description, where they would take thousands of mortgages from all around the United States and package them into a little bundle and put some code name on them that only the insiders could understand and then decide to sell them in pieces—tranches, they called them. And they were betting that the value of real estate would continue to go up and the default rate would not. They guessed wrong on both accounts. The default rate on these rotten mortgages increased and the underlying value of the homes and businesses and other entities began to decline and the bottom fell out. Lewis tells the story about those who saw it coming and ended up making a lot of money because they shorted the market, as they say. They guessed that the real estate bubble was going to burst. How many more times do we need to go through that as a nation before we change the rules on Wall Street in terms of their conduct and what they can do?

We think it is time. This bill is a product of the Senate Banking Committee and a lot of hard work. Senator DODD, the Democratic chairman of the committee, met for several months with the Republican Senator who ranks No. 1 on that committee, RICHARD SHELBY of Alabama, and they could not reach an agreement. Senator DODD then said, I will meet with Senator CORKER of Tennessee, also on the committee, and sadly that didn't result in an agreement either. Then Senator DODD said, Let's have a hearing and let's put this bill right on the table and let people offer amendments to it. The Republicans prepared over 400 amendments to this bill, and when Senator DODD convened the committee, they refused to call up a single one of them—not one of them—to be put on this bill or voted on.

So the bill comes to the floor in that situation and the Republicans refuse to let us move forward. That is because under the Senate rules we need 60 votes. We only have 59 on a good day here, and we clearly need Republican help to move this bill forward. They have decided as a party caucus to stand by Wall Street and to stand against reform. I don't understand it. I can't imagine that they are hearing anything that is different than what I hear when I go home. When I go home, basically people tell me that they believe it is time for accountability from the banks and the speculators on Wall Street and they believe we ought to do it now. They want to see us put a cop on the beat. They want to see the government keeping an eye on these big financial institutions, establishing standards of conduct, establishing margin requirements so we know they are not overextended again as they were leading into this recession, and they want to make sure we are doing something that is going to avoid a replay of what we have just been through.

There is another aspect of this bill. When I spoke to one of the Republicans during the vote today, I said to him: What is the problem here? Why aren't you joining us in this Wall Street reform? Don't you hear the same things at home that we do?

He said: My big concern is the consumer financial protection agency in here.

Well, I am the wrong person to raise that issue with, because I happen to believe in it. We have created safety standards for the inspection of certain products across America. When you buy toys for your kids during the holidays, you want to make sure they don't have lead paint on them or tiny pieces the kids might ingest and choke on. The Consumer Product Safety Commission is supposed to watch out for those sorts of things, and they do. But when it comes to our financial instruments that we have as part of our daily lives, there is no real watchdog. I am talking about mortgages on our homes and credit card agreements, student loans, automobile loans, retirement plans, things that make a big difference in our lives and that can go bad and cost us dearly. This bill sets up within the Federal Reserve an agency for consumer financial protection. It will be the strongest consumer financial protection law in the history of the United States, and it isn't a massive bureaucracy. What it basically does is empower consumers across the country so that when they sit down to sign an agreement, the basics are explained to them. It also puts that watchdog in place to keep an eye on those banks when they start sneaking in new terminology, these tricks and traps that can explode on you at a later date. That is the part this one Republican Senator said has to go. We don't want this consumer financial protection.

Well, the Senator may not want it; the banks don't want it either. They don't want someone looking over their shoulder, but I think the American people not only want it, they deserve it after what we have been through.

I was standing in the airport in Chicago on Monday on my way out here and a fellow came up to me, a businessman in Chicago, and said: Oh, what a coincidence. I am on my way out to see you.

I said: Good.

He said: I am here so that we can exempt our business from the Consumer Financial Protection Agency.

I said: Save the money on the airfare, because I am not voting that way. I don't think we ought to start carving out all of the different special interests and business groups that want to come here and say we are the good guys, we are not the cause of the problem. The fact is if they are, in fact, good guys and good gals, if they are honest in their dealings, if they are treating customers honestly, if they are conscientious and ethical, what are they worried about? This is an agency we have created to go after the bottom feeders, the predators who are out there taking advantage of consumers in the name of consumer credit.

This has happened so many times in the time I have served in Congress, where you come in and say, We want to protect consumers from the worst in the financial industry, and the big banks come in and say, Oh, no, it is just a foot in the door. Pretty soon

they will be looking at us too, and they stop any kind of basic surveillance.

Right now in Illinois—in fact, a couple of blocks from where I live in Springfield, IL—are a couple of operations that take this to the extreme—Payday Loans, Title Loans, Same Day Loans. It is an outrage. It is an outrage that my State lets them get away with it. They have tried to tighten up the law a couple of times, but these folks are slippery. They find a way around it. They charge outrageous interest rates. They are rolling over these debts time and time again until these people are absolutely out of luck. They have nowhere to turn.

I introduced a bill, a cap on interest rates, a usury bill, and I said if you want to meet every creepy, crawly, slimy reptile in the financial industry, introduce a usury bill, and they will all slide under your door to come in and meet with you and tell you how you just don't understand. Yes, they will say to me, it is 108 percent a year annual interest, but it is not what you think it is. It is what I believe it is, and it is a rip-off of consumers that has to come to an end. I am joining with Senator KAY HAGAN of North Carolina to put an end to some of these business operations. I don't think they do any good for America.

It has been about 10 years ago now that Senator Jim Talent, a Republican from Missouri, put an amendment on a bill that didn't attract much attention. The amendment he put on exempted military families from being business clients of these payday loan operations. Why would he exempt military families? Because the Pentagon had reported to him that in many military installations around the United States, soldiers—Air Force, others—were borrowing money from these fly-by-night operations, couldn't pay it back, and got so deeply in debt they had to be discharged from the service. Men and women trained in our military, because of the debt they had incurred as a result of these rotten operations, fly-by-night operations, had to leave the military service, and the Pentagon was saying to this Senator and others, We invested a lot of money training that person and now they are gone.

So we said 10 years ago that we were going to provide that these payday loan operations could not lend money to military families, and it passed and became the law. Well, if we are protecting military families and our national interests, why aren't we protecting all families? That is my point of view. I think Senator KAY HAGAN of North Carolina shares that point of view and I want to make sure we move forward on that. I also want to make sure interest rates are regulated. There is a limit to how much should be charged. There are people who exceed that limit and take advantage of those. Those are the kinds of things that are at issue here.

So this week, if you tried to follow what is going on in the Senate, sometimes there has been a big yawn, because the floor is empty. No one is here, because we are lurching to the next filibuster vote. We are going to ask the Republicans again tomorrow: Now is it possible for us to bring up this bill, a bill that will put consumers in control when it comes to some of the most basic decisions they have to make? Now is it time to have strict new regulations to stop Wall Street gambling from happening again in our financial sector? Now is it time to make sure that the agreements we enter into are in plain, understandable English?

Now is the time to end taxpayer bailouts once and for all. Banks and financial institutions, not American taxpayers, should foot the bill for their own mistakes. If the Republicans object to that, offer an amendment. Stand up here and say, I think we ought to be ready to bail them out.

I don't think they will. Also, it is time for consumers to have the information they need to compare rates so they can make the financial choices that are right for them and their families.

American voters get it overwhelmingly. They want us to pass this bill. But the Wall Street lobbyists get it too. This morning an analyst came forward and said the Wall Street firms are spending $120,000 every day on Capitol Hill for lobbyists. They are working the phones. They are working the corridors. They are doing everything they can to kill this bill. These special interest groups have a lot at stake here. If we do, in fact, come through with this reform, the party is going to be over at some of these banks and they know it, so they are fighting it tooth and nail. If we have a consumer financial protection agency, they are going to change the way they do business. They won't make as much money. They are going to be held to honest standards and they don't like it. So they are spending a fortune begging the Republicans to continue this filibuster to stop the Wall Street reform. I hope a few Republicans will break ranks and join us. If they do, I think many others will follow, but it will take a few courageous, forward-looking people to step up and say, That is enough. Two filibusters in a week is enough.

By Wednesday—by tomorrow—if we can get three or four Republicans to step up, we can start an honest, bipartisan debate that leads to the kinds of reforms we need to make our economy stronger, create more jobs, and protect American taxpayers from ever being soaked again for another bailout.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. 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. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here because for the second day in a row the Republican minority has once again sided with the Wall Street bankers and taken their side in the battle the American people want us to have to clean up Wall Street and see to it that the kind of economic damage that reckless gambling by Wall Street created across our whole economy never happens again.

We want to bring sensible, firm oversight to these Wall Street banks, and we want to create an independent consumer financial protection agency so that there is an institution out there that is looking out for the little guy, the person who can't hire a lobbyist or a lawyer and who has to take it or leave it when the bank comes calling.

The history of what brought us here is instructive. It says a lot about the motivation of what is going on on the Republican side.

We began with the most colossal bank failure and economic meltdown since the Great Depression. This body had to appropriate hundreds of billions of dollars to prop up the financial sector and save it from complete and utter collapse from a global financial meltdown. That is how dangerous the way Wall Street was playing was. It took us right to the brink of global financial meltdown and required unprecedented—and unpopular—actions by Congress to keep that from happening.

You would think the lesson everybody would take from that experience is that Wall Street needs to change, that there needs to be regulatory reform. This cannot be allowed to happen to American families again because wild speculators on Wall Street are playing unregulated games with other people's money. But from then until now, we have seen no Republican bill. Chairman DODD laid down his first bill on November 19, 2009, and the Republicans didn't answer with an alternative of their own. There was no basis from which to negotiate back and forth. They just criticized his bill, and that was that.

Negotiations continued—persistent negotiations—to try to get some Republicans to support Wall Street regulatory reform, and they led nowhere. Were Senators negotiating in good faith but being reeled in at the end by the leadership? Was it just a way to waste time with false negotiations to keep us from getting to this business? I don't know; I am not a mind reader. But what I do know is that there was no Republican alternative.

Eventually, Chairman DODD said: OK, we are going to hearing. We have our bill. Bring your amendments. Let's have a public debate in the Banking Committee about how we regulate Wall Street.

On March 23, Chairman DODD convened that markup. I know our committee members came expecting a long haul. They were expecting late nights

and many days. They were expecting the kind of effort we saw when we did the health care reform bill, and I had the pleasure to serve on the HELP Committee with Chairman DODD. Day after day, week after week, hundreds of hours of hearings we went through amendment after amendment after amendment. We accepted 160, I think, Republican amendments in that process. We still didn't get their support, but at least there was a public discussion.

But when the Banking Committee took up this bill, with that same expectation that there would be long, arduous hours of hearings, argument, public debate, and amendment, what did they get? The ranking member said: We have no amendments. We don't care to discuss this. Call up the vote on the bill. We don't want to do anything in the public light of day. Vote the bill out.

So the chairman had no choice but to do that. He had no choice but to vote the bill out with no amendments. So here we are. We have gone from the worst financial disaster the country has seen since the Great Depression until this point, and the Republicans have no bill, no reform to offer. When it comes to their first opportunity, when their hand is forced in the committee to bring in amendments, they have no amendments, nothing to say.

Now we try to move to the bill, and here we are—stuck.

We are not here voting on the bill, we are here trying to get their clearance to bring up this bill to discuss it and go through the Senate process of debate and amendment and they are objecting to that.

So what is the common theme of a party that has no bill, that offers no amendments, and that wants no floor debate? The common theme of those things is wanting to cut deals in the dark, wanting to have their deals not see the light of day until they are already buried in a bill. Some of them would probably even turn around and object to some of the things they argued to get in.

We should be prepared to do the public's business in the light of day. In fact, after the most public process we have ever seen on health care, we took criticism from the other side for a couple occasional moments when people got together and cut a deal. But those were the exceptions in a hugely public process, ranging across several committees that took weeks and months, in which everybody knew where we were going, what we were doing, and what our priorities were to help the American people. This is the exact opposite. They do not want to do anything in the light of day. They do not have a bill where they are prepared to show the American people what their ideas are. When you say to them: OK. Our idea is, how would you change those, they have nothing to say. They do not want to debate, discuss or amend.

When we call them to the floor to say: OK. Here we go, let's have this discussion for the American people, they say: Nope, we don't want to have a discussion, not until we have cut our deals, not until we have gone into backrooms and cut our deals, not until we have delivered for Wall Street in backroom deals we wouldn't bring to this floor because we know what they would look like in the bright light of day.

That is where we are. Frankly, it is unfortunate and it is a shame for the American people because every day we continue with this is another victory for the Wall Street mischief. Every day we are delayed is another day that the champagne corks are flying out the window of the investment banks on Wall Street as they celebrate the fact that more highly leveraged gambles can go through because we haven't regulated them, more mortgage brokers can go out and sell junk mortgages to folks and take advantage of them with conditions that are buried deep in the fine print that they do not see. More people can get stuck in credit card tricks and traps that are unregulated by an independent consumer financial protection agency to stand up for them. Of course, the CEOs continue to get huge bonuses without the kind of governance this bill would put over executive compensation.

Why do they do it? Well, the relationship between the other party and Wall Street is pretty well known. It has been publicly reported that leaders of the other party went running up to Wall Street not too long ago to have their favorite closed-door, private meetings in the shadows, no publicity, no press. They would not discuss what took place in those meetings, but you know they went up there to offer their services to Wall Street to help defeat this legislation. They just don't want to talk about it.

So that has been pretty well established, and it runs afoul of the desires of the American people. Two-thirds of Americans want us to take action. As those of us who have spent time in public life know, usually people care about issues that relate to them very immediately. They care about pocketbook issues. They care about their family, the roof over their head, their paycheck. For a lot of folks in America, Wall Street is a long way off, and it is almost a kind of hypothetical concern for a lot of Americans. But they have it, just as strongly as they care about the economy right now. Because they know Wall Street has been taking advantage of America for too long; that the risks of it for ordinary families, when it gets out of control, are too great; and that Wall Street needs to be reined in. They know that, and that is why they want us to act.

That is why it is a shame that the minority party is refusing to allow us to even go to the bill and have a public debate in the light of this Chamber, in the light of day, about our ideas. We have told the American people what our ideas are. They are in the bill. Here are our ideas: Our ideas are a strong Consumer Financial Products Safety Commission—an independent consumer financial products protection agency to look out after the little guy.

How often have you looked at a credit card application and seen how many pages of small print are in it? Look at a mortgage. Look at any kind of commercial credit. In all that small print, the lawyers and the lobbyists have done their work. Too often, it is the person who signs on the bottom line who ends up discovering they signed up for a raw deal. Nobody is looking out for them. Nobody is putting at the top of the contract: Green light. This is fair. We have taken a look at it. Safe, good to go, Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval—or yellow light: Careful. You might want to truly know what you are doing before you sign up for this—or red light: Bad deal. Dangerous for consumers. Look out.

Simple, helpful information for American consumers to get, an independent commission to help advise consumers in those ways and have some regulatory authority over the people who put those products together, that is what we want in this bill. It is not fancy. It is not tricky. It is just a way to unwind the ''gotcha'' contracts that too many Americans have had to put up with for too long because Wall Street and the bankers have been writing those contracts and there hasn't been discipline over them.

So that is one of the ideas we are out there with. If they have a better idea, where is it? I don't want to deal that away in the dark. Come to the floor and tell us in the bright light of day what better idea you have than a consumer financial protection agency that is independent and out there to help the ordinary folks.

We would also consolidate bank regulators so that a big Wall Street bank can't shop around and decide which regulator it wants to have regulated. You don't get to choose your ref when you go to play a game, and you shouldn't get to choose your regulator when you go out into the field of commerce. It allows game playing and it is not right.

We should strengthen regulation over all financial firms and no more allowing them to change their charter to avoid rules they do not like. That is not complicated. That is simple. It is clear. It is our position in the bright light of day. If they have a better one, where is it? I am not going to deal that one away in the dark. It wouldn't be right.

There are provisions that would crack down on CEO compensation, to make sure shareholders have a real say in executive pay and to make sure, in particular, that the compensation committees of the board that sets executive pay aren't just the pals and the golfing buddies of the people whose multimillion-dollar pay and bonuses

they are approving; to make sure it is independent directors who are on the compensation committee and making those decisions. That is our position. It is clear. It is out there in the bright light of day. It makes sense. If they have a better idea, bring it. We are happy to listen to it.

But this room is empty of Republicans right now. There are no ideas, there are no alternatives. All they want to do is deal this stuff away in the dark and it is wrong. They will, however, attack it. They will say that a provision in this bill that provides for the banking industry to fund an orderly failure and wipeout of an existing bank so the government doesn't have to come in and bail it out, because there is no provision for an orderly failure, is actually taxpayer-funded bailout legislation. I mean, they couldn't be more wrong. The argument doesn't even make sense.

For starters, there is no bailout. The bank isn't bailed out. It is put out of its misery, but it is put out of its misery and sold off in an organized way. So as far as a taxpayer-funded bailout, there is no bailout. As far as it being taxpayer funded, it is industry funded. There is no taxpayer money in the deal at all. We make the industry pay to basically have a funeral plan for their colleague banks that fail so the taxpayer doesn't have to be there.

They turn that completely inside out, and they do so why? Not because it is true—we know that—but because they have a pollster who has taken a poll and who has discovered that, guess what, the American public doesn't like bailouts and doesn't like bailout bills. So, aha, the geniuses discover they are going to call this a bailout bill because that makes it seem unpopular. It doesn't matter that it is not true. A little confusion never hurts when you don't have a position of your own that you are willing to bring out in the light of day. But that is what they have to say about that provision.

That is actually a provision that I think makes a lot of sense. There has to be a way to have an orderly failure of a bank that goes insolvent so the taxpayer doesn't have to come in and prop it up because people worry, if one goes, is there a run on the bank? What does this mean for the global banking system? You have to have a way for banks to fail, for managers to be fired, for shareholders to lose their money, for all the consequences for failure in a real market system to happen but in an orderly way. That is what the bill does.

So you can go through this bill idea by idea, and I am willing to stand by the Democratic ideas. I actually have some amendments, if we could get to this bill, that I would like to see called up because I think we could improve it. I would love to see us reverse a decision called the Marquette decision—a decision by the Supreme Court that said the rules for a bank are determined by the State where the bank has its headquarters—where it is domiciled, and if there is a conflict between a State law that protects the consumer and the State law for where the bank is, it is the home of the bank that wins.

Well, now, how did that all work out? What happened is the banks figured out the States that have the worst consumer protection laws in the country and they moved there. Not for nothing does your credit card usually come from one of just two or three States.

The result of that is that the power of the States of the United States of America, the sovereign power of the States of the United States of America they have had since before the Revolution to protect consumers from exorbitant interest rates, from rates that were called usury because they were too high, illegally high, was taken away from them. Nobody in Congress made that decision. It slipped through in the back of the Supreme Court decision all those years ago and the industry saw their opportunity and they adapted. If you want to know why you are paying a 30-percent interest rate on your credit card when your home State has an interest rate cap of 18 percent, it is because of that decision.

I am for putting that choice back in the hands of the States to protect their own consumers from these global, international, multinational banks. Global, international, multinational banks, huge Wall Street banks could not give a hoot about Rhode Island. But if they have to obey Rhode Island law, that is another question—Rhode Island law or Colorado law or California law or Vermont law; you name it. The States should be able to protect their consumers the way they always had until this decision—it is part of American history—from exorbitant and cruel interest rates. So I would like to see that amendment.

But the bill as it is, is something we can be proud of. It is a shame that here we are with two votes now back to back, with the Republicans refusing to allow us to even enter that debate. I have wracked my brain to try to think of a way to explain why they are doing this. There are not any good reasons.

One is to prevent progress on anything, anything and everything—the politics of obstruction. If it has President Obama's name on it, if it would reflect well on him no matter how important it is to the American people, forget it. Job No. 1 is to deny any victories, any support to Obama irrespective of the merits. We have seen plenty of evidence of that and maybe that is the reason.

Reason No. 2, they have interests, special interests they want to protect—Wall Street interests, banking interests, people who do not want to see an independent consumer financial protection agency looking over consumer contracts and sticking up for the little guy. That could be another reason. That would explain why they do not want to put their positions on the record anywhere. That is why they will not write a reform bill. That is why they will not put forward a reform amendment in the committee. That is why they will not come to the floor and allow us to debate this bill.

They know their arguments are running against the public interest, the concerns of the American people and the needs of our country, and are just to protect Wall Street. They don't want that in public so they are willing to have this fight. They are willing to blockade even going to this bill, just for the purpose of protecting the darkness in which they want to cut deals to protect Wall Street and the special interests behind them.

That has to stop. Like many of my colleagues I am prepared to stay here, to keep banging away at this, to come and vote over and over again, to spend days and nights on this issue until we get the job done. I take some comfort from some of the stories of history, one of which is the Biblical story of Jericho. When Joshua and the Israelites surrounded Jericho, they didn't go and negotiate and ask them would you please open the door, we will give you what you want. No, they went around the city, time after time—seven times they went around the city of Jericho, blowing their horns, blowing the ram's horn. On the seventh day, on the seventh tour around Jericho, when they blew their horns, Joshua said to the Israelites: Let out a great shout. And they let out their great shout and the ram's horns blared and the walls fell flat.

Maybe it will take seven times around this bill before the walls of obstruction the Republicans have put up to protect the dark deals they want to do for their special interests fall. Maybe it will take seven times. Maybe it will take 17 times. Maybe it will take 27 times. But when you look at the damage that Wall Street caused to this country with its speculative, dangerous practices, with its unregulated, uninhibited excesses, this is important.

This is one we need to win for the American people. This is one we need to win for the safety of our economy going forward. This is one we need for every family that lost their job because the financial catastrophe washed through the business they worked for. They have never been to Wall Street, they have no interest in the financial industry, but they are as out of work as anybody else because of what splashed and sloshed across this country from what happened on Wall Street.

Those are people we cannot forget. Those are people we cannot let down. Rhode Island still has the third highest unemployment in the country. We are in our 27th month of severe recession. It has been compounded by historic flooding that has 2,000 Rhode Islanders still out of their homes. The flooding sure isn't Wall Street's fault but it compounds the harm that Wall Street inflicted on the entire economy, and it focused so intensely in my home State of Rhode Island.

As far as I am concerned, we are here, we are here to stay, we are going to get this done, and we cannot be discouraged by the Republican obstruction.

I see the majority leader on the floor. Would it be convenient to yield to him?

Mr. REID. I so appreciate my friend extending his usual courtesy.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I offer a cloture motion which is at the desk, and I ask it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 349, S. 3217, the Restoring American Financial Stability Act of 2010.

Christopher J. Dodd, Blanche L. Lincoln, Jeff Bingaman, Mark Begich, Charles E. Schumer, Arlen Specter, Robert Menendez, Benjamin L. Cardin, Daniel K. Inouye, Jack Reed, Edward E. Kaufman, Byron L. Dorgan, Richard J. Durbin, Tom Udall, John F. Kerry, Sheldon Whitehouse, Robert P. Casey, Jr.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following a period of morning business tomorrow, Wednesday, April 28, the Senate resume the motion to proceed to S. 3217, with the time until 12:20 p.m. equally divided and controlled between the leaders or their designees; that at 12:20 p.m., the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 3217, with the mandatory quorum waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank the majority leader for his steady and strong leadership through these times.

I yield the floor and 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. WHITEHOUSE. 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. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 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.

SUSPENDING THE 2011 COLA

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I support the recent actions by both the Senate and House of Representatives to suspend the 2011 cost of living adjustment for Members of Congress.

Although there has been encouraging news on some sectors of our economy, too many Californians are unemployed or underemployed. It is fitting that we forgo a cost of living adjustment at this time.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO STANLEY G. JONES

● Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I wish today to pay tribute to the well-respected tribal leader and proud veteran of the War in the Pacific with the U.S. Marine Corps, Stanley G. Jones, Sr., ''Scho-Hallem.''

Mr. Jones is retiring after more than 40 years of service to his people, the Tulalip Tribes, of my State of Washington. Mr. Jones served on the Tulalip Tribes Board of Directors for the past 44 years; longer than any other Tulalip tribe member.

Mr. Jones helped guide tribes in the Northwest through their legal battle to regain lost treaty rights, culminating in the Boldt Decision of the 1970s. He was instrumental in reviving the traditional First Salmon Ceremony in 1976, the practice having been outlawed by the Federal Government in the early 1900s. He was the first Chair of the National Indian Gaming Task Force, and helped set tribal policy regarding the usage of proceeds from Tulalip tribal ventures.

Mr. Jones was a strong advocate for economic development. He led the Tulalip Tribes' efforts to invest their lands, and worked to create jobs and opportunities for his tribe's people, and those in neighboring communities. He also endeavored to provide educational opportunities, health care, housing and senior services to tribal members.

Mr. Jones will be sorely missed but his legacy is in the growing respect for treaty rights and tribal sovereignty that he leaves behind. Today his vision is being carried on by a new generation of tribal leaders.

I take this opportunity to wish him a long and well-deserved retirement.●

REMEMBERING MARY THURMAIER

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today it is with sadness that I remember the life of Mary Thurmaier, who passed away on April 25. I was fortunate to know Mary, who did so much for her community and for our state.

Mary was a tireless activist and volunteer. Perhaps her most significant contribution of all was her 24 years of service on the Stevens Point Area School Board, from 1982 to 2006. Mary, a devoted mother of four herself, spent her nearly two and a half decades on the board working to strengthen public education for the children of Stevens Point. She focused much of her considerable effort on critical issues like early childhood education.

Mary also served a vital role for her community when she managed the Point Area Bus Cooperative before the city took over the operations. She did a tremendous job in that position and later went on to serve as director of the Stevens Point Convention and Visitors Bureau. She also served as a Democratic national committeewoman for Wisconsin.

Above all, Mary was a beloved wife, mother, and grandmother. My thoughts are with her family and friends today, as so many mourn her loss. I know all of us are grateful for Mary's life and her many contributions to Stevens Point and the State of Wisconsin, which will live on for many years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:13 a.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. 4543. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4285 Payne Avenue in San Jose, California, as the ''Anthony J. Cortese Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4861. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1343 West Irving Park Road in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''Steve Goodman Post Office Building''.

At 2:15 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 bill, without amendment:

S. 3253. An act to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. BYRD) reported that he had signed the following enrolled bill, which was previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

S. 1963. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance to caregivers of veterans, to improve the provision of health care to veterans, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 6:30 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 3253. An act to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 4543. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located

at 4285 Payne Avenue in San Jose, California, as the ''Anthony J. Cortese Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4861. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1343 West Irving Park Road in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''Steve Goodman Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on April 27, 2010, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 1963. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance to caregivers of veterans, to improve the provision of health care to veterans, and for other purposes.

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 Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. 3261. A bill to establish the Buffalo Bayou National Heritage Area in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. BOND):

S. 3262. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the volume cap for private activity bonds shall not apply to bonds for facilities for the furnishing of water and sewage facilities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself and Mr. ENSIGN):

S. 3263. A bill to establish a Chief Veterinary Officer in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 3264. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to provide for regulation of debt settlement services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 3265. A bill to restore Second Amendment rights in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 3266. A bill to ensure the availability of loan guarantees for rural homeowners; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 3267. A bill to improve the provision of assistance to fire departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. Res. 501. A resolution recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of Sexual Assault Awareness Month; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. Res. 502. A resolution eliminating secret Senate holds; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BURRIS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TESTER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. Con. Res. 61. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that general aviation pilots and industry should be recognized for the contributions made in response to Haiti earthquake relief efforts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 182

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 182, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 435

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 435, a bill to provide for evidence-based and promising practices related to juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity prevention and intervention to help build individual, family, and community strength and resiliency to ensure that youth lead productive, safe, healthy, gang-free, and law-abiding lives.

S. 504

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 504, a bill to redesignate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps.

S. 891

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor 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. 1055

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1055, a bill to grant the congressional gold medal, collectively, to the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, United States Army, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 1057

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1057, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of physical therapists in the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1190

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1190, a bill to provide financial aid to local law enforcement officials along the Nation's borders, and for other purposes.

S. 1235

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1235, a bill to amend the Public Health Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for treatment of a minor child's congenital or developmental deformity or disorder due to trauma, infection, tumor, or disease.

S. 1239

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1239, a bill to amend section 340B of the Public Health Service Act to revise and expand the drug discount program under that section to improve the provision of discounts on drug purchases for certain safety net providers.

S. 1598

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1598, a bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a permanent background check system.

S. 2882

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2882, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to the treatment of individuals as independent contractors or employees, and for other purposes.

S. 2989

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 2989, a bill to improve the Small Business Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3065

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3065, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the readiness of the Armed Forces by replacing the current policy concerning homosexuality in the Armed Forces, referred to as ''Don't Ask, Don't Tell'', with a policy of nondiscrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

S. 3178

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3178, a bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide for the establishment of Youth Corps programs and provide for wider dissemination of the Youth Corps model.

S. 3213

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3213, a bill to ensure that amounts credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are used for harbor maintenance.

S. 3244

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3244, a bill to provide that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011.

S. 3259

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3259, a bill to amend subtitle A of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 to make the operation of such subtitle permanent law.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. 3261. A bill to establish the Buffalo Bayou National Heritage Area in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill to designate the Buffalo Bayou as a National Heritage Area. This legislation will designate the 25-mile stretch of the Houston Ship Channel as the first National Heritage Area in Texas. This distinction will allow up to $1 million annually for 10 years to the area and provide the tourism benefits of Federal recognition without restriction on land or commerce.

In 2002, Congressman GENE GREEN and I introduced the Buffalo Bayou National Heritage Study Act, which directed the U.S. Department of the Interior to conduct a study to determine if the Buffalo Bayou was eligible to receive National Heritage Area distinction. The Department of the Interior has concluded that the Buffalo Bayou has met the criteria needed for National Heritage Area distinction, and I support this distinction. I wish to recognize Congressman GREEN for spearheading the efforts to designate the Buffalo Bayou as a National Heritage Area.

The Buffalo Bayou has played an important role in the development of Texas and our nation's commerce. The Buffalo Bayou has helped the City of Houston become the fourth largest city in the United States by supporting oil refining, petrochemical production and commercial trade.

The history of the Buffalo Bayou begins on August 30, 1836, when Augustus Chapman Allen and his brother, John Kirby Allen, founded the City of Houston near the banks of the Buffalo Bayou. The city was incorporated on June 5, 1837, and named after the former General and President of the Republic of Texas, Sam Houston. One of the most significant battles in the history of Texas, the Battle of San Jacinto, was fought at the mouth of Buffalo Bayou and the San Jacinto River. It paved the way for the Republic of Texas to become an independent country.

If approved by Congress, the Buffalo Bayou's National Heritage Area status would enhance as well as promote the national significance of this historic waterway.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself and Mr. ENSIGN):

S. 3263. A bill to establish a Chief Veterinary Officer in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill, along with Senator ENSIGN, to establish a Chief Veterinary Officer within the Department of Homeland Security. I want to acknowledge the leadership that our colleagues in the House, especially Representative ROGERS of Alabama, have shown in introducing a bipartisan companion bill. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation advances increased focus on veterinary health, food defense, and agricultural security within the Department of Homeland Security. Importantly, it does this without creating an additional layer of management within the Department.

Animal disease and zoonotic outbreaks are a looming threat to the United States. A major foreign animal disease outbreak, such as foot-and-mouth disease, could have far-reaching effects, threatening our food supply and harming both domestic commerce and international trade. The Department of Homeland Security would be called upon to provide leadership and to integrate the necessary assets and people from across the Nation to respond to such an incident.

This bill would strengthen the Department's capacity to prepare for and respond to such a crisis by ensuring that there is a veterinary leader within the Department who is fully prepared and empowered to respond. The Secretary of Homeland Security would be required to appoint a veterinarian with expertise in veterinary public health, emergency preparedness, and other related fields as the Department's Chief Veterinary Officer. He or she would lead the division of the Department with primary responsibility for veterinary issues, food defense, and agricultural security, and would serve as the Department's lead policy advisor and principal point of contact on those issues. This senior leader also would provide overall guidance for the health of the Department's working animals that play a vital role in the Nation's defense.

I have long been concerned about the Nation's ability to prepare for and respond to agriculture disasters, such as a catastrophic foreign animal disease outbreak. In February, 2009, I held a hearing on protecting public and animal health and received testimony from several agencies, including the Government Accountability Office, GAO, which had recently completed a review of the Federal veterinary workforce. GAO reported troubling shortfalls in our veterinarian workforce and our planning to respond to foreign animal disease and zoonotic outbreaks. I believe that this bill will help address this challenge and support a more capable and prepared Department of Homeland Security.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

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. 3263

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

SECTION 1. CHIEF VETERINARY OFFICER OF DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 317. CHIEF VETERINARY OFFICER.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is in the Department a Chief Veterinary Officer, who shall be appointed by the Secretary.

''(b) REPORTING RELATIONSHIP.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chief Veterinary Officer shall report directly to the Chief Medical Officer.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—If an individual other than the Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs is serving as the Chief Medical Officer, the Chief Veterinary Officer shall report directly to the Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs.

''(c) QUALIFICATIONS.—The individual appointed as Chief Veterinary Officer shall be a veterinarian who possesses—

''(1) a demonstrated ability in and knowledge of veterinary public health and emergency preparedness; and

''(2) other professional experience, as determined by the Secretary, including experience in agriculture, food defense, and disaster medicine.

''(d) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Chief Veterinary Officer shall—

''(1) be the head of the division of the Department with primary responsibility for veterinary issues, food defense, and agriculture security; and

''(2) have primary responsibility within the Department for responsibilities relating to veterinary medicine and veterinary public health, including—

''(A) serving as the principal authority in the Department responsible for advising the

Secretary, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs, on veterinary public health, food defense, and agricultural security issues;

''(B) providing guidance for the health and welfare of the working animals of the Department, including those used to enhance transportation, border, and maritime security, and for other purposes;

''(C) leading the policy initiatives of the Department relating to—

''(i) food, animal, and agricultural incidents, and the impact of such incidents on animal and public health; and

''(ii) overall domestic preparedness for and collective response to agricultural terrorism;

''(D) serving as the principal point of contact in the Office of Health Affairs for—

''(i) all veterinary preparedness and response research and development; and

''(ii) sharing homeland security veterinary medical information with Department officials, including all components with veterinary, food, or agricultural interests;

''(E) serving as the principal point of contact within the Department with respect to veterinary homeland security issues for—

''(i) the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Defense, the Department of Health and Human Services, and other Federal departments and agencies; and

''(ii) State, local, and tribal governments, the veterinary community, and other entities within and outside the Department; and

''(F) performing such other duties relating to the responsibilities of the Chief Veterinary Officer as the Secretary may require.

''(e) ADVANCE NOTICE OF REORGANIZATION REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days before carrying out any reorganization within the Department that would affect any responsibility of the Chief Veterinary Officer, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the proposed reorganization.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title III the following:

''Sec. 317. Chief Veterinary Officer.''.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 3265. A bill to restore Second Amendment rights in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am proud to introduce the Second Amendment Enforcement Act today with Senator TESTER. I have always supported Americans' Second Amendment rights and was pleased when the Supreme Court found in June 2008 that the District of Columbia had reached too far in restricting the District's residents from owning firearms and defending themselves in their home. The legislation that we introduce today seeks to implement the Supreme Court's decision in District of Columbia v. Heller.

Specifically, the Second Amendment Enforcement Act would codify many of the laws the District of Columbia City Council has put in place in response to the Supreme Court's decision. For example, this legislation would codify the District's repeal of the semiautomatic ban and retain the District's ban on fully-automatic machine guns. The legislation would also codify the District City Council's law that prohibits the carrying of firearms into the District's public buildings that have implemented security measures and codify the Council's law regulating the carrying of rifles or shotguns.

The legislation would correctly restore the right of self-defense for any District resident in his or her home. Previously, the District had a requirement that any firearm kept in a home be stored in a manner that made it essentially useless for self-defense, e.g. kept ''unloaded and either disassembled or secured by a trigger lock, gun safe, locked box, or other secure device.'' The legislation would also clarify that landlords cannot prohibit firearms in rented homes or offices or dictate what firearms tenants may own.

Most egregious was the District's restrictions on the purchase of firearms and outright ban on the purchase of ammunition. At the heart of the Supreme Court's decision was that District residents must be able to own operable firearms for lawful purposes, which must then allow residents meaningful opportunities to purchase firearms and ammunition. Since the District does not have traditional retail gun shops and current federal law prohibits a person from purchasing handguns outside the person's State of residence, the legislation would amend Federal law to allow District residents the ability to purchase guns from federally-licensed dealers in Maryland and Virginia and then transport them back to their homes in DC. Let me be very clear on this point, this legislation would not allow residents of the District to buy firearms from anyone who is not a federally-licensed dealer, even at a gun show. I believe this is a very reasonable restriction and one that again, like much of this legislation, takes into consideration the concerns of the District's City Council.

Some may ask why a Senator from Arizona and a Senator from Montana would introduce legislation that impacts the lives of District residents. It is simple—we believe that residents across this country should have access to firearms to protect themselves, particularly in their own home or place of business. It is a constitutional right and one that was put in place by the Founding Fathers, recognized by the Supreme Court and cherished by many Americans. However, the District of Columbia City Council did not follow the Supreme Court's directive in fully updating their city's laws regarding firearms, and so now it is up to Congress to ensure that District residents' rights are respected by their government.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this important legislation that will not only restore District residents' rights, but also ensure that no resident in any State, territory or the District is prevented from exercising his or her Second Amendment right.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Second Amendment Enforcement Act of 2010 with Senators MCCAIN, BEGICH, BENNETT, BROWNBACK, BURR, CHAMBLISS, GRAHAM, HATCH and WICKER to codify the landmark U.S. Supreme Court decision District of Columbia v. Heller, which ruled Washington, DC's, decades-old ban on firearms unconstitutional. This bill will repeal the District of Columbia's restrictions on semiautomatic firearms, current gun storage law and complicated firearms registration system. It will ensure that law-abiding persons in Washington, DC, are able to fully exercise their Second Amendment rights just like all other Americans.

My cosponsors and I, all signers of the bipartisan friend-of-the-court brief for District of Columbia v. Heller, urging the Court to support gun rights, think this is a very important bill and we welcome our colleagues' support.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 501—RECOGNIZING AND SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 501

Whereas on average, a person is sexually assaulted in the United States every 2½ minutes;

Whereas the Department of Justice reports that 203,830 people in the United States were sexually assaulted in 2008;

Whereas 1 in 6 women and 1 in 33 men have been victims of rape or attempted rape;

Whereas the Department of Defense received 2,908 reports of sexual assault involving members of the Armed Forces in fiscal year 2008, representing an 8 percent increase from fiscal year 2007;

Whereas children and young adults are most at risk of sexual assault, as 44 percent of sexual assault victims are under 18 years of age, and 80 percent are under the 30 years of age;

Whereas sexual assault affects women, men, and children of all racial, social, religious, age, ethnic, and economic groups in the United States;

Whereas women, children, and men suffer multiple types of sexual violence, including acquaintance, stranger, spousal, and gang rape, incest, child sexual molestation, forced prostitution, trafficking, forced pornography, ritual abuse, sexual harassment, and stalking;

Whereas it is estimated that the percentage of completed or attempt rape victimization among women in institutions of higher education is between 20 and 25 percent over the course of a college career;

Whereas, in addition to the immediate physical and emotional costs, sexual assault has associated consequences that may include post-traumatic stress disorder, substance abuse, major depression, homelessness, eating disorders, and suicide;

Whereas only 41 percent of sexual assault victims pursue prosecution by reporting their attack to law enforcement agencies;

Whereas ⅔ of sexual crimes are committed by persons who are not strangers to the victims;

Whereas sexual assault survivors suffer emotional scars long after the physical scars have healed;

Whereas, because of advances in DNA technology, law enforcement agencies have the potential to identify the rapists in tens of thousands of unsolved rape cases;

Whereas aggressive prosecution can lead to the incarceration of rapists and therefore prevent these individuals from committing further crimes;

Whereas national, State, territory, and tribal coalitions, community-based rape crisis centers, and other organizations across the Nation are committed to increasing public awareness of sexual violence and its prevalence, and to eliminating it through prevention and education;

Whereas important partnerships have been formed among criminal and juvenile justice agencies, health professionals, public health workers, educators, first responders, and victim service providers;

Whereas free, confidential help is available to all survivors of sexual assault through the National Sexual Assault Hotline, more than 1,000 rape crisis centers across the United States, and other organizations that provide services to assist survivors of sexual assault;

Whereas, according to a 2010 survey of rape crisis centers by the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, 72 percent of programs have experienced a reduction in funding over the past year, 56 percent have experienced a reduction in staffing, 23 percent have a waiting list for services, and funding and staffing cuts have resulted in an overall 50 percent reduction in the provision of institutional advocacy services;

Whereas individual and collective efforts reflect the dream of the people of the United States for a nation where citizens and organizations actively work to prevent all forms of sexual violence and no sexual assault victim goes unserved or ever feels there is no path to justice; and

Whereas April is recognized as ''National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) it is the sense of the Senate that—

(A) National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month provides a special opportunity to educate the people of the United States about sexual violence and to encourage the prevention of sexual assault, the improved treatment of survivors of sexual assault, and the prosecution of perpetrators of sexual assault;

(B) it is appropriate to properly acknowledge the more than 20,000,000 men and women who have survived sexual assault in the United States and salute the efforts of survivors, volunteers, and professionals who combat sexual assault;

(C) national and community organizations and private sector supporters should be recognized and applauded for their work in promoting awareness about sexual assault, providing information and treatment to survivors of sexual assault, and increasing the number of successful prosecutions of perpetrators of sexual assault; and

(D) public safety, law enforcement, and health professionals should be recognized and applauded for their hard work and innovative strategies to increase the percentage of sexual assault cases that result in the prosecution and incarceration of the offenders;

(2) the Senate strongly recommends that national and community organizations, businesses in the private sector, colleges and universities, and the media promote, through National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, awareness of sexual violence and strategies to decrease the incidence of sexual assault; and

(3) the Senate supports the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

SENATE RESOLUTION 502—ELIMINATING SECRET SENATE HOLDS

Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was:

S. RES. 502

Resolved,

SECTION 1. ELIMINATING SECRET SENATE HOLDS.

Rule VII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following:

''7. (a) The majority and minority leaders of the Senate or their designees shall recognize a notice of intent of a Senator who is a member of their caucus to object to proceeding to a measure or matter only if the Senator—

''(1) submits the notice of intent in writing to the appropriate leader or their designee and grants in the notice permission for the leader or designee to object in the Senator's name; and

''(2) not later than 2 session days after the submission under clause (1), submits for inclusion in the Congressional Record and in the applicable calendar section described in subparagraph (b) the following notice:

'' 'I, Senator _____, intend to object to proceeding to _____, dated _____.'

''(b) The Secretary of the Senate shall maintain for both the Senate Calendar of Business and the Senate Executive Calendar a separate section entitled 'Notices of Intent to Object to Proceeding'. Each section shall include the name of each Senator filing a notice under subparagraph (a)(2), the measure or matter covered by the calendar that the Senator objects to, and the date the objection was filed.

''(c) A Senator may have an item relating to that Senator removed from a calendar to which it was added under subparagraph (b) by submitting for inclusion in the Congressional Record the following notice:

'' 'I, Senator _____, do not object to proceeding to _____, dated _____.'.''.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 61—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS THAT GENERAL AVIATION PILOTS AND INDUSTRY SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED FOR THE CONTRIBUTIONS MADE IN RESPONSE TO HAITI EARTHQUAKE RELIEF EFFORTS

Mr. BEGICH (for himself, Mr. JOHANNS, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BURRIS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TESTER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 61

Whereas, on January 12, 2010, the country of Haiti suffered a devastating earthquake;

Whereas, after the earthquake, general aviation pilots rallied to provide transportation for medical staff and relief personnel;

Whereas more than 4,500 relief flights were made by general aviators in the first 30 days after the earthquake;

Whereas business aircraft alone conducted more than 700 flights, transporting 3,500 passengers, and over 1,000,000 pounds of cargo and supplies;

Whereas relief flights were fully paid for by individual pilots and aircraft owners;

Whereas smaller general aviation aircraft were able to deliver supplies and medical personnel to areas outside Port-Au-Prince which larger aircraft could not serve; and

Whereas the selfless efforts of the general aviation community have saved countless lives and provided humanitarian assistance in a time of need: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) recognizes the many contributions of the general aviation pilots and industry to the Haiti earthquake relief efforts; and

(2) encourages the continued generosity of general aviation pilots and operators in the ongoing humanitarian relief efforts in Haiti.

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 business meeting has been scheduled before Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The business meeting will be held on Thursday, April 29, 2010, to convene off the Senate floor immediately following the first vote.

The purpose of the business meeting is to consider the nomination of Jeffrey Lane to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs).

For further information, please contact Amanda Kelly.

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, May 6, 2010, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of the hearing is to review current issues related to offshore oil and gas development including the Department of the Interior's recent 5-year planning announcements and the accident in the Gulf of Mexico involving the offshore oil rig Deepwater Horizon.

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, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510–6150, or by email to Abigail_Campbell@energy.senate.gov

For further information, please contact Linda Lance or Abigail Campbell.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate to conduct a hearing on on April 27, at 10 a.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 27, 2010, at 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. 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 ''Putting Safety First: Strengthening Enforcement and Creating a Culture of Compliance at Mines and Other Dangerous Workplaces'' on April 27, 2010. The hearing will commence at 2 p.m. in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 27, 2010, at 10 a.m. in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Department of Homeland Security.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 27, 2010, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''Connecting Main Street to the World: Federal Efforts to Expand Small Business Internet Access.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 27, 2010, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Wall Street and the Financial Crisis: The Role of Investment Banks.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence by authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 27, 2010, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMPETITIVENESS, INNOVATION, AND EXPORT PROMOTION

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Competitiveness, Innovation, and Export Promotion of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 27, 2010, at 10 a.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Water and Power be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate to conduct a hearing on April 27, 2010, at 3 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND WILDLIFE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Water and Wildlife of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 27, 2010, at 10 a.m. in room 406 of the Dirksen Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 498.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 498) designating April 2010 as ''National Child Abuse Prevention Month.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 498) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 498

Whereas, in 2008, approximately 772,000 children were determined to be victims of abuse or neglect;

Whereas, in 2008, an estimated 1,740 children died as a result of abuse or neglect;

Whereas, in 2008, an estimated 80 percent of the children who died due to abuse or neglect were under the age of 4;

Whereas, in 2008, of the children under the age of 4 who died due to abuse or neglect, the majority were under the age of 1;

Whereas abused or neglected children have a higher risk in adulthood for developing health problems, including alcoholism, depression, drug abuse, eating disorders, obesity, suicide, and certain chronic diseases;

Whereas a National Institute of Justice study indicated that abused or neglected children—

(1) are 11 times more likely to be arrested for criminal behavior as juveniles; and

(2) are 2.7 times more likely to be arrested for violent and criminal behavior as adults;

Whereas an estimated ⅓ of abused or neglected children grow up to abuse or neglect their own children;

Whereas providing community-based services to families impacted by child abuse or neglect may be far less costly than—

(1) the emotional and physical damage inflicted on children who have been abused or neglected;

(2) providing to abused or neglected children services, including child protective, law enforcement, court, foster care, or health care services; or

(3) providing treatment to adults recovering from child abuse; and

Whereas child abuse or neglect has long-term economic and societal costs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 2010 as ''National Child Abuse Prevention Month'';

(2) recognizes and applauds the national and community organizations that work to promote awareness about child abuse or neglect, including by identifying risk factors and developing prevention strategies;

(3) supports the proclamation issued by President Obama declaring April 2010 as ''National Child Abuse Prevention Month''; and

(4) should—

(A) increase public awareness of prevention programs relating to child abuse or neglect; and

(B) continue to work with the States to reduce the incidence of child abuse or neglect in the United States.

SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 501, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 501) recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of Sexual Assault Awareness Month.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 501) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 501

Whereas on average, a person is sexually assaulted in the United States every 2½ minutes;

Whereas the Department of Justice reports that 203,830 people in the United States were sexually assaulted in 2008;

Whereas 1 in 6 women and 1 in 33 men have been victims of rape or attempted rape;

Whereas the Department of Defense received 2,908 reports of sexual assault involving members of the Armed Forces in fiscal year 2008, representing an 8 percent increase from fiscal year 2007;

Whereas children and young adults are most at risk of sexual assault, as 44 percent of sexual assault victims are under 18 years of age, and 80 percent are under the 30 years of age;

Whereas sexual assault affects women, men, and children of all racial, social, religious, age, ethnic, and economic groups in the United States;

Whereas women, children, and men suffer multiple types of sexual violence, including acquaintance, stranger, spousal, and gang rape, incest, child sexual molestation, forced prostitution, trafficking, forced pornography, ritual abuse, sexual harassment, and stalking;

Whereas it is estimated that the percentage of completed or attempt rape victimization among women in institutions of higher education is between 20 and 25 percent over the course of a college career;

Whereas, in addition to the immediate physical and emotional costs, sexual assault has associated consequences that may include post-traumatic stress disorder, substance abuse, major depression, homelessness, eating disorders, and suicide;

Whereas only 41 percent of sexual assault victims pursue prosecution by reporting their attack to law enforcement agencies;

Whereas ⅔ of sexual crimes are committed by persons who are not strangers to the victims;

Whereas sexual assault survivors suffer emotional scars long after the physical scars have healed;

Whereas, because of advances in DNA technology, law enforcement agencies have the potential to identify the rapists in tens of thousands of unsolved rape cases;

Whereas aggressive prosecution can lead to the incarceration of rapists and therefore prevent these individuals from committing further crimes;

Whereas national, State, territory, and tribal coalitions, community-based rape crisis centers, and other organizations across the Nation are committed to increasing public awareness of sexual violence and its prevalence, and to eliminating it through prevention and education;

Whereas important partnerships have been formed among criminal and juvenile justice agencies, health professionals, public health workers, educators, first responders, and victim service providers;

Whereas free, confidential help is available to all survivors of sexual assault through the National Sexual Assault Hotline, more than 1,000 rape crisis centers across the United States, and other organizations that provide services to assist survivors of sexual assault;

Whereas, according to a 2010 survey of rape crisis centers by the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, 72 percent of programs have experienced a reduction in funding over the past year, 56 percent have experienced a reduction in staffing, 23 percent have a waiting list for services, and funding and staffing cuts have resulted in an overall 50 percent reduction in the provision of institutional advocacy services;

Whereas individual and collective efforts reflect the dream of the people of the United States for a nation where citizens and organizations actively work to prevent all forms of sexual violence and no sexual assault victim goes unserved or ever feels there is no path to justice; and

Whereas April is recognized as ''National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) it is the sense of the Senate that—

(A) National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month provides a special opportunity to educate the people of the United States about sexual violence and to encourage the prevention of sexual assault, the improved treatment of survivors of sexual assault, and the prosecution of perpetrators of sexual assault;

(B) it is appropriate to properly acknowledge the more than 20,000,000 men and women who have survived sexual assault in the United States and salute the efforts of survivors, volunteers, and professionals who combat sexual assault;

(C) national and community organizations and private sector supporters should be recognized and applauded for their work in promoting awareness about sexual assault, providing information and treatment to survivors of sexual assault, and increasing the number of successful prosecutions of perpetrators of sexual assault; and

(D) public safety, law enforcement, and health professionals should be recognized and applauded for their hard work and innovative strategies to increase the percentage of sexual assault cases that result in the prosecution and incarceration of the offenders;

(2) the Senate strongly recommends that national and community organizations, businesses in the private sector, colleges and universities, and the media promote, through National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month, awareness of sexual violence and strategies to decrease the incidence of sexual assault; and

(3) the Senate supports the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 2010

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. Wednesday, April 28; 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 there be a period of morning business for 90 minutes, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the next 30 minutes; that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 3217, the Wall Street reform legislation, as provided for under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Under a previous order, at 12:20 p.m. tomorrow, there will be a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to consider the Wall Street reform bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. 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 7:11 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, April 28, 2010, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MR. TODD NELSON

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the years of service given to the people of Chautauqua County by Mr. Todd Nelson. Mr. Nelson served his constituency faithfully and justly during his tenure as the Kiantone Town Justice.

Public service is a difficult and fulfilling career. Any person with a dream may enter but only a few are able to reach the end. Mr. Nelson served his term with his head held high and a smile on his face the entire way. I have no doubt that his kind demeanor left a lasting impression on the people of Chautauqua County.

We are truly blessed to have such strong individuals with a desire to make this county the wonderful place that we all know it can be. Mr. Nelson is one of those people and that is why Madam Speaker I rise in tribute to him today.

HONORING ISRAELI INDEPENDENCE DAY

SPEECH OF

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 2010

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, this week we witnessed the 62nd anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel. It is an occasion to celebrate the achievements of a country that, like the United States, aspires to be a land of peace, prosperity and the pursuit of happiness.

The United States and Israel are bound by a common history forged by those who dared to dream of democracy and freedom; of civil and human rights; of laws and not wishes. President Harry Truman was the first world leader to recognize the Israeli declaration of independence in 1948. Other countries soon followed. In this way, with the United States at its side, Israel entered the community of nations.

We continue to share that sacred bond born in 1948. The bond carries with it a burden that all such undeniable relationships bring—the responsibility to celebrate our successes, and to address our challenges. We are both stronger nations because of this. To do otherwise would be to diminish that special bond.

An anniversary is also an opportunity to think about the future and therefore this is a time for us to renew our commitment to work for peace. As former Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin said, "We must think differently, look at things in a different way. Peace requires a world of new concepts, new definitions." As a friend and ally of Israel, I look forward to the work of nurturing the seeds of peace that will sustain and protect Israel.

TRIBUTE TO JOAN HASKELL

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of Joan Haskell from the Marshall County Farm Bureau, and to express my appreciation for her 14 years of service to her community.

A Marshall County native with a strong agriculture background, Ms. Haskell achieved the position of Office Administrator with the Bureau's federation staff. Her extensive work with members of the Farm Bureau since 1995 has earned Joan the respect and appreciation of her community.

Madam Speaker, I commend Joan Haskell for her many years of loyalty and dedication to her fellow Iowans. It is an honor to represent Joan in the United States House of Representatives, and I know that my colleagues join me in wishing her a happy and healthy retirement.

HONORING ISRAELI INDEPENDENCE DAY

SPEECH OF

HON. SHELLEY BERKLEY

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 2010

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 62nd anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel.

Sixty-two years ago, a brave group of Jews living in the Middle East made the audacious claim that a Jewish State could be successfully re-invented in their ancient homeland. More than 2,000 years after the last independent Jewish government had come to an end, they believed they could somehow re-establish a Jewish state, almost from scratch, in a way that had never happened before, anywhere in the world.

These daring Jews came from all around the globe: from Yemen, from Russia, from France, from the United States, and, in many cases, from the very land that was about to become the State of Israel. They shared a common heritage, but it remained to be seen whether these disparate peoples could unify to develop a country or a common culture. Could they even agree on what kind of government to form? Or what laws to pass?

Their claim was particularly bold, given that seven Arab neighbors stood ready to destroy this state in its infancy. Armed with some of the most advanced weaponry known to man, these Arab countries were determined never to allow a Jewish state in their neighborhood. But, in what can only be described as a miracle, this tiny Jewish state survived those initial days and fought to victory in 1948. They did it again in 1956, 1967 and 1973. In fact, every time Arab countries sought to destroy Israel, they found the Israelis stronger and more determined than ever to survive.

Seeing that the military option wasn't successful, the Arab nations turned toward a different method to try to destroy Israel: terrorism. Through rockets, bus bombings, suicide attacks, hostage crises and the murders of countless innocent civilians, Israel has continued to survive, determined that life will go on, as usual, no matter what the obstacle or challenge.

Israel's enemies have also tried to use the United Nations, UN, to delegitimize it. They have passed resolutions in the UN equating Zionism with racism. They have created entire agencies at the UN to highlight Israel's alleged "war crimes." And they have hijacked the UN Human Rights Council to push their own racist, anti-Semitic agenda.

And despite all of these enemies, Israel has demonstrated over and over its desire and yearning to live in peace. They willingly gave up the Sinai to make peace with Egypt, and signed a peace agreement with Jordan in 1994. They withdrew from Lebanon a decade ago and pulled out of Gaza in 2005, all in hopes they would find a peace partner on the other side.

But instead, Israel's offers have been spurned, and their adversaries have refused to negotiate. Their so-called "partners" say that Israel must make unreasonable concessions before they will even sit down and negotiate with them. When Arab leaders were invited to attend a peace conference with Israel, in 2007, they even refused to walk through the same door as Israel's leaders.

Through all this, the United States has stood by Israel, even in these darkest of times. We provided Israel with weapons, with technical expertise and a friendship that has endured through generation after generation of American leadership. The American people demand no less: we believe in the Jewish people's right to a homeland, and their right to live in peace, as our democratic ally. This position does not win us friends in the Muslim world, but we stand by this position because we know it is right. The people of Israel, I know, are eternally grateful for this friendship and have repaid it with their loyalty throughout the years of its existence.

I am extremely proud of the strong U.S.-Israel relationship and I call on the Obama Administration to continue this tradition of strong U.S. support for Israel. We must focus our attention not on minor irritants in our bilateral relationship, but on bringing the parties together to meet face-to-face for negotiations. We cannot impose any solution on them; only they can come up with a negotiated solution that strengthens the security for both sides and brings about a state for the Palestinian people. Only they can bring peace to this region.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of the State of Israel is as audacious today as it was 62 years ago. It shows that a group of determined individuals can successfully band together and triumph in the most difficult of circumstances. It shows

● 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.

that David can defeat Goliath, with the proper planning, courage and determination.

I honor and stand in awe of the State of Israel on its 62nd birthday. It is an achievement many people thought would never be possible. On this historic day, I call on my colleagues to join me in congratulating Israel on this milestone and in assuring them of U.S. support for generations to come.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF BO JOOST ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young man from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that Bo Joost of Sherwood, Ohio has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Maryland.

Bo's offer of appointment poises him to attend the United States Naval Academy this fall with the incoming midshipmen Class of 2014. Attending one of our Nation's military academies is an invaluable experience that offers a world-class education while placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Bo brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2014. While attending Fairview High School in Sherwood, Ohio, Bo attained a grade point average of 4.0 that placed him first in his graduating class. He was inducted into the National Honor Society where he served as vice president his senior year. Bo was also a member of the Varsity Club and Foreign Language Society.

Throughout high school, Bo participated in the football, baseball, and archery teams, having served as co-Captain of the varsity football team his senior year. Bo has been active and held numerous leadership positions in Student Council, Fellowship of Christian Athletes, Students Against Destructive Decisions, Students for Action in Education, served as a D.A.R.E. role model, and participated in Lutheran Youth Fellowship. Bo also volunteers for relay for life, central shares, and vacation bible school. I am confident that Bo will carry the lessons of his student leadership to the Naval Academy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Bo Joost on the acceptance of his appointment to the United States Naval Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Bo will excel during his career at the Naval Academy and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the Nation.

THE CONGRESSIONAL YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL: A LEGACY OF SERVICE

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in congratulating the 2009–2010 Congressional Youth Advisory Council. This year 45 students from public, private, and home schools in grades 9 through 12 made their voices heard and made a difference in their communities, their country and their Congress. These students volunteered their time, effort, and talent to inform me about the important issues facing their generation. As young leaders within their communities and their schools, these students boldly represent the promise and the hope we all have for their very bright future.

President Ronald Reagan 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 once like in the United States where men were free.''

To ensure that the blessing of freedom is passed from one generation to the next, the members of the CYAC spent time interviewing a veteran and documenting the experience for the ''Preserving History Project.'' Today I'm proud to submit the brief summaries provided so the patriotic service of our dedicated veterans and the thoughtful work of the CYAC may be preserved for antiquity in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A copy of each submitted student summary follows.

To each member of the Congressional Youth Advisory Council, thank you for making this year and this group a success. It is not a coincidence that this congressional tribute celebrates two generations of service. Each of you is trusted with the precious gift of freedom.

You are the voices of the future and I salute you. God bless you and God bless America.

The summary follows:

I chose someone who was close to the hearts of my family, a man of God, and someone who is loyal to his country, Captain Jones. Born and raised in El Paso, Texas, after Captain Jones joined the Navy, he expanded tremendously beyond those Texas border lines. Captain Jones has a genuine outlook on the thirty-five years he served in the Navy and is nothing less than satisfied with those years. He finished college while gaining his commission in the Navy, and still had an ample amount of time to continue serving in the military, which he did with full devotion and determination. Captain Jones is a great man, and his story is one of a kind. Prior to this exceptional interview, I already had a great appreciation for the Navy, as well as the other branches of service, because I grew up with a father who actively served to protect the United States of America. Even with my previous knowledge and gratitude of the military service, after I completed the personal interview with Captain Jones, my eyes and my mind were open to more reasons why I truly support all of the troops. I still get a sudden shock when I hear that one person in the crowd, say anything but good things about the United States Military Force. However, as Captain Jones would so kindly put it, ''Don't be narrow minded to the good opportunities that the military has to offer.''—Valencia King

TRIBUTE TO EMMA SKAHILL

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Emma Skahill, of Earlham, Iowa, who has achieved national recognition for exemplary volunteer service in her community. The 2010 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program recently named Emma as a Distinguished Finalist of top youth volunteers in Iowa for her part in organizing a fund-raising walk and awareness campaign to help with the construction of a Habitat for Humanity house for a Mississippi family in need.

Created in 1995, by Prudential Financial in partnership with the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards annually honors the most impressive student volunteers in each state and the District of Columbia. This organization strives to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions are critically important and highly valued, while inspiring other young individuals to follow their example. Over the past 15 years, the program has become the nation's largest youth recognition effort based solely on community service, and has honored nearly 100,000 young volunteers at the local, state and national level.

Madam Speaker, individuals such as Emma Skahill must be recognized and applauded for their sincere dedication to maintaining a healthy community and for their positive impact on the lives of others. Emma's actions show that young Americans can—and do—play important roles in our nation, and I am proud to represent Emma, her family and her fellow volunteers in the United States Congress.

GUADALUPE FLORES JUAREZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Guadalupe Flores Juarez who has received the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Guadalupe Flores Juarez is an 8th grader at Wheat Ridge Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Guadalupe Flores Juarez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations once again to Guadalupe Flores Juarez for winning

the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character to all her future accomplishments.

CONGRATULATING BUTLER UNIVERSITY ON REACHING THE NCAA MEN'S BASKETBALL NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my hometown Butler Bulldogs on their first ever run to the NCAA Men's Basketball Championship Game.

While their loss to Duke was painful for fans of the Bulldog faithful, it was a great ride and the entire State of Indiana was ecstatic to be a part of it.

The game itself was nothing short of epic. Fifteen lead changes. Two shots to win it in the final thirteen seconds.

But most importantly, both teams represented the peak of success on AND off the court.

While many athletic programs focus on attracting NBA prospects instead of student athletes, we saw two schools with 90-percent-plus graduation rates playing for the national championship.

This run allowed the Bulldogs to introduce America to something we know as the Butler Way—which means playing with character and toughness, and placing team above self.

In the end, Duke took home the championship, but Butler won the hearts of the American people.

Mark my words—Butler will be back again next year running with the big dogs—winning their way. The Butler Way.

ESMERALDA VALDEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Esmeralda Valdez who has received the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Esmeralda Valdez is an 8th grader at Moore Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Esmeralda Valdez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations once again to Esmeralda Valdez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character to all her future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO DEREK MUIRDEN

HON. WILLIAM L. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding career of Mr. Derek Muirden, a veteran of the armed forces and one of northern New York's most recognizable voices, for his decades of service to the North Country

For years, Derek has produced quality programming for Mountain Lake PBS, Plattsburgh's public television station and has reached millions of viewers in New York, Vermont and Quebec.

Derek has been a regional storyteller for decades through the many series he has produced and hosted including: People Near Here, Roadside Adventures, Roadside Recipes and Rustic Living. He is also noted in the region as a documentary filmmaker with productions such as: A Castle in Every Heart: The Arto Monaco Story, Voices of Scotland, Then Again: Reliving History at Fort Ticonderoga and Reach for the Sky: Inside the U.S. Air Force Thunderbirds.

Mr. Muirden is admired by many throughout our community for his in depth and entertaining reporting of the history of the North Country. He is held in high regards by many in our region because of his balanced reporting and his dedication to preparation and professionalism. Creating hundreds of hours of television chronicling our region, he is a prolific producer and host of programs that capture the unique feel and environment of the Adirondacks and our North Country region.

Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate and thank Derek Muirden for his decades of effort to immortalize our community and honor our Nation. He is a great entertainer and a source of pride for our region, and the North Country would not be the same without him.

ERIKA LOPEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Erika Lopez who has received the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Erika Lopez is an 8th grader at Mandalay Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Erika Lopez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations once again to Erika Lopez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character to all her future accomplishments.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF GRANT GENZMAN ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young man from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that Grant Genzman of Perrysburg, Ohio has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Maryland.

Grant's offer of appointment poises him to attend the United States Naval Academy this fall with the incoming midshipmen Class of 2014. Attending one of our Nation's military academies is an invaluable experience that offers a world-class education while placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Grant brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming class of midshipmen. While attending St. John's Jesuit High School in Toledo, Ohio, Grant attained an impressive grade point average that placed him first in his graduating class. Grant earned the AP Scholar Award, the Outstanding Academic Achievement Award, the Claver Scholar Award and he was inducted into the National Honor Society.

Outside the classroom, Grant was a member of the football, wrestling, and tennis teams. Grant utilized his leadership skills by participating in St. John Jesuit's Integrity Committee, Ambassadors Core Team, Marine Science Club, and Student Council. I am confident that Grant will carry the lessons of his student leadership to the Naval Academy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Grant Genzman on his acceptance of appointment to the United States Naval Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Grant will excel during his career at the Naval Academy and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the Nation.

ERIC JIMENEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Eric Jimenez who has received the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Eric Jimenez is a 12th grader at Wheat Ridge High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Eric Jimenez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations once again to Eric Jimenez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character to all his future accomplishments.

THE CONGRESSIONAL YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL: A LEGACY OF SERVICE

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in congratulating the 2009–2010 Congressional Youth Advisory Council. This year 45 students from public, private, and home schools in grades 9 through 12 made their voices heard and made a difference in their communities, their country and their Congress. These students volunteered their time, effort, and talent to inform me about the important issues facing their generation. As young leaders within their communities and their schools, these students boldly represent the promise and the hope we all have for their very bright future.

President Ronald Reagan 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 once like in the United States where men were free.''

To ensure that the blessing of freedom is passed from one generation to the next, the members of the CYAC spent time interviewing a veteran and documenting the experience for the ''Preserving History Project.'' Today I'm proud to submit the brief summaries provided so the patriotic service of our dedicated veterans and the thoughtful work of the CYAC may be preserved for antiquity in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A copy of each submitted student summary follows.

To each member of the Congressional Youth Advisory Council, thank you for making this year and this group a success. It is not a coincidence that this congressional tribute celebrates two generations of service. Each of you is trusted with the precious gift of freedom.

You are the voices of the future and I salute you. God bless you and God bless America.

The summary follows:

In the interview I conducted, I conversed with former Air Force Captain Wayne R. Thompson. He served the United States from 1960–1963 during the time when Cold War tensions were greatest. Stationed at NORAD in Colorado Springs, he was in charge of emergency power, and he also participated in different construction projects. At one point, during the Cuban Missile Crisis, he slept for three days at the base because an attack seemed imminent. There were many false alarms, and many times he did not know if he would make it. Luckily, for the United States and him, no nuclear weapons were fired, and Kennedy resolved the situation. Thompson learned a lot from his stay in the military as he said that the experience helped him build character and leadership. The camaraderie that he felt with his fellow comrades was his favorite part of being in the military. The bonds that they shared were tighter than any other because they were all united with a common purpose. From the interview, I learned a lot about joining the armed forces. His experiences proved to me that by serving the country, one can really gain the skills and character traits to be successful in life. I fully respect Thompson and his commitment to serving the nation.—Kenny Lee

EMMA RITTER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Emma Ritter who has received the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Emma Ritter is an 8th grader at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Emma Ritter is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations once again to Emma Ritter for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character to all her future accomplishments.

INTRODUCTION OF THE RESTITUTION FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT OF 2010

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of my legislation, the Restitution for Local Government Act of 2010. This legislation will require the Department of the Treasury to assist public entities that lost taxpayer dollars when Lehman Brothers declared bankruptcy in September of 2008 . . . the single largest bankruptcy in the history of the United States.

More than 40 municipalities from around the country lost close to $1.7 billion when Lehman collapsed.

In my Congressional District, San Mateo County and its public institutions were severe victims, and still are, of the Lehman Brothers bankruptcy.

San Mateo County is required by California State law to hold operating funds, reserves and bond proceeds in an investment pool. Their investment pool held funds for the county and local cities, school districts, transit agencies and the community college district. They invested in the most highly-rated, conservative Lehman securities. They were not 'playing the market' or rolling the dice. They are victims of some of the worst abuses and deceit of a financial institution that was considered to be one of the soundest and safest in the Nation.

When Lehman collapsed, San Mateo County lost $155 million. As a result, the county and its 735,000 residents are now reeling financially. Teachers are being laid off. Schools are not being built or renovated. Roads are not being improved. Transportation plans are being scrapped, and critical upgrades in public safety have ceased.

The financial plight of San Mateo County was recently profiled in detail in a February 24, 2010, Wall Street Journal article entitled, Lehman's Ghost Haunts California. (Madam Speaker, I respectfully request that this article be included in the RECORD.)

My legislation will require the Secretary of the Treasury to use any profit made by the sale of troubled assets acquired through the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to be used to purchase the securities, bonds, and other financial instruments issued by Lehman Brothers which were held by local governments on September 12, 2008. The bill directs the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a $1.7 billion remediation fund, and grants him the authority to assist the public entities affected by the collapse of Lehman Brothers.

Under my legislation taxpayers will get their money back and will know where the money goes. My legislation specifically states that any local government which receives money from this new fund must report back to the federal government on how this money is being used, and demonstrate job creation, retention, and economic activity equal to the amount of funds received.

Financial institutions were deemed ''too big to fail.'' Today, we should not overlook those who are being treated as though they are too small to help.

It's time to serve the best interests of the American people. They lost their hard-earned taxpayer dollars which were specifically intended to be invested in their community for vital services, and I urge my colleagues to join in this critical effort.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 24, 2010]

LEHMAN'S GHOST HAUNTS CALIFORNIA

(By John Carreyrou)

SAN MATEO, CALIF.—Little more than a year after the worst of the financial panic, Wall Street is bouncing back. But in this county just south of San Francisco, pain from the financial system's near-collapse is still felt every day.

San Mateo, a scenic swath of peninsula between the Pacific Ocean and San Francisco Bay, saw $155 million evaporate when Lehman Brothers went bankrupt in September 2008. On top of deep budget cuts brought on by California's fiscal crisis, the loss on Lehman securities means San Mateo's 735,000 residents are taking a hit.

Public schools here have laid off dozens of teachers and delayed or canceled renovations. Local community colleges are slashing classes and scrapping new facilities, even as enrollment surges because of the bad economy. The county trimmed its commuter rail service and shelved plans to build a new women's jail to alleviate overcrowding.

The biggest factor behind San Mateo's trouble is California's spending cuts. But its Lehman losses make a bad situation worse. The problem underscores the diverging fortunes of Wall Street and Main Street and helps explain the populist anger still simmering in many parts of the country. Last week, Barclays PLC reported that its 2009

profit more than doubled to $14.7 billion thanks in part to its acquisition of Lehman's North American operations.

Lehman Brothers' collapse is ''old news for most of America,'' says Richard Gordon, a member of the county's board of supervisors. But in San Mateo County, he says, ''It's a continuing story that continues to unfold.''

A report by Beacon Economics, commissioned by the county, estimates that the Lehman losses reduced local government spending, especially on construction projects, by $148 million over two years. The consulting firm says this resulted in 1,648 jobs lost or not created. County unemployment now hovers around 9%, double what it was 18 months ago.

Dozens of cities and counties around the country, from Sarasota, Fla., to Boulder, Colo., lost a total of $1.7 billion when Lehman went under, because they held Lehman bonds or other securities. The two worst hit states are Florida and California. Florida public agencies lost a total of more than $400 million, mostly from a state investment pool. California municipalities lost a total of $250 million across some 28 cities and counties.

San Mateo County's loss was the biggest of any municipality. Under state rules, the county government, city governments and area school districts hold their operating funds, reserves and bond proceeds together in an investment pool that lost about 6% of its value when Lehman went under.

The investment pool owned highly rated Lehman bonds and notes, which currently trade around 20 cents on the dollar. Any recovery from the bankruptcy process will take at least another year. A recovery of 20 cents on the dollar would leave the pool with a loss of roughly $125 million.

Much of the anger in San Mateo is directed at the Obama administration and, specifically, at Timothy Geithner, the Treasury secretary. Mr. Geithner has declined to use funds from the government's Troubled Asset Relief Program, or TARP, to bail out municipalities.

''There's too big to fail, and we're too small for them to care,'' says Mary McMillan, the county's deputy manager.

Before Wall Street's crash in late 2008, San Mateo County was on track to balance its $1.7 billion annual budget within five years. California's cutbacks and the Lehman collapse torpedoed that.

The county government lost $37 million when Lehman Brothers went under. That's on top of a $100 million deficit due in part to state cutbacks. San Mateo County has limited power to increase taxes: Boosting sales taxes requires two-thirds voter approval, and two efforts have failed in recent years.

The schools were hit hard, too. In one typical case, Lehman-related losses at the Sequoia Union High School district, one of 25 in the county, totaled $6.2 million, an amount equivalent to 7% of the district's annual budget. Meanwhile, the state cut its funding to the Sequoia district this school year by $1.9 million and is cutting it again next school year by another $3.4 million.

San Mateo ranks among California's most diverse counties. Home to software giant Oracle Corp. and biotechnology pioneer Genentech, it encompasses both wealthy enclaves and working-class, immigrant cities such as Daly City and East Palo Alto that depend heavily on county services. In East Palo Alto, unemployment is 20%.

When Lehman Brothers filed for bankruptcy-court protection on Sept. 15, 2008, the news was met with a mix of panic and disbelief by local officials. The county's schools took the worst hit, losing $38 million overnight. Two county school districts, the Sequoia district and the Menlo Park City Elementary School District, had just sold more than $90 million worth of bonds to fund renovations and expansions and deposited the proceeds in the county investment fund. The lost bond proceeds totaled nearly $8 million, a debt local taxpayers will be paying off for the next 30 years.

Jean Holbrook, the county's superintendent of schools, says the Lehman losses came on the heels of deep funding cuts from the state that had already cost the jobs of 91 of the school's 681 employees, including 21 teachers. In the ensuing year, 60 more school employees would have to be let go, resulting in larger class sizes and fewer elective courses.

San Mateo's board of supervisors ordered an independent review of the way the county investment fund was run, but found no wrongdoing. In keeping with rules California passed in the mid–1990s (following Orange County's disastrous experiment with derivatives), San Mateo's treasurer had invested in highly rated securities and put no more than 10% of the fund in any single issuer.

With Lehman bonds trading at pennies on the dollar, county officials held little hope of recovering their investment through bankruptcy proceedings. So they opted for a two-pronged strategy: They sued former Lehman Brothers executives for fraud, and they lobbied their state congressional representatives to insert language in TARP legislation that would let municipalities tap the federal rescue program.

Though such language was included in the final bill, bailing out municipalities was low on the list of the federal government's priorities in late 2008 as the financial system flirted with collapse.

To rally support and keep the issue alive in Washington, Ms. McMillan, the deputy county manager, began reaching out to other counties and cities ensnared in the Lehman bankruptcy.

In May 2009, as financial institutions began to stabilize and the specter of a depression subsided, the House Committee on Financial Services agreed to hold a hearing on the matter.

In their testimony before the committee, Democratic Reps. Anna Eshoo and Jackie Speier, whose districts span parts of San Mateo County, argued that the $1.7 billion municipalities were asking for amounted to just one-quarter of 1% of TARP funds and paled in comparison with the hundreds of billions of dollars the Treasury Department had provided to banks.

Ron Galatolo, chancellor of San Mateo's community colleges, told the assembled congressmen that he felt it was ''highly inequitable to use TARP funding to shore up banks and to bail out failing corporations but fail to protect agencies' taxpayer dollars, such as ours.''

After the hearing, Rep. Eshoo sought a meeting with Mr. Geithner, but says the Treasury secretary didn't respond to her letters and phone calls for months.

Rep. Eshoo finally met with him on Oct. 28, followed by a second meeting on Dec. 2. She says Mr. Geithner told her that TARP was intended only for financial institutions and that rescuing municipalities would open a Pandora's box of claims from other investors.

Rep. Eshoo invoked the passage inserted a year earlier in the TARP bill, which refers to ''the need to ensure stability for U.S. public instrumentalities, such as counties and cities, that may have suffered significant increased costs or losses in the current market turmoil.''

She says Mr. Geithner said the passage fell short of mandating use of TARP funds to bail out municipalities.

While declining to comment on the meetings, a Treasury spokeswoman says: ''There are countless well-intentioned ideas for deploying TARP funds, but we determined that making Lehman Brothers' creditors whole is not consistent with what Congress intended for TARP funding.''

In San Mateo, reverberations from the Lehman losses were on display on the campus of Canada College, one of the county's three community colleges, earlier this month.

Students held a two-day teach-in to protest faculty layoffs, course cancellations and fees that jumped 30% this year.

Lilliam Castellanos, a 35-year-old student majoring in Latin America studies to become an interpreter, said she could no longer afford textbooks because the funding for a program that handed out book vouchers to Hispanic students had been cut sharply. Other students complained about long wait lists to get into courses and a reduction in the number of counselors.

Mr. Galatolo, the chancellor, says the colleges' $25 million Lehman loss compounded funding cuts made by the state, forcing him to slash the colleges' annual budget by one-fifth, to $100 million from $125 million.

Of the $25 million loss, $20 million had been earmarked for new buildings and classrooms that he says now won't be built. The remaining $5 million came directly out of the colleges' operating fund.

Mr. Galatolo says he's angered by the return of multimillion-dollar bonuses on Wall Street ''while we can't make ends meet for our students.'' As for Mr. Geithner, he says, ''He had the ability to help us, and he chose not to.''

On the other side of the peninsula, in the wind-swept, rural community of Half Moon Bay, Robert Gaskill, superintendent of the Cabrillo Unified School District, says his district's share of the Lehman loss was $1.4 million, out of an annual budget of $28 million.

Mr. Gaskill says he had to lay off five teachers and projects that 20 more will be let go in the 2010–11 school year, out of 177, because of state funding cuts. The district is also paring back summer school.

Michael Bachicha, former director of the schools' special programs, sat through the school-board meeting at which his job was eliminated in April 2009. Because he had tenure, Mr. Bachicha was able to land another job teaching at the district's ''continuation'' high school for students who are falling behind. But his salary dropped from $105,000 to $72,000. Around the same time, his wife lost her job as a kindergarten teacher at a local private school.

Mr. Gaskill, the district superintendent, says the teaching job that Mr. Bachicha took bumped someone else less senior off the payroll, resulting in one of the five teacher layoffs.

Ms. McMillan, the deputy county manager, hasn't given up on getting the Lehman money back. She holds conference calls every two weeks with officials from other affected counties and cities to plot strategy. On last week's call, 35 people dialed in from across the country.

In the meantime, the county is gearing up to dismiss hundreds of employees this spring, the first time it has had to resort to mass layoffs, according to Mr. Gordon, the member of the board of supervisors.

DULCE VEGA SALINAS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Dulce Vega

Salinas who has received the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Dulce Vega Salinas is a 12th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Dulce Vega Salinas is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations once again to Dulce Vega Salinas for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character to all her future accomplishments.

IN HONOR OF THOMAS P. FOTE

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Thomas P. Fote and congratulate him upon receiving the New Jersey Governor's and New Jersey Jefferson's Environmental Stewardship award. This award recognizes outstanding volunteers who pioneer and promote energy conservation and environmental action. Mr. Fote's years of selfless work to improve New Jersey's environment make him a highly deserving recipient of this honor.

Mr. Fote serves as Legislative Chair of Jersey Coast Anglers Association where he has built a coalition to stop the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey from ocean dumping. Because of his efforts residents of New Jersey benefit from improved ocean water and a safer, cleaner coastal environment. Mr. Fote also serves on the Policy Board of the Barnegat Bay Estuary Program. Under his leadership, the Barnegat Bay's water quality has improved while the program's administrative costs have remained low. As an unpaid volunteer, Mr. Fote selflessly donates much of his time to these critical environmental efforts. Mr. Fote is also a retired Army captain who bravely served our country in Vietnam. His lifetime of service to New Jersey and our nation is an example to us all.

The Governor's Volunteer Awards are being presented for the first time this year in a new partnership with the New Jersey Jefferson Awards. Mr. Fote's volunteer work is especially deserving of an inaugural award from these two long standing and highly respected volunteer recognition efforts.

Madam Speaker, it is my hope that this body will join me in honoring Thomas P. Fote for his exceptional service and congratulate him upon receiving the New Jersey Governor's Environmental Stewardship award.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF JOEL BOOSE ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young man from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that Joel Boose of Norwalk, Ohio has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York.

Joel's offer of appointment poises him to attend the United States Military Academy this fall with the incoming cadet Class of 2014. Attending one of our Nation's military academies is an invaluable experience that offers a world-class education while placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Joel brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2014. While attending St. Paul High School in Norwalk, Ohio, Joel attained a grade point average that placed him in the top ten percent of his graduating class. Joel was inducted into the National Honor Society, participated in the Teens Leadership Corps, and was active in the Student Council.

Throughout high school, Joel was a member of the football, track, and swimming teams. Joel utilized his leadership skills by being captain of the football team and vice-president of the Key Club. In addition, Joel was awarded an academic letter each year and was recognized as a McScholar Athlete. I am confident that Joel will carry the lessons of his student leadership to West Point.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Joel Boose on the acceptance of his appointment to the United States Military Academy at West Point. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Joel will excel during his career at West Point and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the Nation.

THE CONGRESSIONAL YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL: A LEGACY OF SERVICE

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in congratulating the 2009–2010 Congressional Youth Advisory Council. This year 45 students from public, private, and home schools in grades 9 through 12 made their voices heard and made a difference in their communities, their country and their Congress. These students volunteered their time, effort, and talent to inform me about the important issues facing their generation. As young leaders within their communities and their schools, these students boldly represent the promise and the hope we all have for their very bright future.

President Ronald Reagan 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 once like in the United States where men were free.''

To ensure that the blessing of freedom is passed from one generation to the next, the members of the CYAC spent time interviewing a veteran and documenting the experience for the ''Preserving History Project.'' Today I'm proud to submit the brief summaries provided so the patriotic service of our dedicated veterans and the thoughtful work of the CYAC may be preserved for antiquity in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A copy of each submitted student summary follows.

To each member of the Congressional Youth Advisory Council, thank you for making this year and this group a success. It is not a coincidence that this congressional tribute celebrates two generations of service. Each of you is trusted with the precious gift of freedom.

You are the voices of the future and I salute you. God bless you and God bless America.

The summary follows:

Captain Lawrence Nunn, USA (born March 1979) is currently serving in the United States Army. Captain Nunn is a 2001 graduate of the United States Military Academy. He served two tours in the Second Gulf War in Iraq. He is the recipient of two Bronze Star Medals for his exceptional bravery in each of his tours. He also received the Global War on Terrorism Ribbon and many other medals and accolades. Captain Nunn is married to Olivia Nunn who is also a Captain in the U.S. Army. Captain Nunn was born and raised in Canton, Michigan.

I learned from my interview with Captain Nunn that the highest form of service to our country is exemplified in soldiers like Captain Nunn. This level of service to our country requires exceptional courage, dedication, commitment and above all unrelenting perseverance to and for our country.—Nathan Lee

DRAZEN FILLIP DOSLO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Drazen Fillip Doslo who has received the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Drazen Fillip Doslo is a 12th grader at Arvada School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Drazen Fillip Doslo is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations once again to Drazen Fillip Doslo for winning the

Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character to all his future accomplishments.

HONORING SHERIFF GARY MADDOX ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize Schoolcraft County Sheriff Gary Maddox of Manistique, Michigan on his retirement after 30 years of dedicated law enforcement service. Sheriff Maddox's commitment to the citizens of Schoolcraft County reflects the enthusiasm and work ethic that embody the spirit of Michigan's Upper Peninsula.

Gary has remained close to his roots throughout his career in law enforcement. He was named Schoolcraft County Deputy Sheriff on February 22, 1979 and went on to be appointed Schoolcraft County Sheriff on January 1, 1986. Over the years he was reelected by the people of Schoolcraft County five times before retiring at the end of 2009.

Under his leadership, Schoolcraft County has implemented many important public safety programs. Gary launched the first D.A.R.E. program to provide area youth with skills to avoid involvement with drugs. He also coordinated the county's first taser program, established the county's 911 service, developed training programs for corrections officers and led an incident command school for law enforcement officers. As sheriff, Gary coordinated and managed countless search and rescue operations effectively and with composure. Over the years he has demonstrated both professionalism and concern while working to consistently improve public safety in the community.

Gary has never been one to rest on his laurels; he has always taken advantage of opportunities to improve his training and expertise. He has participated in the National Drug Court Institute Adult Drug Court Planning Initiative Training Program, completed Emergency Medical Technician-Ambulance Training and Level II Law Enforcement Training for the Federal Forest Service, among others. He has also helped to inspire and educate others looking to enter the field of law enforcement serving for 21 years as an executive board member and instructor of Northern Michigan University's Law Enforcement Training Consortium.

As sheriff, Gary has demonstrated a commitment to his profession serving as a District I Upper Peninsula representative to the Michigan Sheriffs' Association. He also served as President of the Upper Peninsula Law Enforcement Association in past years. Outside of law enforcement Gary has made community service a priority in his life. He has volunteered time working with the Veterans of Foreign Wars Ladies Auxiliary Voice of Democracy Broadcast Scriptwriting Program and served as chairman of the local C.B.C. radio telethon to raise funds for the American Cancer Society, Bay Cliffs Health Camp and the Easter Seals Society of Michigan. He also serves on the Central Upper Peninsula Planning and Development Committee.

I know Gary well and over the years he has been an honorable public servant and a good friend. Gary embodies the unique character of the Upper Peninsula through his courage in the face of danger, his forward-looking vision and his willingness to lend a hand to help those around him.

Madam Speaker, Gary devoted 30 years of his life enforcing the law and protecting the citizens of Schoolcraft County. His career as sheriff and his commitment to his community should be commended. I ask Madam Speaker, that you and the entire U.S. House of Representatives, join me in recognizing Sheriff Gary Maddox for his courage, his dedication, and his years of service on his retirement from the Schoolcraft County Sheriff's Department.

DOMINIC DRUMRIGHT

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Dominic Drumright who has received the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Dominic Drumright is a 7th grader at Drake Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Dominic Drumright is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations once again to Dominic Drumright for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character to all his future accomplishments.

FATHER EDWARD BRYCE

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. DOYLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a Pittsburgh resident and a constituent of mine, Father Edward Bryce. Father Bryce is celebrating the Golden Jubilee of his priestly ordination after 50 years of ministry to the Pittsburgh community.

Born in Pittsburgh, Father Bryce attended North Catholic High School and St. Charles Seminary in Philadelphia. He continued his studies at the North American College in Rome, eventually earning a licentiate in sacred theology from the Pontifical Gregorian University there. Father Bryce was ordained a priest on March 25th, 1960 and began his ministry as a parochial vicar at Immaculate Conception Parish in Washington, Pennsylvania. This first assignment was the beginning of a vocation that would carry him throughout the Pittsburgh area in service to the needs of the Catholic community.

In his 50 years as a priest, Father Bryce always seemed to find a way to minister to the community through a variety of means, often simultaneously. While teaching theology students for 6 years at Duquesne University, he also served as a Chaplin at St. Joseph's Hospital and a priest-in-residence at Holy Rosary Parish. He then moved to the motherhouse of the Sisters of St. Francis for 9 years. It was during this time that Father Bryce became more active in the larger efforts of the Diocese of Pittsburgh. In 1970, he became the founding director of the Office for Pro-Life Activities and 2 years later took the same position in the Office for Justice and Peace. This commitment to needs of the living Church community in an evermore complex society eventually propelled Father Bryce here to Washington, DC as the Pro-Life Activities Secretary for the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, a position which he held for 10 years.

In 1988, he returned to his hometown to lead St. Bede Parish in Pittsburgh's Point Breeze neighborhood, where he has served as pastor for over 20 years. Beyond his dedicated ministry to the faith and educational life of the St. Bede parish, Father Bryce continued to play important roles in the larger Pittsburgh Catholic community as dean of the Central Deanery, consultor in the College of Consultors, and a member of the priest council. Continuing on as administrator of St. Bede past his retirement age, he provides the parish with continuity and an ever-present model for faithful ministry.

Father Bryce credits the priests that he knew growing up in St. Bernard Parish as providing the inspiration for his vocation of priestly ministry. I have no doubt that he himself has provided similar inspiration to generations of St. Bede parishioners and members of the Catholic community in Pittsburgh.

I want to congratulate Father Bryce for his 50 years of dedicated service to the Church and the Pittsburgh community and I wish him many more years at St. Bede.

DIANA ROMERO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Diana Romero who has received the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Diana Romero is a 12th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Diana Romero is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations once again to Diana Romero for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character to all her future accomplishments.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF MICHAEL WATROL ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young man from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that Michael Watrol of Rossford, Ohio has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Maryland.

Michael's offer of appointment poises him to attend the United States Naval Academy this fall with the incoming midshipmen Class of 2014. Attending one of our Nation's military academies is an invaluable experience that offers a world-class education while placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Michael brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2014. While attending St. Francis de Sales High School in Toledo, Ohio, Michael attained an impressive grade point average. He received numerous academic awards.

Throughout high school, Michael was a member of the water polo, tennis, CYO basketball and Belmont Swim teams. He received his varsity letter in tennis. Michael has been active in Young Marines of Toledo, Junior State of America, Bethel Lutheran Church, and has volunteered for numerous organizations in the community. I am confident that Michael will carry the lessons of his student leadership to the Naval Academy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Michael Watrol on the acceptance of his appointment to the United States Naval Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Michael will excel during his career at the Naval Academy and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the Nation.

DESTINY HINOJOS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Destiny Hinojos who has received the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Destiny Hinojos is a 12th grader at Wheat Ridge High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Destiny Hinojos is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations once again to Destiny Hinojos for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character to all her future accomplishments.

COMMENDING SAMUEL A. KRAKOWER

HON. JOHN H. ADLER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Cadet Samuel A. Krakower and his outstanding performance in the Rancocas Valley Regional High School NJROTC unit. Mr. Krakower is a Naval Science 3 cadet and a junior at Rancocas Valley Regional High School.

Cadet Krakower has been a member of the NJROTC drill team for 2 years where he has earned the prestigious Blue and Gold drill cord. He has also represented his unit as a member of the Uniform Inspection Team, and has participated in, and completed the Junior Officer Leadership Training Program. Currently, Cadet Krakower holds the position of Public Affairs Department Head and is an editor of the unit's newspaper.

Throughout his academic career, Cadet Krakower has performed in the top of his class while remaining an integral and active participant in his local community through the Boy Scouts of America and as a volunteer with a local food pantry.

Cadet Krakower has received the American Legion Medal for Scholastic Excellence and the NJROTC Community Service Ribbon, with 3 stars. He has been selected to attend the Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University Summer 2010 program for students for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM). He will be recognized at the Rancocas Valley High School NJROTC Awards Banquet on May 26, 2010.

In recognition of this young man's achievements, I ask that the House of Representatives and all Americans join me in congratulating this honorable young man on his achievements. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character to all his future endeavors.

HONORING MISS LAUREN CHOLEWINSKI

HON. JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, it is with great pride that I acknowledge the achievements of Miss Lauren Cholewinski. An accomplished young woman of 21 years of age, Lauren Cholewinski honorably represented the United States of America in her participation at the 2010 Vancouver Winter Olympics. Her discipline and determination carried her from her home in York County, South Carolina, where she attended Northwestern High School in Rock Hill, to compete in the 500 Meter Women's Speedskating competition on February 16, 2010. Her two times were 39.51 and 39.58 placing her 30th overall.

On behalf of South Carolina, I am proud to recognize Lauren Cholewinski's achievements as a professional and Olympic athlete.

STATEMENT HONORING THE LIFE OF MRS. JODY LOWRY

HON. BETTY SUTTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to pay tribute to Jody Lowry, who passed away on December 25, 2009 after a courageous battle with cancer. I know Jody from her active role in the Northeast Ohio Community, and have personally come to know her friendship and hospitality at her lovely home in Akron.

Jody was an avid volunteer, devoted daughter, wife, and loving mother.

Jody was also very active with local service groups in Akron, Ohio.

She knew that she could make a positive contribution in Akron while continuing to fight her cancer. Jody was determined to serve our community by giving to the people who needed her help.

Whether it was at The Summit County Battered Women's Shelter, Children's Hospital, or the St. Joseph Parenting Center, Jody committed her time to helping people who could not always help themselves.

Her work for children's rights continued as a Guardian Ad Litem for the Summit County CASA/GAL Program and was further proof of her devotion to others in need.

Perhaps her most avid cause was her work at the Alzheimer's Association, where she chaired the Annual Alzheimer's Association Gala last year. She became involved in the Alzheimer's Association as a result of her father, Jacob's long time Alzheimer's illness, which took his life last summer.

Jody was a lifelong resident of Akron, was a respected and beloved member of the greater Akron Community, and her presence will be remembered by the entire area. Her legacy of community, friendship, family and good work will continue for many, many years however. The fact that her funeral at the Akron Jewish Center was overflowing with hundreds upon hundreds of her friends and family members is a testament to her life long work.

Jody leaves behind not only those whom she served, but also a loving family—her husband Randy, her daughters Marisa and Meredith, her mother Elaine Apelbaum, her brother Perry Apelbaum, as well as other many other close family members and friends.

Jody will truly be missed.

We will always remember Jody for her ever-present smile, her commitment to her community, and her dedication to her family.

On behalf of the people of Ohio's 13th District, I want to express my deepest sympathies to her Mother Elaine, her husband Randy and her daughters, Marisa and Meredith.

They have lost a great daughter, wife and mother who passed away much too soon and we have lost a true friend and committed member of our community.

COMMENDING THE WORK OF THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO'S BLUE RIBBON TASK FORCE ON ADULT HEALTH COVERAGE EXPANSION

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, the national healthcare reform bill passed by this Congress was an historic achievement that will improve the lives of millions of Americans. This reform would not have been possible without the tireless efforts and advocacy of so many individuals and organizations across the country, including local governments whose own healthcare initiatives improved access to medical care and advanced the cause of nationwide reform.

That is why I commend the County of San Mateo's Blue Ribbon Task Force on Adult Health Coverage Expansion. A broad-based coalition comprised of representatives from healthcare providers, labor, chambers of commerce, local governments, and community advocacy groups, the Task Force achieved meaningful gains in the quality and efficiency of San Mateo County's healthcare delivery system and expanded health coverage to more than 2,000 previously uninsured adults through the Access to Coverage for All program. Originally funded in-part through a federal grant, this program has since become a mainstay of the effort to expand access to healthcare in the county.

The work of this Task Force is an enduring symbol of the compassion, commitment, dedication and talent of the residents of San Mateo County and the 12th Congressional District, whom I am fortunate and honored to represent. Madam Speaker, I commend the County of San Mateo's Blue Ribbon Task Force on Adult Health Coverage Expansion for its leadership in helping to solve one of our nation's most pressing issues, and for its courage to think globally and to act locally.

HONORING MARVIN AVERY PALMORE CENTER FOR HOPE, INC. FOR THEIR EXTRAORDINARY WORK IN THE COMMUNITY

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a nonprofit organization that serves my district, Marvin Avery Palmore Center for Hope, Inc.

Center for Hope has demonstrated an overwhelming amount of commitment to serving the Long Island community. My constituents rely on our nonprofits for the vital services they offer. These organizations' continuous acts of selfless efforts are admirable.

I am proud to honor Marvin Avery Palmore Center for Hope, Inc. for their extraordinary work in the community.

COMMEMORATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF EARTH DAY

SPEECH OF

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 2010

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution to honor one of Wisconsin's greatest Senators, the late Gaylord Nelson, the founder of Earth Day. Tomorrow, we will celebrate the 40th anniversary of this important day, and just as Senator Nelson envisioned, people across the country will reflect on the importance of conservation and environmental stewardship.

When Gaylord Nelson founded Earth Day 40 years ago, environmental protection was an issue of little importance to most Americans. Today, I know he would be proud to see how far we've come. Thanks to his foresight and leadership, environmental stewardship is one of the top issues in American politics and society.

Not only has the issue risen here in Washington, but now American citizens and businesses large and small are doing their part to protect our environment and create the innovative industries of the future. Public and private investment in green technology and renewable energy can reduce our dependence on foreign oil, re-invigorate our economy, and create new jobs. In fact, the area I represent in western Wisconsin has abundant natural resources that could help the area become a leader in clean energy innovation.

As we celebrate the 40th anniversary of Earth Day, it is important to realize that as good stewards of the planet, we must work to do our part to conserve energy, restore our environment and take care of this place we call home. We can all do more to lower our carbon footprints. Simple steps such as using energy-saving light bulbs, increasing the sustainability of our homes, carpooling with others in the neighborhood, and recycling our trash are all important ways we can lessen our energy consumption and preserve our environment for future generations.

Senator Nelson's legacy is alive and well today, especially in Wisconsin and I will continue to carry it forward in Congress and I hope that people in western Wisconsin and across the country will remember it in the work they do and the way they lead their lives. Together we ensure a safe, clean, and abundant natural world for our children.

THE CONGRESSIONAL YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL: A LEGACY OF SERVICE

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in congratulating the 2009–2010 Congressional Youth Advisory Council. This year 45 students from public, private, and home schools in grades 9 through 12 made their voices heard and made a difference in their communities, their country and their Congress. These students volunteered their time, effort, and talent to inform me about the important issues facing their generation. As young leaders within their communities and their schools, these students boldly represent the promise and the hope we all have for their very bright future.

President Ronald Reagan 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 once like in the United States where men were free.''

To ensure that the blessing of freedom is passed from one generation to the next, the members of the CYAC spent tithe interviewing a veteran and documenting the experience for the ''Preserving History Project.'' Today I'm proud to submit the brief summaries provided so the patriotic service of our dedicated veterans and the thoughtful work of the CYAC may be preserved for antiquity in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A copy of each submitted student summary follows.

To each member of the Congressional Youth Advisory Council, thank you for making this year and this group a success. It is not a coincidence that this congressional tribute celebrates two generations of service. Each of you is trusted with the precious gift of freedom.

You are the voices of the future and I salute you. God bless you and God bless America.

The summary follows:

Mr. Marcus Poe is a combat veteran of World War II. He was born in rural Oklahoma. At the time of his enlistment, he was married with two children (Mark and Marcia), and was attending Tulsa Business College, majoring in secretary and accounting. He served for 22 months, from 1944 to 1945. He was in the United States Air Force and was a nose gunner on a B–24 fighter plane. Beginning at the rank of private, he eventually became a sergeant. He served in the 436th unit bomb group in the 15th Air Force. He received basic training in multiple states, such as Oklahoma and Texas. Afterwards, he was stationed in Cerignola, Italy, where he flew missions every third day. He had confirmed hits and was never shot down. He returned home on November 3, 1945, a few months after the atomic bombing of Nagasaki and Hiroshima that resulted in VJ Day. He moved to Texas in 1970 to be with his son Marcus, and retired in July of 1987, having never been unemployed for a day in his life. He is now 89 years old, and still goes about his daily lifestyle with ease.—Yu-Chun Lin

HONORING ADELANTE OF SUFFOLK COUNTY INC. FOR THEIR EXTRAORDINARY WORK IN THE COMMUNITY

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a nonprofit organization that serves my district, Adelante of Suffolk County Inc.

Adelante has demonstrated an overwhelming amount of commitment to serving the Long Island community. My constituents

rely on our nonprofits for the vital services they offer. Adelante's continuous selfless efforts are admirable.

I am proud to honor Adelante of Suffolk County Inc. for their extraordinary work in the community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIMOTHY V. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Madam Speaker, unfortunately last night I was unable to cast my votes on H.R. 4543, H. Res. 1103, and H.R. 4861 and wish the RECORD to reflect my intentions had I been able to vote.

Last night, I was meeting with constituents of mine who represent various student organizations from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and I was unable to arrive in Washington, DC to cast my votes.

Had I been present on rollcall No. 221 on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4543, the Anthony J. Cortese Post Office Building, I would have voted ''aye.''

Had I been present on rollcall No. 222 on suspending the rules and passing H. Res. 1103, Celebrating the life of Sam Houston on the 217th anniversary of his birth, I would have voted ''aye.''

Had I been present on rollcall No. 223 on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4861, the Steve Goodman Post Office Building, I would have voted ''aye.''

SAN RAMON'S FIRE CHIEF

HON. JERRY McNERNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. MCNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I am honored to take this opportunity to commemorate the life of William Joseph Fereira. Bill Fereira was born in 1921 and grew up in San Ramon, California when the city was inhabited by fewer than 100 people. His father was San Ramon's first postmaster, and his family owned a general store. Bill attended San Ramon Grammar School and San Ramon Valley High School, and went on to join the U.S. Navy. Bill served his country with honor in the South Pacific during World War II and was involved in the historic Doolittle Raid. After the war, Bill returned to California and started a family in nearby Danville.

As the area grew, Bill and his neighbors realized that their community required greater firefighting resources. With the help of Howard Weidemann, a local rancher, Bill established the San Ramon Fire Protection District and became San Ramon's first Fire Chief. Operations were run out of his garage, where Bill was in charge of answering calls 24 hours a day and maintaining a fire truck and jeep.

Upon retiring after serving 15 years as Fire Chief, Bill stayed active by fixing up anything that needed repairing, expanding his aviation memorabilia, and sharing his knowledge of local lore with the community. Bill was crucial to the development of San Ramon as it grew into the fine city it is today. We all mourn Bill's passing and recognize his tremendous contribution to our community.

HONORING HUNTINGTON ENRICHMENT CENTER FOR THEIR EXTRAORDINARY WORK IN THE COMMUNITY

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a nonprofit organization that serves my district, Huntington Enrichment Center.

Huntington Enrichment Center has demonstrated an overwhelming amount of commitment to serving the Long Island community. My constituents rely on our nonprofits for the vital services they offer. The continuous selfless efforts of those involved with Huntington Enrichment Center are admirable.

I am proud to honor Huntington Enrichment Center for their extraordinary work in the community.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF KYLE HALL ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young man from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that Kyle Hall of Greenwich, Ohio has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York.

Kyle's offer of appointment poises him to attend the United States Merchant Marine Academy this fall with the incoming midshipmen Class of 2014. Attending one of our Nation's military academies is an invaluable experience that offers a world-class education while placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Kyle brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2014. While attending South Central High School in Greenwich, Ohio, Kyle attained an impressive grade point average. Kyle was inducted into the National Honor Society, active in the Student Council, was a class officer, and achieved numerous academic honors.

Throughout high school, Kyle was a member of the football, basketball, and track teams. He was co-captain of the football team and was a third year letterman in the sport. Kyle served the community of Greenwich by assisting with the Salvation Army. I am confident that Kyle will carry the lessons of his student leadership to the Merchant Marine Academy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kyle Hall on the acceptance of his appointment to the United States Merchant Marine Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Kyle will excel during his career at the Merchant Marine Academy and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the Nation.

THE CONGRESSIONAL YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL: A LEGACY OF SERVICE

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in congratulating the 2009–2010 Congressional Youth Advisory Council. This year 45 students from public, private, and home schools in grades 9 through 12 made their voices heard and made a difference in their communities, their country and their Congress. These students volunteered their time, effort, and talent to inform me about the important issues facing their generation. As young leaders within their communities and their schools, these students boldly represent the promise and the hope we all have for their very bright future.

President Ronald Reagan 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 once like in the United States where men were free.''

To ensure that the blessing of freedom is passed from one generation to the next, the members of the CYAC spent time interviewing a veteran and documenting the experience for the ''Preserving History Project.'' Today I'm proud to submit the brief summaries provided so the patriotic service of our dedicated veterans and the thoughtful work of the CYAC may be preserved for antiquity in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A copy of each submitted student summary follows.

To each member of the Congressional Youth Advisory Council, thank you for making this year and this group a success. It is not a coincidence that this congressional tribute celebrates two generations of service. Each of you is trusted with the precious gift of freedom.

You are the voices of the future and I salute you. God bless you and God bless America.

The summary follows:

Arjinderpal Singh Sekhon: Serving the Country, Representing a People Serving one's country is undoubtedly one of the most honorable duties of any citizen. Representing one's country in the face of great adversity and threatening challenges requires more than a sense of duty, however. It requires a sense of patriotism. Arjinderpal Singh Sekhon, a Colonel in the United States Army from 1984 to 2009, espoused that very attitude when he volunteered his medical physician services as a Pulmonary and Internal Medicine specialist. As the first follower of the Sikh faith to become a battalion commander, Dr. Sekhon served primarily in Operation Desert Storm and Operation Enduring Freedom. His experiences representing

his country throughout the years, whether as a consultant or as the head of the Intensive Care Unit on base, led to him being awarded a total of 18 medals of commendation. Following his retirement, Colonel Sekhon continued serving the nation as he ran for the United States Congress, aspiring for political office. As a reminder of the multicultural foundation of our great country, Dr. Sekhon's story rings true to the basic principles of this nation: regardless of race or religion, any citizen may dedicate his or her life to safeguarding the liberties of our shared home.—Jaywin Singh Malhi

RECOGNITION FOR THE INTERCULTURAL CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF DESERTS AND OCEANS

HON. GABRIELLE GIFFORDS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Ms. GIFFORDS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding achievements of the Intercultural Center for the Study of Deserts and Oceans, also known as CEDO—El Centro de Estudios de Desiertos y Océanos.

On May 1 2010, CEDO celebrates 30 years of exploring and helping to protect the creatures, habitats and cultures of the Sonoran Desert and the Sea of Cortez. Its educational and research facility is located on the Sea of Cortez in Puerto Peñasco, Sonora, México, where students and visitors alike are exposed to its essential work to preserve this fragile ecosystem.

CEDO was envisioned in 1975 when Peggy Turk Boyer, CEDO's executive director, first visited Puerto Peñasco with professors John Hendrickson and Don Thomson of the University of Arizona's Ecology and Evolutionary Biology Department, as part of the University of Arizona's marine biology program.

CEDO opened its doors in 1980. Since then, thousands of people have participated in CEDO's research, education and conservation programs. CEDO's biological field station annually provides hands-on marine studies to hundreds of university students and researchers. CEDO also has expanded its outreach by offering school field trips, eco adventures, summer camps for young marine biologists and community education programs.

Gus, a 13 year old who spent time at CEDO, spoke for many others who have enjoyed the incredible opportunities that are available there. Gus wrote ''in one small trip, I experienced a colossal adventure. It's not every day that you get to do something as magical as I was able to do, but luckily, CEDO is dedicated to bringing people closer to nature and all of its creatures. I have gained a new determination to protect the beauty of Puerto Peñasco and its unique environment. I believe that ordinary people, such as you and me, are the key to conserving the Sea of Cortez's irreplaceable natural wonder. Together, we can save the Sea. Thank you CEDO for your wonderful contributions to conservation.''

The CEDO vision is that all residents and visitors to the Northern Gulf understand, appreciate and participate in sustainable activities and actions that support a healthy, thriving and productive ecosystem. CEDO seeks to learn about the region through research, share the fruits of that research through educational activities and then use this knowledge to bring people together to help protect this unique and irreplaceable ecosystem.

Today, CEDO is working with researchers and fishermen in the Sea of Cortez to protect the Vaquita porpoise—the world's smallest and most endangered marine mammal species. Only about 200 Vaquitas remain—down two-thirds from a decade ago. CEDO is helping design a new type of net that will protect the Vaquitas and works with fishermen so they understand how they can ply their trade without harming the few remaining Vaquitas.

The research and educational efforts of the Intercultural Center for the Study of Deserts and Oceans have substantially improved the biological health and the sustainability of the Sea of Cortez. CEDO also understands the importance of collaboration with other entities. More than forty funding and program partners are part of the diverse CEDO network.

CEDO is doing critical conservation work for all of us and we look forward to everything that it will accomplish in the next 30 years. I commend the dedicated staff, board members and volunteers whose dedication sustains this essential environmental organization.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, on Monday, April 26, 2010, I was absent for three votes for medical reasons. I rise today to enter into the RECORD how I would have voted had I been able to vote.

House rollcall vote 221. I would have voted ''yes.''

House rollcall vote 222. I would have voted ''yes.''

House rollcall vote 223. I would have voted ''yes.''

HONORING JACOB'S LIGHT FOUNDATION, INC. FOR THEIR EXTRAORDINARY WORK IN THE COMMUNITY

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a nonprofit organization that serves my district, Jacob's Light Foundation.

Jacob's Light Foundation has demonstrated an overwhelming amount of commitment to serving the Long Island community. My constituents rely on our nonprofits for the vital services they offer. The continuous selfless efforts of those involved with Jacob's Light Foundation are admirable.

I am proud to honor Jacob's Light Foundation, Inc. for their extraordinary work in the community.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF JACOB BRODMAN ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young man from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that Jacob Brodman of Tiffin, Ohio, has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York.

Jacob's offer of appointment poises him to attend the United States Military Academy this fall with the incoming cadet Class of 2014. Attending one of our Nation's military academies is an invaluable experience that offers a world-class education while placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Jacob brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming class of West Point cadets. While attending Calvert High School in Tiffin, Ohio, Jacob attained an impressive grade point average. Jacob was a member of the School's Spanish Club and Quiz Bowl team, and he earned academic letters throughout his high school career.

Outside the classroom, Jacob was a member of the football, wrestling, and track teams. Jacob utilized his leadership skills by participating in Calvert High School's National Honor Society and Student Council. I am confident that Jacob will carry the lessons of his student leadership to West Point.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Jacob Brodman on his acceptance of appointment to the United States Military Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Jacob will excel during his career at West Point and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the Nation.

HONORING LONG ISLAND COALITION FOR THE HOMELESS FOR THEIR EXTRAORDINARY WORK IN THE COMMUNITY

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a nonprofit organization that serves my district, Long Island Coalition for the Homeless.

Coalition for the Homeless has demonstrated an overwhelming amount of commitment to serving the Long Island community. My constituents rely on our nonprofits for the vital services they offer. The continuous selfless efforts of those involved with the Coalition are admirable.

I am proud to honor the Long Island Coalition for the Homeless for their extraordinary work in the community.

THE CONGRESSIONAL YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL: A LEGACY OF SERVICE

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in congratulating the 2009–2010 Congressional Youth Advisory Council. This year 45 students from public, private, and home schools in grades 9 through 12 made their voices heard and made a difference in their communities, their country and their Congress. These students volunteered their time, effort, and talent to inform me about the important issues facing their generation. As young leaders within their communities and their schools, these students boldly represent the promise and the hope we all have for their very bright future.

President Ronald Reagan 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 once like in the United States where men were free.''

To ensure that the blessing of freedom is passed from one generation to the next, the members of the CYAC spent time interviewing a veteran and documenting the experience for the ''Preserving History Project.'' Today I'm proud to submit the brief summaries provided so the patriotic service of our dedicated veterans and the thoughtful work of the CYAC may be preserved for antiquity in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A copy of each submitted student summary follows.

To each member of the Congressional Youth Advisory Council, thank you for making this year and this group a success. It is not a coincidence that this congressional tribute celebrates two generations of service. Each of you is trusted with the precious gift of freedom.

You are the voices of the future and I salute you. God bless you and God bless America.

The summary follows:

I interviewed retired Captain John Michael Hayes, a former Air Force pilot during the Vietnam War from 1968 to 1972. Mr. Hayes is an exceptional veteran who was a vital contributor during our war efforts. He flew 166 successful combat missions and gained over 24,000 flying hours in the military and in commercial flight. In Vietnam he was given a rare opportunity to wear the mantle of senior-officer-hood while being a junior officer. He taught and trained many men in the delicate art of flight while being stationed near northern Vietnam and the brunt of the warfare. Not only was Mr. Hayes an outstanding military officer, he also is an incredible asset to our community. As Veterans Affairs/Military Liaison he deals with numerous cases daily spanning from post-war medal bestowment, to veterans/widows benefits, to youth involvement with our retired servicemen. Mr. Hayes also conducts veterans interviews to keep the stories of WWII veterans and others alive. Mr. Hayes further solidified my yearning to make a difference in America by joining the armed forces. His unique take on leadership and patriotism opened my eyes to new possibilities in America. I may now rest assured that great men are on the front lines, whether it be in the military or in public service, who are truly working for the betterment of our community and the progress of America as a whole.—Adrianne Mikes

HONORING LONG ISLAND LATINO TEACHERS ASSOCIATION FOR THEIR EXTRAORDINARY WORK IN THE COMMUNITY

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a nonprofit organization that serves my district, Long Island Latino Teachers Association.

LILTA has demonstrated an overwhelming amount of commitment to serving the Long Island community. My constituents rely on our nonprofits for the vital services they offer. The continuous selfless efforts of those involved with LILTA are admirable.

I am proud to honor Long Island Latino Teachers Association for their extraordinary work in the community.

CONGRATULATING THE LINCOLN UNIVERSITY TRACK AND FIELD TEAM

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, let me take this means to congratulate the men and women of the Lincoln University Track and Field team for their outstanding performance at this year's NCAA Division II Indoor Track and Field Championships.

The women's team finished the season by bringing home their second national title in as many years and the Blue Tigers' tenth overall national championship. This accomplishment is even more impressive given the strong performance by the men's Track and Field team. Led by junior Kimour Bruce, himself a national champion in the 60-meter dash, the men's team finished in fourth place.

Madam Speaker, I wish to extend my congratulations to the student-athletes of the Lincoln University Track and Field team for these remarkable achievements.

COMMENDING HIS EXCELLENCY PHIANE PHILAKONE, AMBASSADOR OF THE LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the distinguished service of His Excellency Phiane Philakone, the Ambassador of the Lao People's Democratic Republic (PDR) to the United States. Ambassador Philakone will soon be returning to Laos and, for historical purposes, I want to publicly acknowledge the good work he has done on behalf of his country.

For more than three years, Ambassador Philakone has honorably carried out his responsibilities as Laos' Ambassador to the United States. During his service, he has worked with the House Foreign Affairs' Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific and the Global Environment, which I chair, to bring greater attention to the issue of Unexploded Ordnance in Laos.

Because of him, I was able to visit Laos on two occasions and gain a firsthand understanding of the catastrophic and lasting effects of U.S. Air Force bombing operations in Laos during the Vietnam War. To this very day, these deadly, unexploded ordnances continue to claim the lives of a people who are not and never were at war with us, and unless we rectify this now, the loss of life will go on and on, tomorrow, the next day, and every day thereafter. I thank Ambassador Philakone for his leadership on this issue.

Before Ambassador Philakone accepted his assignment to come to the U.S. in February 2007, he devoted six years as Ambassador of the Lao PDR to the Republic of the Philippines. From 1996–1999, he was the Deputy Governor of the Lao Central Bank. Prior to that position, he served as President of a joint venture commercial bank in the Lao PDR.

Ambassador Philakone has held other distinguished banking posts, including Managing Director of a state commercial bank and Director of Administration of the Lao Development Bank. Additionally, from 1976–1989, he was the Director of Research of the Bank of the Lao PDR.

In addition to his extensive practical experience, Ambassador Philakone has academic training in policy and diplomatic matters. He received a Bachelor's Degree in Law and Administration from Institut Royal de Droit et d'Administration in Laos and an advanced degree from Institut International d'Administration Publique (IIAP) in France. He is fluent in English, French, and Thai.

Ambassador Philakone and his wife, Mrs. Somchit Philakone, have three children, and I extend to them my highest regards and best wishes.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF SEAN MURRAY ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young man from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that Sean Murray of Defiance, Ohio has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Sean's offer of appointment poises him to attend the United States Air Force Academy this fall with the incoming cadet Class of 2014. Attending one of our Nation's military academies is an invaluable experience that offers

a world-class education while placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Sean brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2014. While attending Defiance High School in Defiance, Ohio, Sean attained a 4.0 grade point average that placed him first in his graduating class. Sean was inducted into the National Honor Society and also received the Scholar-Athlete Award, Academic Achievement Award, Eagles Excellence Award, Academic All-League, Academic All-Ohio, and was named to the Principal's List.

Throughout high school, Sean was a member of the football and track teams, serving as captain of the football team his senior year. Sean received his varsity letter in both sports and holds the school record for the 4x800 meter relay. Sean also served as National Honor Society vice president and Student Council vice president, in addition to being active in the D.A.R.E. middle school role model program. He also volunteers within the community for various organizations. I am confident that Sean will carry the lessons of his student leadership to the Air Force Academy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Sean Murray on the acceptance of his appointment to the United States Air Force Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Sean will excel during his career at the Air Force Academy and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the Nation.

HONORING LONG ISLAND IMMIGRATION ALLIANCE FOR THEIR EXTRAORDINARY WORK IN THE COMMUNITY

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a nonprofit organization that serves my district, Long Island Immigration Alliance.

Long Island Immigration Alliance has demonstrated an overwhelming amount of commitment to serving the Long Island community. My constituents rely on our nonprofits for the vital services they offer. The continuous selfless efforts of those involved with the Long Island Immigration Alliance are admirable.

I am proud to honor Long Island Immigration Alliance for their extraordinary work in the community.

THE CONGRESSIONAL YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL: A LEGACY OF SERVICE

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in congratulating the 2009–2010 Congressional Youth Advisory Council. This year 45 students from public, private, and home schools in grades 9 through 12 made their voices heard and made a difference in their communities, their country and their Congress. These students volunteered their time, effort, and talent to inform me about the important issues facing their generation. As young leaders within their communities and their schools, these students boldly represent the promise and the hope we all have for their very bright future.

President Ronald Reagan 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 once like in the United States where men were free.''

To ensure that the blessing of freedom is passed from one generation to the next, the members of the CYAC spent time interviewing a veteran and documenting the experience for the ''Preserving History Project.'' Today I'm proud to submit the brief summaries provided so the patriotic service of our dedicated veterans and the thoughtful work of the CYAC may be preserved for antiquity in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A copy of each submitted student summary follows.

To each member of the Congressional Youth Advisory Council, thank you for making this year and this group a success. It is not a coincidence that this congressional tribute celebrates two generations of service. Each of you is trusted with the precious gill of freedom.

You are the voices of the future and I salute you. God bless you and God bless America.

The summary follows:

Charlie O'Reilly was inducted into the United States Army in Kansas City and completed Basic Army Training at Camp Chaffee, Arkansas. Charlie received badges for hours shooting proficiency. After completing his training at Camp Chaffee, Charlie was ordered to report for duty at Andrews Air Force Base, Washington D.C. He was assigned to the 601st AAA Battalion. Their mission was the defense of the Washington, D.C. area. In addition to his normal duties, Charlie was required to serve periodically in the control center where he would plot the position of aircraft around the military District of Washington. Charlie entered the Army as a Buck Private (E1) and when transferred from active duty to the army reserves he held the rank of an E4 (SP3/CPL). He completed his active duty service and was transferred to Fort George G. Meade, Maryland where he was released from active duty and transferred to the United States Army Reserve where he served for an additional six years before receiving his Honorable Discharge. Through my interview I learned of my grandfather's times and memories as a ''troop.'' I learned that there is always hope for better days; that believing in yourself is a quality you must develop and once pursued should truly be cherished. Hope, faith, endurance, and happiness are key necessities for not only doing well in the military but surviving our society today. My grandfather learned many great lessons in the Army and over-all experienced a life-changing experience that he will value forever.—Tara O'Reilly

HONORING BEN DAVIS HIGH SCHOOL'S GIRLS BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize and commend the Ben Davis High School Lady Giants for winning the 2010 Indiana State High School Athletic Association Girls Basketball Championship.

Ben Davis High School is a 3-year high school in the Metropolitan School District of Wayne Township, located in the 7th Congressional District of Indiana.

Since 1892, the school has provided Indianapolis students with nationally recognized academic and athletic programs. The high school is known for its debate and journalism activities, and it continues to expand on the artistic programs offered to its students.

The Lady Giants are an example of the success and pride that young people can achieve through receiving a well-rounded education.

In the Championship game, the Lady Giants defeated the Merrillville High School Lady Pirates with a final score of 99 to 52. Not only was this the Lady Giants' second straight championship win, but the team also set a new state record for making it their 58th consecutive victory.

I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in praising these extraordinary young women for their hard work and perseverance, and I encourage them to continue to develop and serve as an example for all students across the United States.

TRIBUTE TO UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL MISSOURI PRESIDENT AARON PODOLEFSKY

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I wish to extend my congratulations and best wishes to Dr. Aaron Podolefsky as he prepares to end his tenure as president of the University of Central Missouri, UCM, in Warrensburg, MO. After 5 years of dedicated service to the University, Dr. Podolefsky will become the president of Buffalo State College in Buffalo, New York.

After a distinguished record of academic accomplishment as a scholar at San Jose State University in California and the State University of New York at Stony Brook, Dr. Podolefsky pursued a career as an educator and academic administrator, showing a commitment to public universities and the development of young minds across the country.

During his tenure as President of UCM, Dr. Podolefsky presided over a period of great change. With the adoption of a new name for the University, he brought together students, educators, community partners, and civic leaders to develop and implement a new vision for UCM. He expanded opportunities for students and enhanced economic development in the region by reorganizing the academic departments and developing partnerships with national and international institutions.

Under his leadership, the U.S. News and World Report and Princeton Review have recognized UCM as one of the best universities in the Midwest for the first time in university history. And, UCM provides this exceptional education at low cost, ranking first in the Midwest in low student debt. These accolades, combined with an ever increasing job placement rate for UCM graduates, are evidence of Dr. Podolefsky's sustained commitment to the University.

Madam Speaker, I wish Dr. Podolefsky the best of luck in his future career at Buffalo State College and thank him for his dedication to the University of Central Missouri. Together with his wife Ronnie and sons, Noah and Isaac, Dr. Podolefsky will be missed and his mark on UCM will be felt for years to come.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF TODD KLEMAN ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young man from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that Todd Kleman of Fort Jennings, Ohio has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York.

Todd's offer of appointment poises him to attend the United States Merchant Marine Academy this fall with the incoming midshipmen Class of 2014. Attending one of our Nation's military academies is an invaluable experience that offers a world-class education while placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Todd brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2014. While attending Fort Jennings High School in Fort Jennings, Ohio, Todd attained an impressive grade point average. Todd was inducted into the National Honor Society, active in the Scholastic Bowl, and a member of the Envirothon Team.

Throughout high school, Todd was a member of the soccer and track teams, earning varsity letters in both events. Todd was active in the community by being a 4–H member, Junior Leader, member of the Junior Fair Board, and a Boy Scout. Todd also participated in the marching and pep bands. I am confident that Todd will carry the lessons of his student leadership to the Merchant Marine Academy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Todd Kleman on the acceptance of his appointment to the United States Merchant Marine Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Todd will excel during his career at the Merchant Marine Academy and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the Nation.

THE CONGRESSIONAL YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL: A LEGACY OF SERVICE

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in congratulating the 2009–2010 Congressional Youth Advisory Council. This year 45 students from public, private, and home schools in grades 9 through 12 made their voices heard and made a difference in their communities, their country and their Congress. These students volunteered their time, effort, and talent to inform me about the important issues facing their generation. As young leaders within their communities and their schools, these students boldly represent the promise and the hope we all have for their very bright future.

President Ronald Reagan 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 once like in the United States where men were free.''

To ensure that the blessing of freedom is passed from one generation to the next, the members of the CYAC spent time interviewing a veteran and documenting the experience for the ''Preserving History Project.'' Today I'm proud to submit the brief summaries provided so the patriotic service of our dedicated veterans and the thoughtful work of the CYAC may be preserved for antiquity in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A copy of each submitted student summary follows.

To each member of the Congressional Youth Advisory Council, thank you for making this year and this group a success. It is not a coincidence that this congressional tribute celebrates two generations of service. Each of you is trusted with the precious gift of freedom.

You are the voices of the future and I salute you. God bless you and God bless America.

The summary follows:

I interviewed Master Sergeant Darrell Crews who retired from the Army with over twenty years of service and became a high school Army JROTC instructor. Master Sergeant Darrell Crews served in Infantry, Armor, and combat support during his career in the Army. He served in conflicts such as Vietnam and Desert Storm, seeing combat in both. He was also deployed in several other countries in the Middle East and was even stationed at a base in Germany. After serving he used the G.I. Bill to receive payment for college to become further educated. With his prior knowledge and experience with the military he is able to influence students to strive for their best in what they believe and that education is an important gift that should be sought after by all students. My interview with Master Sergeant Darrell Crews showed me how military service affects someone and that the skills gained throughout his career can be used to help others in their lives. Also, just like ordinary people, NCO's and officers have to use teamwork in order to make things happen which is one thing that Master Sergeant Crews truly believes in.—Eric Parker.

HONORING NASSAU SUFFOLK LAW SERVICES FOR THEIR EXTRAORDINARY WORK IN THE COMMUNITY

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a nonprofit organization that serves my district, Nassau Suffolk Law Services.

Nassau Suffolk Law Services has demonstrated an overwhelming amount of commitment to serving the Long Island community. My constituents rely on our nonprofits for the vital services they offer. The continuous selfless efforts of those involved with Nassau Suffolk Law Services are admirable.

I am proud to honor Nassau Suffolk Law Services for their extraordinary work in the community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, on April 26, 2010, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to record my vote for rollcall No. 221–223. Had I been present I would have voted:

Rollcall No. 221: ''Yes''—Anthony J. Cortese Post Office Building.

Rollcall No. 222: ''Yes''—Celebrating the life of Sam Houston on the 217th anniversary of his birth.

Rollcall No. 223: ''Yes''—Steve Goodman Post Office Building.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Speaker, yesterday I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall 221, 222, and 223. If present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall 221, 222, and 223.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF RICHARD SNYDER ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young man from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that Richard Snyder of McClure, Ohio has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York.

Richard's offer of appointment poises him to attend the United States Military Academy this fall with the incoming cadet Class of 2014. Attending one of our Nation's military academies is an invaluable experience that offers a world-class education while placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Richard brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2014. While attending Napoleon High School in Napoleon, Ohio, Richard attained a 4.0 grade point average that placed him first in his graduating class. Richard was inducted into the National Honor Society and attained the A.P. Scholar Award.

Throughout high school, Richard was a member of the cross country and track teams and active in intramural basketball and volleyball. Richard received the Greater Buckeye Conference's All Academic Award. Richard served as senior class president at Napoleon High School and has been an active member of St. Paul Lutheran Church in Napoleon, Ohio. He was selected to attend Buckeye Boys State, was a Student Council representative and a member of Peers Achieving Win-Win Situations, P.A.W.S. I am confident that Richard will carry the lessons of his student leadership to West Point.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Richard Snyder on the acceptance of his appointment to the United States Military Academy at West Point. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Richard will excel during his career at West Point and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the Nation.

THE CONGRESSIONAL YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL: A LEGACY OF SERVICE

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in congratulating the 2009–2010 Congressional Youth Advisory Council. This year 45 students from public, private, and home schools in grades 9 through 12 made their voices heard and made a difference in their communities, their country and their Congress. These students volunteered their time, effort, and talent to inform me about the important issues facing their generation. As young leaders within their communities and their schools, these students boldly represent the promise and the hope we all have for their very bright future.

President Ronald Reagan 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 once like in the United States where men were free.''

To ensure that the blessing of freedom is passed from one generation to the next, the members of the CYAC spent time interviewing a veteran and documenting the experience for the ''Preserving History Project.'' Today I'm proud to submit the brief summaries provided so the patriotic service of our dedicated veterans and the thoughtful work of the CYAC may be preserved for antiquity in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A copy of each submitted student summary follows.

To each member of the Congressional Youth Advisory Council, thank you for making this year and this group a success. It is not a coincidence that this congressional tribute celebrates two generations of service. Each of you is trusted with the precious gift of freedom.

You are the voices of the future and I salute you. God bless you and God bless America.

The summary follows:

I interviewed John Sadler. Mr. Sadler served in the Navy branch of the armed forces for five years. Mr. Sadler served on submarines for four years of his service and is now a very successful medical physicist. He has lived a very fulfilling and respectable life and is a great role model. Through interviewing Mr. Sadler I have really come to realize the honor that should be given to veterans in our society. They risk their lives for us, fighting to preserve our freedoms, but we so often neglect to even thank them or consider this. There are many people that we know have served in the armed forces and we aren't even aware of this. This is sad as these people should be respected and honored in today's society. These veterans should be given a special place in the society that they have risked their lives to protect, leaving behind loved ones and everything they once knew to preserve this great nation. Without the service of these veterans America would not be the free land that it is today. We should remember each day what these veterans have done for us and thank them for it. These veterans' stories should be preserved as they are a huge part of American history and how this country got to where it is today. I think that this interview has given me a new perspective on veterans and their service.—Troy Pickens

HONORING VICTIMS INFORMATION BUREAU OF SUFFOLK FOR THEIR EXTRAORDINARY WORK IN THE COMMUNITY

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a nonprofit organization that serves my district, Victims Information Bureau of Suffolk.

VIBS has demonstrated an overwhelming amount of commitment to serving the Long Island community. My constituents rely on our nonprofits for the vital services they offer. VIBS' constant selfless efforts are admirable.

I am proud to honor Victims Information Bureau of Suffolk for their extraordinary work in the community.

HONORING THE FIRST LADY OF ALBANIA, DR. LIRI BERISHA

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the First Lady of the Republic of Albania, Dr. Liri Berisha, and to welcome her once again to the United States.

Dr. Liri Berisha, a devoted mother and a diligent pediatrician, became the very first First Lady in the history of democratic Albania in 1992 when her husband, Sali Berisha, was elected President of the Republic. Throughout her husband's 5 years in office and since his election in 2005 as Prime Minister, Dr. Berisha has been distinguished for her involvement in public life and commitment to people in need.

Among her many endeavors, I strongly commend the First Lady for her dedication to the women and children of Albania. Dr. Berisha is Honorary President of the UNICEF office in Albania. She actively promotes efforts to expand education and healthcare to marginalized women and children and is an outspoken voice against human trafficking. In 2009, the Women's Information Network named Dr. Berisha ''Woman of the Year'' for ''her commitment to make the world a better place for women and all citizens''.

In 2008, Dr. Berisha founded the Mother Teresa Cultural Foundation which commemorates its namesake as a symbol of hope and human dignity. This week, the First Lady joins us on Capitol Hill to honor the 100th anniversary of the birth of Mother Teresa with a reception and special exhibition. As the Chair of the Congressional Albanian Issues Caucus, I look forward to participating in this celebration and again welcoming the distinguished First Lady of Albania to the United States.

MEDIA SHOW BIAS ON ARIZONA IMMIGRATION LAW

HON. LAMAR SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, the national media have given mostly negative coverage to Arizona's new immigration enforcement law, which Arizonans support overwhelmingly.

A CBS report gave the perspective of opponents of the law, one of whom called it ''mean-spirited'' and compared it to Nazi repression. The report featured video of signs that read, ''Veto Racism'' and ''Stop the Hate.''

NBC asked an Arizona sheriff, ''Are you worried that it affects the image of your state?'' and questioned whether the new policy will ''distract law enforcement'' and ''take valuable resources away from cracking down on more serious crimes.''

An MSNBC headline curiously read, ''Law Makes it a Crime to be Illegal Immigrant.''

The national media should tell Americans the truth: Arizona's new law mirrors what is already federal law. Then Americans can decide for themselves what to think.

MISTAKEN ADDITION AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2499

HON. W. TODD AKIN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, my name was mistakenly added as a cosponsor of H.R. 2499. Let the RECORD reflect that I would remove my name as a cosponsor of this bill if I were able.

IN HONOR OF THE ANNUAL JAMES MONROE DAY PROGRAM IN WESTMORELAND COUNTY

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I am privileged to rise today to honor the James Monroe Memorial Foundation and the annual James Monroe Day Program.

I am pleased to recognize and honor the birth and life of our Nation's fifth president, and First District of Virginia native, James Monroe. I appreciate the invitation to share this special occasion with you.

First, I want to recognize the important accomplishments of the James Monroe Foundation. Since 1928, the James Monroe Foundation has worked tirelessly to preserve the former President's great legacy. Your efforts have kept his memory alive and have allowed generations of people to learn about his many significant contributions to our Nation. I would like to thank the foundation for your hard work and for organizing this magnificent celebration.

James Monroe came to the Presidency as one of the most qualified men to ever assume the office. He was the last American President of the ''Virginia Dynasty,'' and one who left such a lasting impression on American history that we gather today to recognize his life and celebrate his birth.

As you know, President Monroe, one of five children to Spence Monroe and Elizabeth Jones, was born here in Westmoreland County on April 28, 1758. Monroe was raised and educated in what is now the First Congressional District of the Commonwealth of Virginia. He worked on the family farm until entering the College of William and Mary at the age of 16. Within a year, the American Revolution began and Monroe soon left college to enlist in the Continental Army. He was one of the men who crossed the Delaware with George Washington.

As a politician, Monroe served in the Virginia Assembly, the Continental Congress, as Governor to the Commonwealth of Virginia, as a U.S. Senator, Secretary of State and Secretary of War to President James Madison. Ultimately, James Monroe became our fifth President of the United States.

His presidency represented a key point in our history. National identity and patriotism were growing and the country's democratic institutions and capitalist economy were taking form.

During Monroe's early years in the White House his administration was known as the ''Era of Good Feelings'', a time period in American political history in which partisan bitterness abated. President Monroe went on two long national tours in order to gain the trust and faith of the American people. Monroe expanded the country's borders by purchasing Florida from Spain. Yet, Monroe may be best remembered for his belief that the Americas should be free from future European colonization and interference in sovereign countries' affairs. His strong opinions and principles on foreign policy came to be known as the Monroe Doctrine.

James Monroe was a loyal public servant and an exceptional statesman. He proved to be a visionary leader who helped form our Nation in its infant stages, and later helped to reconcile a deeply divided country in the aftermath of the War of 1812.

President Monroe cherished the very principle of democracy, and championed the cause of a republic empowered not by privilege or birthright, but by the people. He once stated, ''In this great Nation there is but one order, that of the people, whose power, by a peculiarly happy improvement of the representative principle, is transferred from them, without impairing in the slightest degree their sovereignty, to bodies of their own creation, and to persons elected by themselves, in the full extent necessary for the purposes of free, enlightened, and efficient government''. This eloquent statement contained a very simple message that continues to ring true today.

I recently introduced the James Monroe Commemorative Coin Act (H.R. 4329) to honor James Monroe and the contributions he made to the Commonwealth and our Nation. This legislation would authorize the U.S. Treasury to mint coins to commemorate the bicentennial of the election of President James Monroe.

In addition, the funds collected from the coin will go to the James Monroe Memorial Foundation to reconstruct the birthplace of President Monroe including farm buildings and a visitor and education center in Westmoreland County. Additional proceeds will then be used to support continuing education programs about President Monroe, the Monroe Doctrine, an online library, and collection and preservation of artifacts and historical items related to James Monroe's childhood and presidency.

James Monroe was an outstanding citizen, soldier, and statesman who dedicated his life to our country. He was a good man who inspired a nation at a moment in time that begged for leadership. Jefferson said of his fellow Virginian, ''A better man cannot be.''

The citizens of the Commonwealth of Virginia and especially America's First District express their gratitude to James Monroe, in commemoration of the 252nd anniversary of his birthday.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Madam Speaker, today our national debt is $12,880,364,008,405.96

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 $2,241,938,262,112.10 so far this Congress.

This debt and its interest payments we are passing to our children and all future Americans.

HONORING CHARLES ''KENNY'' HILL

HON. TIMOTHY V. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Charles ''Kenny'' Hill, one of the hard working employees of the House Wellness Center. Kenny is retiring from duty as a Members' Wellness Center Attendant after 41 years of service to the Architect of the Capitol. He and his wife Carole look forward to enjoying his retirement with their children Lisa, Kenny, and Tony and their grandchildren Christopher, Charlie, Pamela, Tiffany, Elizabeth, Wayne, and Kyle. The Members of the 111th Congress would like to thank you Kenny for all your years of hard work and dedication. You will be missed.

HONORING URBAN LEAGUE OF LONG ISLAND FOR THEIR EXTRAORDINARY WORK IN THE COMMUNITY

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a nonprofit organization that serves my district, Urban League of Long Island.

Urban League has demonstrated an overwhelming amount of commitment to serving the Long Island community. My constituents rely on our nonprofits for the vital services they offer. The continuous selfless efforts of those involved with the Urban League of Long Island are admirable.

I am proud to honor Urban League of Long Island for their extraordinary work in the community.

IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF ANDERSON SHOWMAN ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding young man from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am happy to announce that Anderson Showman of Willard, Ohio has been offered an appointment to attend the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York.

Anderson's offer of appointment poises him to attend the United States Military Academy

this fall with the incoming cadet Class of 2014. Attending one of our Nation's military academies is an invaluable experience that offers a world-class education while placing demands on those who undertake one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Anderson brings an enormous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2014. While attending Willard High School in Willard, Ohio, Anderson attained a grade point average that placed him in the top ten percent of his graduating class. Anderson was inducted into the National Honor Society, active in Student Council, and was a class officer.

Throughout high school, Anderson was a member of the football, basketball, and baseball teams. He earned varsity letters in those sports and was also an instructor with the Midwest Baseball Camp. Anderson served the community of Willard by assisting with the community's hospital events, the Salvation Army, and the local food bank. I am confident that Anderson will carry the lessons of his student leadership to West Point.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Anderson Showman on the acceptance of his appointment to the United States Military Academy at West Point. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Anderson will excel during his career at West Point and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to the Nation.

FITNESS INTEGRATED WITH TEACHING KIDS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 2010

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the bipartisan Fitness Integrated with Teaching (FIT) Kids Act, H.R. 1585, legislation I authored with my colleague, Representative ZACH WAMP. Throughout my time in Congress, I have taken a special interest in ensuring our nation's youth live healthy, active lives. The FIT Kids Act focuses on getting physical education back into schools and has the support of over 50 organizations in addition to bipartisan support in the House.

With one in three children in this country being classified as overweight or obese it is clear that childhood obesity has reached epidemic proportions. Our kids are living increasingly sedentary lives, not enjoying the wonders of the outdoors or being active. As opposed to going outside, they stay indoors, sit in front of the television and play video games. In Wisconsin alone, 25 percent of children watch three or more hours of television a day and 20 percent play video games or use a computer for means other than school work three or more hours per day. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recommends that children participate in 60 minutes of physical activity daily. Since kids spend a majority of their time at school, it is clear that schools must be involved as we work to get kids moving.

This is especially true when it is considered that for children ages 9–13, an age that kids should be at their most active, 61.5 percent don't receive any physical activity outside of school hours. Even more disturbing, only 3.8 percent of elementary schools, 7.9 percent of middle schools, and 2.1 percent of high schools provide daily physical education and 22 percent do not require students to take any physical education. The rise in childhood obesity correlates with the removal of physical education from schools over the past two decades and a decline in routine physical activity.

Of all the deaths from major chronic diseases, 23 percent are linked to sedentary lifestyles that today begin in early childhood. This is backwards; we need to ensure that our nation's youth learn the merits of living active lifestyles starting at an early age, not how to live inactive lives. It is true that you can't have a healthy mind without a healthy body. Study after study have shown that active children perform better on tests and are more focused and driven during the school day. With the advance in technology and the changing society we live in, it may be true that today's kids will never be as active as they were in the past. However, we can provide them with quality physical education that will teach them the immense benefits to living an active life beginning at an early age.

The FIT Kids Act will get kids moving during the day again and help them learn how to live healthy, active lifestyles. The bill will provide information to parents and communities on the amount of physical education being offered in schools measured against the most recent national recommendations. Also, it will require that school districts provide parents with information on healthy living because schools can only solve so much of this problem. This information increases awareness of entire families and communities about opportunities for physical activity and how best to live healthy lives. Providing parents and caregivers with this information is imperative to ensure that they are making healthy choices at home.

In addition to providing information to parents and communities, the bill enacts a National Research Council Study on the types of physical education offered in schools and various and innovative means that schools successfully employ physical education in order to get students active. Additionally, there will finally be a comprehensive study regarding the relationship between cognitive development, academic achievement and physical education and fitness. The cost of the study will be minimal and the benefits substantial. While some studies have indicated that physical activity and education lead to better academic achievement, including a study most recently conducted by the CDC, the study in this bill would provide definitive evidence of the importance of movement and exercise to cognitive development and future productivity.

Lastly, this bill will make available to state education agencies and local education agencies best practices on innovative physical education and physical activity policies and programs at the state and local level while identifying common challenges in implementing physical education and barriers for meeting the DC recommendations for physical education.

I am so proud that the FIT Kids Act made it to the floor today. With all of the great things the First Lady has been doing to stop childhood obesity and all of the historical private and public partnerships that are currently being formed throughout the country, the timing is perfect for us to address the lack of physical education being provided in schools. I want to give a special thanks to my colleague, ZACH WAMP, for all of his tireless work supporting this bill. I would also like to thank Chairman MILLER for his devotion to the concepts and goals of the FIT Kids Act. The American Heart Association, the National Association for Sports and Physical Education, the American Diabetes Association, and the National Football League with their Play 60 campaign, all support the FIT Kids Act and advocated for its passage.

And, last but certainly not least, I want to thank Richard Simmons. For nearly four decades, Richard has helped millions of Americans lose weight, tirelessly working with overweight adults, teaching them to adopt a lifestyle of balance, moderate eating and exercise. Most recently, he has changed his focus from adults to children, traveling to over 200 schools last year. A leading advocate for the FIT Kids Act, Richard has praised the bill at schools, on television, and at speaking events around the country. His successful grassroots campaign in favor of the bill flooded congressional offices with letters urging support of the bill. As we pass the FIT Kids Act today, it serves as a testament to Richard's tenacious advocacy to make our children healthy again.

The benefits of getting physical activity back into schools are so great that it is something we need to come together and commit to. Routine physical education is a proven way to lower children's body mass index, increase students' attention and attentiveness during the day, and improve kids' academic scores. Let's pass this bill to ensure that we don't continue spending $147 billion annually on obesity related medical expenses or have more of our population suffer from chronic diseases, harming their quality of life and economic output. We need to commit to providing children with the foundations and knowledge to make healthy choices and live active lives; the FIT Kids Act puts us on the path toward doing this.

TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN RANDY JACKSON, USN

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, it has come to my attention that my friend CAPT Randy Jackson will retire from the United States Navy on June 4, 2010, after three decades of service to our nation. Let me take this means to congratulate Captain Jackson on his well-earned retirement and to thank him for his lifetime of service to the United States and for his many years of friendship.

Born in my hometown of Lexington, Missouri, Captain Jackson received his appointment to the United States Naval Academy and graduated in 1980 with a degree in Systems Engineering. After distinguishing himself in the classroom, Captain Jackson moved across the country to serve aboard the USS *Elliot*, based in San Diego, California.

Over the next 30 years, Captain Jackson showed remarkable adaptability and flexibility as he moved from post to post and job to job

in the United States and around the world. As a Surface Warfare Officer, a Seabee Combat Warfare Officer and a Joint Qualified Officer, Captain Jackson dedicated his life to ensuring the men and women of the United States Navy had well-functioning and state-of-the-art systems, accommodations, and equipment.

His superior service did not go unnoticed. Over the years, Captain Jackson has received numerous unit and service awards, among them the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Navy Commendation Medal, and the Navy Achievement Medal.

Married to the former Sonja Huff of Camdenton, MO, Captain and Mrs. Jackson are the proud parents of three young adults: Ryan, Kirsten, and Evan.

Madam Speaker, throughout his life, Captain Jackson has shown uncommon commitment to service and dedication to country. I trust my fellow members of the House will join me in wishing him well as he prepares to close a chapter in his life and begins to write another.

IN RECOGNITION OF SHEN YUN PERFORMING ARTS

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the cultural impact of Shen Yun Performing Arts, a dance and music company that promotes traditional Chinese heritage throughout the United States and the world. The group will be coming to New Jersey in coordination with the New Jersey Falun Dafa Association, and I would like to thank them for sharing their art with my home state.

Shen Yun's performances are marked by their beauty and grace and the dancers' ornate costumes. Each dancer adheres to a strict training regimen that requires a thorough knowledge of Chinese dance and customs. The production showcases 5,000 years of Chinese history while bringing the audience a thrilling experience. Their show combines the energy of dance and music with the wisdom of famous Chinese legends in a manner that both educates and entertains its spectators.

Shen Yun Performing Arts has made incredible strides in its short existence. In 2009 alone, they performed in front of over 800,000 people, four times more than in their first year, in almost 100 cities worldwide. They have been featured in such esteemed venues as Radio City Music Hall in New York, the Kennedy Center in Washington, DC and Le Palais de Congres in Paris, France.

Madam Speaker, I would once more like to thank Shen Yun Performing Arts for their contribution to the advancement of the arts and their tireless promotion of Chinese culture. Their efforts have breathed new life into Chinese traditions and provided thousands with an indepth look into their heritage.

THE CONGRESSIONAL YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL: A LEGACY OF SERVICE

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in congratulating the 2009–2010 Congressional Youth Advisory Council. This year 45 students from public, private, and home schools in grades 9 through 12 made their voices heard and made a difference in their communities, their country and their Congress. These students volunteered their time, effort, and talent to inform me about the important issues facing their generation. As young leaders within their communities and their schools, these students boldly represent the promise and the hope we all have for their very bright future.

President Ronald Reagan 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 once like in the United States where men were free.''

To ensure that the blessing of freedom is passed from one generation to the next, the members of the CYAC spent time interviewing a veteran and documenting the experience for the ''Preserving History Project.'' Today I'm proud to submit the brief summaries provided so the patriotic service of our dedicated veterans and the thoughtful work of the CYAC may be preserved for antiquity in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A copy of each submitted student summary follows.

To each member of the Congressional Youth Advisory Council, thank you for making this year and this group a success. It is not a coincidence that this congressional tribute celebrates two generations of service. Each of you is trusted with the precious gift of freedom.

You are the voices of the future and I salute you. God bless you and God bless America.

The summary follows:

The person I interviewed was Mr. Vance Miller, a past Captain of the United States Air Force. This person accomplished everything. Once he got back from service, he became a better person and a better leader. Mr. Miller gets respect and the care he needs for what he does every day as a businessman for his company. Once I walked into his office, everyone gave him respect and spoke to him with such care that could not be described. What I gained from this interview is to look at life as more than what you see right at first sight. When I spoke with Mr. Miller, he really made me think of what it is like to give your life up for your country and for the people you serve. Once I was finished he made me think about life a lot more. Life is more than just what is inside the box, it is about what you make of it and how much you put into it. Finally, I admire Mr. Miller tremendously for what he has done for this great nation and the people in it.—Elliott Polanchyck

RECOGNIZING SHANA GUZMAN PANGELINAN FOR THE U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION'S JEFFREY BUTLAND FAMILY-OWNED BUSINESS OF THE YEAR FOR 2010

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Shana Guzman Pangelinan for her entrepreneurial spirit in growing her family-owned business on Guam and her dedication to our community. Ms. Pangelinan is the President of International Distributors, Inc. (IDI) and has been named the U.S. Small Business Administration's Jeffrey Butland Family-Owned Business of the Year for 2010.

A native daughter of Guam, Shana is the second oldest of five children of Frank C. and Annie P. Guzman. Shana graduated from the Academy of Our Lady of Guam High School and attended the University of San Francisco in California as a Business Management major. She returned home to Guam in 1993 and worked with her father, Frank, who established IDI, and learned from him the best practices which allowed Shana to take over management when he passed away in 2000. Under Shana's direction and leadership, IDI continues to thrive.

With the same passion and conviction Shana demonstrates for her business, she dedicates her time and talents to her three children and their school activities. She has served as the Finance Committee Co-Chair for Mercy Heights Nursery School and contributes to the community as a member of the Board of Trustees for the Department of Chamorro Affairs and through organizations such as Hurao, Inc., a non-profit organization whose mission is to perpetuate the Chamorro language and culture. To assist & promote Hurao, Shana has developed her own Chamorro immersion program. With her leadership, IDI continues to support our community by donating produce to various charitable organizations, including Catholic Social Services, Guma' San Jose, Alee Shelter, Department of Youth Affairs, and the Tamuning Senior Citizens Center. Shana also continues her father's legacy by ensuring IDI remains an active member & supporter of the Micronesian Chefs' Association, an organization of which her late father was a founding member, supporting the education and talents of young local chefs.

It is on the occasion of her recognition by the U.S. Small Business Administration as their Jeffrey Butland Family-Owned Business of the Year for 2010, that I join the people of Guam in acknowledging her service and outstanding leadership in our business community.

RECOGNIZING MR. JACK CHAN AS THE U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION'S MINORITY CHAMPION OF THE YEAR FOR 2010

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Jack Chan for his leadership and advocacy in support of minority small business owners. Mr. Chan is the Vice President of Kwong Hwa Trading Co. and is the U.S. Small Business Administration's ''Minority Champion of the Year'' for 2010.

Jack was born in Hong Kong in 1972 to Ping Chan and King Ng. He attended elementary school in Hong Kong before relocating with his parents and five siblings to Guam in 1985. He attended John F. Kennedy High School and completed a one year Tourism Vocational Program at Guam Community College during his final year of high school. Jack continued his educational pursuits at the University of Guam, graduating with a Bachelor's degree in Business Administration in Marketing in 1997 while helping to maintain his family's business and working at a local tour agency.

Jack serves as Vice President of Kwong Hwa Trading, and under his leadership, the company continues to work closely with other businesses, suppliers and local government agencies and non-profit organizations to support the local community.

Jack's hard work, dedication and industrious nature have earned him the respect of business leaders in our community and in the western Pacific region. His efforts on the Board of Directors of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce of Guam (CCCG) have made a difference in the participation of other minority business owners and associates as CCCG members. A CCCG Member since the organization's inception, Jack is actively involved in its annual events and activities. Jack's participation in CCCG has helped to raise support and awareness for local organizations such as the Big Brothers and Big Sisters Club of Guam and the American Red Cross Guam Chapter.

It is on the occasion of his recognition by the U.S. Small Business Administration as Minority Champion of the Year for 2010, that I join the people of Guam to acknowledge his service and outstanding leadership in our community.

RECOGNIZING MR. ARTHUR F. MESA AS VETERAN SMALL BUSINESS CHAMPION OF THE YEAR FOR 2010

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Arthur F. Mesa for his years of civic engagement, leadership and advocacy for Guam's veterans. Mr. Mesa, known to his family and friends as ''Art,'' is Editor and Publisher of the Guam Veterans News, host of K-57's radio show, ''Vet Talk,'' and was recently named the U.S. Small Business Administration's ''Veteran Small Business Champion of the Year for 2010.''

Art served in the Vietnam War from 1970 to 1971 as a member of the U.S. Army's 101st Airborne Division. He is a 35-year resident of Guam. Following his service in the U.S. Army, Art worked in sales and in 1985, founded Independent Trading Company trading food products, appliances, and construction materials from the mainland to Guam and Micronesia. From 1989 to 1996, Art opened and operated Eagle Freight Services—which provided air freight services through five offices from Guam to the Midwest United States. From 1999 to 2006, Art co-founded and managed Auto Services 2000.

Art has become a prominent figure in our community and serves as a Board Member for the Pacific Island Microcredit Institute, an organization that provides microloans to veterans and individuals at poverty level seeking self sufficiency and business opportunities. A strong and dynamic advocate for Guam's veterans' community, Art volunteers his time to educate veterans on a variety of issues including programs, benefits, health care, legal rights and national representation.

Art's involvement in the veteran community has been recognized by various organizations. Art served as the Master of Ceremonies for Guam's Annual Veterans Day Memorial Program in 2009 and was a recipient of the Rotary Club of Tumon Bay's ''Service Above Self Award'' for his commitment to our island's veterans. An avid motorcycle rider, Art is a member of the Guam Veterans Harley Davidson Organization, which provides motorcade escorts for funerals of fallen soldiers and conducts other philanthropic activities such as distributing holiday treats to children on Guam during their annual Christmas motorcades.

It is on the occasion of his recognition by the U.S. Small Business Administration as their Veteran Small Business Champion of the Year for 2010, that I join the people of Guam to acknowledge him for his service and his commitment to our veteran community.

CONGRATULATING THE ARCADIA HIGH SCHOOL CONSTITITION TEAM

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Arcadia High School, AHS, Constitution Team on their first place finish in the 23rd annual ''We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution,'' contest which was held in Washington, DC this past weekend and concluded Monday evening.

The AHS team represented the entire state of California in the competition, which tests students' knowledge of the U.S. Constitution, the Bill of Rights and American democracy. After spending time with this outstanding group of students last week, I was confident they would take their knowledge of and dedication to learning about the Constitution and turn it into a great win for Arcadia and California.

After winning local and state competitions, these students proved themselves champions at the final competition here in our nation's capital. The City of Arcadia and the entire San Gabriel Valley should be very proud of these outstanding students.

On Monday, after three days of simulated congressional hearings testing the students' knowledge of constitutional principles, which were judged by a panel of constitutional scholars, lawyers, journalists and government leaders, the AHS team was announced the winners of this year's competition.

I believe very firmly in the tremendous importance of understanding our history and the principles on which our nation was founded. These students should be commended for their mastery of our founding documents and the words of our founding fathers, and I enthusiastically congratulate them on their success.

The AHS Constitution Team's victory is a testament not just to the hard work and dedication of these students, but also the guidance and commitment of their teacher Kevin Fox and coaches Gary Kovacic, Jim Romo, Bob Garrett and Karyn McCreary.

The members of the AHS Constitution Team are: Robel Abdella, Wini Addanki, Pallavi Bugga, Madyson Cassidy, Andrew Chang, Winston Chang, Greg Chen, Ruodi Duan, Daphne Fan, Kathy Garcia, Jamie Griswold, Derek Ha, Jennifer Hang, Lauren Hanna, Frank Huang, Rayla Hylbom, Michael Kallin, Amanda Kallis, Jesse Li, Andrew Lin, Sangavi Pari, Tim Semenov, Joanna Shen, Kiko Sunata, Bonnie Tam, Andrew Taylor, Catherine Tong and Shen Wang.

RECOGNIZING MS. LINDA TUNG AS THE U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION'S WOMEN IN BUSINESS CHAMPION OF THE YEAR FOR 2010

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Linda Tung for her entrepreneurial leadership and mentorship in the women's business community on Guam. Ms. Tung is the President and Founder of GIT International Tours and was recently named the U.S. Small Business Administration's Women in Business Champion of the Year for 2010.

Linda was born and raised in Taiwan and is fluent in English, Japanese, Mandarin Chinese and Taiwanese. Following her graduation from high school in 1966, she began working for a number of leading in-bound travel agencies in Taipei.

Linda married Dr. Frank C. Tung in 1976 and after traveling throughout the United States for educational opportunities, the couple settled on Guam in 1985. Since that time, Linda served as Guam Operations Manager of Japan Travel Land and established GIT International Tours, Inc. Since its inception, GIT Tours has successfully provided various services to more than 320,000 visitors from Taiwan (R.O.C.), Hong Kong, Shanghai, Beijing, Honcho, Liaoning and the Philippines.

Linda's thirty years of experience have proved invaluable as Chairwoman of the Tourism Committee of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce of Guam. She works in partnership with members of the Guam Visitors Bureau,

the Office of the Governor of Guam, Government of Guam agencies, Guam Hotel & Restaurant Association, Chinese Chamber of Commerce of Guam and United Chinese Association of Guam, as well as numerous agencies in the Asia-Pacific region to promote Guam as a premier, family-oriented tourist destination in the Western Pacific.

Linda often volunteers to help aspiring entrepreneurs on Guam. In addition, Linda has created opportunities for her female employees to engage in in-house cross-training to develop their leadership skills and expertise in all facets of the tour business. A number of her former female employees have continued to pursue their education and other career opportunities and are now recognized as leaders in their respective communities. As a mentor for women in the business community, Linda is a sounding board and colleague for many women seeking to emulate her success.

It is on the occasion of her recognition by the U.S. Small Business Administration as their Women in Business Champion of the Year for 2010, that I join the people of Guam to acknowledge her service and outstanding leadership in our business community.

RECOGNIZING MR. FONG S. WU AS THE U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION'S PERSON OF THE YEAR FOR 2010

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Fong S. Wu for his years of community involvement and service on Guam. Mr. Wu is the President and Chief Executive Officer of Sunny Plastic (Guam) Inc. and Pacific Sunny Group of Companies. He was recently named the U.S. Small Business Administration's ''Person of the Year'' for 2010.

Fong is currently the Managing Partner and Chief Executive Officer of LTA, LLC., and is responsible for corporate planning and the operation of Ladera Towers, a luxury hotel/condominium. He is also Managing Partner and Chief Executive Officer of PacSun Investments, responsible for all strategic initiatives of its real estate investment projects. In addition, Fong is Managing Partner of Pago Bay Resort, LLC.

Raised on the island of Guam, Fong is a valuable member of our community and is an officer and founding member of Guam's Chinese Chamber of Commerce. He has also served as the Chairman for the Guam Chinese School Foundation, President of the Chinese School Board of Guam and President and member of the Board of the United Chinese Association of Guam. Fong has held public office as Secretary and member of the Board of Directors for the Guam Economic Development Authority, as well as the Overseas Compatriot Affairs Commissioner of the Republic of China. He was appointed by Governor Felix Camacho of Guam as an Ambassador of Goodwill to foster better economic ties between Guam and Taiwan.

Fong strives for excellence in business and in all aspects of life. He has taken a leadership role in fundraising, contributing time and energy towards various non-profit and community organizations. His service spans a wide range of organizations including the American Red Cross, Make a Wish Foundation, Fo Guan Shan Temple, University of Guam Endowment Foundation, University of Guam Board of Regents, Guam Memorial Hospital Volunteer Association, Guam Hotel & Restaurant Association, Guam Visitors Bureau, Filipino Community of Guam, Korean Ladies' Association of Guam, Rotary of Guam Sunrise, International Women's Club of Guam, and the Guam Society of America among others.

It is on the occasion of his recognition by the U.S. Small Business Administration as Person of the Year for 2010, that I join the people of Guam to acknowledge him for his commendable service and leadership in our community.

RECOGNIZING MR. KEVEN CAMACHO AS THE U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION'S FINANCIAL SERVICES CHAMPION OF THE YEAR FOR 2010

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 2010

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Keven Camacho for his community engagement, support, and assistance for small business owners on Guam. As the Vice President/Northern Regional Manager for the Bank of Guam, Mr. Camacho was recently named the Guam Small Business Administration's Financial Services Champion of the Year for 2010.

Keven earned his degree in Finance from Arizona State University in 1996 and soon began his career as a Management Trainee with the Bank of Guam. In 1997, Keven was promoted to Credits Officer, specializing in consumer loans and real estate. Continuing his advancement with the Bank of Guam, he was promoted as Branch Manager of their Tumon, Belau and Mangilao Branches. He later graduated in 2003 from the Pacific Coast Banking School at the University of Washington, completing an intensive two-year Masters-level extension program for senior officers in the banking industry. Additionally, Keven received his Masters in Business Administration from the University of Guam in 2006.

In his current role, Keven assists small businesses in our community in identifying opportunities for growth. Over his 13-year career with the Bank of Guam, Keven's hard work and dedication have helped to advance the interests of small businesses on Guam.

Keven uses his education and years of experience to serve our community by providing assistance with the grant funded Guam Options for Alternative Loans for Assistive Technology (GOAL-AT) and Get Guam Teleworking (GGT) programs. These programs provide loans to individuals with disabilities to assist them with starting home-based businesses. Keven not only provides technical assistance to these organizations but assists in outreach and presentations to various disability and senior citizen events, educating them about these programs, resources and the loan process. Keven also serves on the board of the Felix M. Camacho and Carlos G. Camacho Scholarship, a non-profit organization that offers up to four $1,000 scholarships annually to qualified participants. Keven's business background, professional advocacy, and his outstanding spirit of community, are, and will continue to be, valuable assets to our island community.

It is on the occasion of his recognition by the U.S. Small Business Administration as Financial Services Champion of the Year for 2010, that I join the people of Guam in acknowledging his service and outstanding leadership in our community.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2673–S2713

Measures Introduced: Seven bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3261–3267, S. Res. 501–502, and S. Con. Res. 61. **Page S2708**

Measures Passed:

National Child Abuse Prevention Month: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 498, designating April 2010 as ''National Child Abuse Prevention Month'', and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S2712**

Sexual Assault Awareness Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 501, recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of Sexual Assault Awareness Month. **Pages S2712–13**

Measures Considered:

Restoring American Financial Stability Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 3217, to promote the financial stability of the United States by improving accountability and transparency in the financial system, to end ''too big to fail'', to protect the American taxpayer by ending bailouts, to protect consumers from abusive financial services practices. **Pages S2680–S2707**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Thursday, April 29, 2010. **Page S2707**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on April 26, 2010, was agreed to. **Page S2697**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on April 26, 2010, was agreed to. **Page S2697**

By 57 yeas to 41 nays (Vote No. 126), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having not voted in the affirmative, Senate upon reconsideration rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Pages S2697–98**

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at approximately 11 a.m., on Wednesday, April 28, 2010, with the time until 12:20 p.m., equally divided and controlled between the two Leaders, or their designees; that at 12:20 p.m., Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S2707**

Messages from the House: **Page S2707**

Measures Referred: **Pages S2707–08**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S2708**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2708–09**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S2709–11**

Additional Statements: **Page S2707**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S2711**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S2712**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—126) **Pages S2697–98**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:11 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, April 28, 2010. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2713.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

PROMOTING OUR NATIONAL PARKS AS TRAVEL DESTINATIONS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Competitiveness, Innovation, and Export Promotion concluded a hearing to examine promoting our national parks as travel destinations, after receiving testimony from Michael M. Ward, Superintendent, Voyageurs National Park, National

Park Service, and Will Shafroth, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, both of the Department of the Interior; Diane Shober, Wyoming Director of Tourism, Cheyenne; Ken Burns, Florentine Films, Walpole, New Hampshire; Scott Bacher, Carlsbad, New Mexico; and Clyde Butcher, Venice, Florida.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Philip D. Moeller, of Washington, who was introduced by Senator Murray, and Cheryl A. LaFleur, of Massachusetts, who was introduced by Senators Shaheen and Brown (MA), both to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

WATER BILLS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power concluded a hearing to examine S. 745 and H.R. 2265, bills to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Magna Water District water reuse and groundwater recharge project, S. 1138 and H.R. 2442, bills to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to expand the Bay Area Regional Water Recycling Program, S. 1573 and H.R. 2741, bills to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the City of Hermiston, Oregon, water recycling and reuse project, S. 3099, to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the American Falls Reservoir, S. 3100, to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Little Wood River Ranch, H.R. 325, to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Avra Black Wash Reclamation and Riparian Restoration Project, H.R. 637, to authorize the Secretary, in cooperation with the City of San Juan Capistrano, California, to participate in the design, planning, and construction of an advanced water treatment plant facility and recycled water system, H.R. 1120, to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Central Texas Water Recycling and Reuse Project, H.R. 1393, to amend the Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000 to authorize additional projects and activities under that Act, and H.R. 2522, to raise the ceiling on the Federal share of the cost of the Calleguas Municipal Water District Recycling Project, after receiving testimony from Kira L. Finkler, Deputy Commissioner for External and Intergovernmental Affairs, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; Timothy Quinn, Association of California Water Agencies, Sacramento; and Ed Brookshier, City of Hermiston, Oregon.

WILDLIFE AND HABITAT MANAGEMENT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Water and Wildlife concluded a hearing to examine collaborative solutions to wildlife and habitat management, after receiving testimony from Gary Frazer, Assistant Director, Endangered Species, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; Robyn Miller, Nature Conservancy, Boise, Idaho; Jeff Benoit, Restore America's Estuaries, Arlington, Virginia; and Debbie Straughn, Grove Valley Elementary School, Edmond, Oklahoma.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2971, to authorize certain authorities by the Department of State, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3087, to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nomination of Mari Carmen Aponte, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of El Salvador, Department of State.

WALL STREET AND THE FINANCIAL CRISIS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations concluded a hearing to examine Wall Street and the financial crisis, focusing on the role of investment banks, after receiving testimony from Josh Birnbaum, Tilden Park Capital Management, and Michael Swenson, David A. Viniar, Craig Broderick, and Lloyd C. Blankfein, all of New York, New York, and Fabrice Tourre, London, England, all of the Goldman Sachs Group, Inc; and Daniel L. Sparks, New Canaan, Connecticut.

ENFORCING SAFETY IN MINES AND OTHER DANGEROUS WORKPLACES

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine putting safety first, focusing on strengthening enforcement and creating a culture of compliance at mines and other dangerous workplaces, after receiving testimony from Joseph A. Main, Assistant Secretary for

Mine Safety and Health, and David Michaels, Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health, both of the Department of Labor; Cecil E. Roberts, United Mine Workers of America (UMWA), Triangle, Virginia; Jeffrey Harris, Patriot Coal Company, Farley, West Virginia; Wes Addington, Appalachian Citizens' Law Center, Whitesburg, Kentucky; Bruce Watzman, National Mining Association (NMA), Washington, D.C.; Peg Seminario, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrialized Organizations (AFL–CIO) Bethesda, Maryland; Michael Brandt, American Industrial Hygiene Association (AIHA), Los Alamos, New Mexico; Kelli Heflin, Scott's Liquid Gold, Denver, Colorado; and Holly Shaw, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Homeland Security, after receiving testimony from Janet Napolitano, Secretary of Homeland Security.

SMALL BUSINESS INTERNET ACCESS

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Federal efforts to expand small business Internet access, after receiving testimony from former Senator Gordon H. Smith, on behalf of the National Association of Broadcasters; former Representative Steve Largant, on behalf of CTIA–The Wireless Association; Julius Genachowski, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; Lawrence E. Strickling, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information, National Telecommunications and Information Administration; Jonathan Adelstein, Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture; Susan Walthall, Acting Chief Counsel, Office of Advocacy, and Sean J. Greene, Associate Administrator for Investment, both of the Small Business Administration; Terry Huval, Lafeyette City-Parish Consolidated Government, Lafeyette, Louisiana, on behalf of the American Public Power Association; and Steve Friedman, American Cable Association, and Thomas A. Gerke, CenturyLink, both of Washington, D.C.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 16 public bills, H.R. 5143–5158; and 6 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 268–269; and H. Res. 1301–1304 were introduced. **Pages H2935–36**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2936–37**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 1300, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5013) to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for performance management of the defense acquisition system (H. Rept. 111–467). **Page H2935**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Edwards (MD) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2879**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:01 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H2882**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Providing for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958: S. 3253, to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; **Pages H2895–96**

Supporting the goals and ideals of Global Youth Service Day: H. Res. 1240, amended, to support the goals and ideals of Global Youth Service Day; **Pages H2896–98**

Expressing support for the goals and ideals of National Child Abuse Prevention Month: H. Res. 1293, amended, to express support for the goals and ideals of National Child Abuse Prevention Month; **Pages H2898–99**

Expressing support for designation of the week of April 18, 2010, through April 23, 2010, as National Assistant Principals Week: H. Res. 1131, amended, to express support for designation of the week of April 18, 2010, through April 23, 2010, as National Assistant Principals Week, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 411 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 224; **Pages H2899–H2900, H2912–13**

Congratulating the Onondaga Community College Lady Lazers: H. Res. 561, to congratulate the Onondaga Community College Lady Lazers for winning the National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA) Division I Women's Lacrosse Tournament; **Pages H2904–05**

Congratulating the Onondaga Community College Lazers: H. Res. 563, to congratulate the Onondaga Community College Lazers for winning the National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA) Division I Men's Lacrosse Tournament; **Pages H2905–06**

Expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the goals and ideals of National Healthy Schools Day: H. Res. 1280, amended, to express the support of the House of Representatives for the goals and ideals of National Healthy Schools Day; **Pages H2906–07**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "Expressing support for designation of April 26, 2010, as National Healthy Schools Day." **Page H2907**

Rural Housing Preservation and Stabilization Act of 2010: H.R. 5017, amended, to ensure the availability of loan guarantees for rural homeowners, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 352 yeas to 62 nays, Roll No. 225; **Pages H2907–09, H2913**

Providing that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011: H.R. 5146, to provide that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 402 yeas to 15 nays, Roll No. 226; **Pages H2909–12, H2913–14**

Recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of Sexual Assault Awareness Month: H. Res. 1259, to recognize and support the goals and ideals of Sexual Assault Awareness Month; **Pages H2914–17**

Supporting the goals of World Intellectual Property Day: H. Res. 1208, to support the goals of World Intellectual Property Day; **Pages H2917–19**

Interstate Recognition of Notarizations Act: H.R. 3808, to require any Federal or State court to recognize any notarization made by a notary public licensed by a State other than the State where the court is located when such notarization occurs in or affects interstate commerce; and **Pages H2919–20**

Expressing support for designation of April 2010 as "National Autism Awareness Month": H. Res. 1033, amended, to express support for designation of April 2010 as "National Autism Awareness Month" and to support efforts to devote new resources to research into the causes and treatment of autism and to improve training and support for individuals with autism and those who care for individuals with autism. **Pages H2920–24**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "Expressing support for designation of April 2010 as 'National Autism Awareness Month' and supporting efforts to devote resources to research into the causes and treatment of autism and to improve training and support for individuals with autism and those who care for individuals with autism.". **Page H2924**

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed:

Supporting the goals and ideals of Workers' Memorial Day: H. Res. 375, amended, to support the goals and ideals of Workers' Memorial Day in order to honor and remember the workers who have been killed or injured in the workplace. **Pages H2900–04**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2912–13, H2913 and H2914. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Committee Meetings

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a hearing on FY 2011 Budget Request for the Election Assistance Commission. Testimony was heard from Donetta Davidson, Chair, U.S. Election Assistance Commission.

DEFENSE TRAVEL SYSTEM IMPROVING

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on Simplifying Defense Travel: Improving the Defense Travel System for the User. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Pam Mitchell, Director, Defense Travel Management Office; and David Fisher, Director, Business Transformation Agency.

ARMY RESERVE-GUARD/AIR NATIONAL GUARD TRAINING AND OPERATION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing on Fiscal Year 2011 Army Reserve, Army National Guard, and Air National Guard Training and Operations. Testimony was heard from following officials of the Department of Defense: LTG Jack Stulz, USA, Chief, U.S. Army Reserve; MG Raymond W. Carpenter, USA, Acting Director, U.S. Army National Guard; and LTG

Harry M. Wyatt III, USAF, Director, U.S. Air National Guard.

SPECIAL FORCES ROTARY WING AIRCRAFT SHORTFALLS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities held a hearing on Closing the Gap: Addressing Critical Rotary Wing Shortfalls for U.S. Special Operations Forces in Fiscal Year 2011 and Beyond. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: COL Vincent Reap, USA, Director, Maritime and Rotary Wing Assessment, U.S. Special Operations Command; and Garry Reid, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Special Operations and Combating Terrorism.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Ordered reported the following bills: H.R. 5017, amended, Rural Housing Preservation and Stabilization Act of 2010; H.R. 2336, amended, GREEN Act of 2009; H.R. 5072, amended, FHA Reform Act of 2010, H.R. 2555, amended, Homeowners' Defense Act of 2009; H.R. 1264, Multiple Peril Insurance Act of 2009; and H.R. 5114, amended, Flood Insurance Reform Priorities Act of 2010.

RUSSIA TRADE RESTRICTION REPEAL

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Europe and the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Trade held a joint hearing on A Relic of the Cold War: Is It Time to Repeal Jackson-Vanik for Russia? Testimony was heard from Stephen Sestanovich, former Ambasssador-at-Large and Special Adviser to the Secretary of State for the new Independent States; and public witnesses.

FEMA BUDGET PRIORITIES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Emergency Communications, Preparedness, and Response held a hearing entitled "FEMA's FY 2011 Priorities and Beyond: Aligning Budget, Mission, and Vision." Testimony was heard from W. Craig Fugate, Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security.

CIVIL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law held a hearing on H.R. 3764, Civil Access to Justice Act of 2009. Testimony was heard from Senator Harkin; Representative Scott of Virginia; the following officials of the Legal Services Corporation: John G. Levi, Chairman, Board of Directors; and Jeffrey E. Schanz, Inspector General; and public witnesses.

MARINE MAMMALS IN CAPTIVITY

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, Oceans and Wildlife held an oversight hearing entitled "Marine Mammals in Captivity: What Constitutes Meaningful Public Education." Testimony was heard from Representative Grayson; Eric Schwaab, Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA, Department of Commerce; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 2986, National Capital Region Land Conservation Act of 2009; H.R. 3923, Sugar Loaf Protection District Land Exchange Act of 2009; H.R. 3967, To amend the National Great Black Americans Commemoration Act of 2004 to authorize appropriations through fiscal year 2015; H.R. 3989, Heart Mountain Relocation Center Study Act of 2009; H.R. 4514, Colonel Charles Young Home Study Act; H.R. 4686, Rota Cultural and Natural Resources Study Act; and H.R. 4773, Fort Pulaski National Monument Lease Authorization Act. Testimony was heard from Representatives Moran of Virginia, Kingston, Clay, and Polis; Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Delegate, Northern Mariana Islands; Katherine Stevenson, Assistant Director, Business Services, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Greg Smith, Director, Lands, U.S. Forest Service, USDA; and public witnesses.

ARMED FORCES ACQUISITION REFORM

Committee on Rules: Granted, by a non-record vote, a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 5013, the "Implementing Management for Performance and Related Reforms to Obtain Value in Every Acquisition Act of 2010." The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI.

The rule further makes in order only those amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules. The amendments made in order may be offered only in the order printed in the Committee

report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against the amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The rule provides that the Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or a designee. Finally, the rule provides that the Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill. Testimony was herd from Chairman Skelton, and Representatives Andrews, Grayson, McKeon, Conaway and Sessions.

COAST GUARD CIVIL RIGHTS DIVERSITY INITIATIVES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing on Status of Coast Guard Civil Rights Programs and Diversity Initiatives. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security: Terri Dickerson, Director, Civil Rights Directorate; RADM Ronald T. Hewitt, Assistant Commandant, Human Resources; and RADM J. Scott Burhoe, Superintendent, U.S. Coast Guard Academy; and Laurie Ekstrand, Director, Strategic Issues, GAO.

SSA DISABILITY CLAIMS BACKLOG

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security and the Subcommittee on Income Security and Family Support held a joint hearing on SSA's large backlogs in disability claims. Testimony was heard from Representative Filner; the following officials of the SSA: Michael J. Astrue, Commissioner; and Patrick P. O'Carroll, Inspector General; Dan Bertoni, Director, Disability Issues Education, Workforce and Income Security Team, GAO; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D402)*

H.R. 4573, to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Directors at the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and other multilateral development institutions to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to cancel immediately and completely Haiti's debts to such institutions. Signed on April 26, 2010. (Public Law 111–158)

H.R. 4887, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that health coverage provided by the Department of Defense is treated as minimal essential coverage. Signed on April 26, 2010. (Public Law 111–159)

S.J. Res. 25, granting the consent and approval of Congress to amendments made by the State of Maryland, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the District of Columbia to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulation Compact. Signed on April 26, 2010. (Public Law 111–160)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 2010

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to hold hearings to examine a national assessment of energy policies, focusing on significant achievements since the 1970s and an examination of U.S. energy policies and goals in the coming decades, 10 a.m., SD–124.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2011 for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and for the Securities and Exchange Commission, 2:30 p.m., SD–138.

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel, to hold hearings to examine military compensation and benefits, including special and incentive pays, in review of the Defense Authorization request for fiscal year 2011 and the Future Years Defense Program, 10 a.m., SR–222.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine, to hold an oversight hearing to examine motor carrier safety efforts, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests, to hold hearings to examine S. 1241, to amend Public Law 106–206 to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to require annual permits and assess annual fees for commercial filming activities on Federal land for film crews of 5 persons or fewer, S. 1571 and H.R. 1043, bills to provide for a land exchange involving certain National Forest System lands in the Mendocino National Forest in the State of California, S. 2762, to designate certain lands in San Miguel, Ouray, and San Juan Counties, Colorado, as wilderness, S. 3075, to withdraw certain Federal land and interests in that land from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws and disposition under the mineral

and geothermal leasing laws, S. 3185, to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Elko County, Nevada, and to take land into trust for the Te-moak Tribe of Western Shoshone Indians of Nevada, and H.R. 86, to eliminate an unused lighthouse reservation, provide management consistency by incorporating the rocks and small islands along the coast of Orange County, California, into the California Coastal National Monument managed by the Bureau of Land Management, and meet the original Congressional intent of preserving Orange County's rocks and small islands, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to resume hearings to examine Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization, focusing on standards and assessments, 2 p.m., SD–430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, "Fire Grants Reauthorization Act of 2010", S. 2782, to provide personal jurisdiction in causes of action against contractors of the United States performing contracts abroad with respect to members of the Armed Forces, civilian employees of the United States, and United States citizen employees of companies performing work for the United States in connection with contractor activities, S. 3167, to amend title 13 of the United States Code to provide for a 5-year term of office for the Director of the Census and to provide for authority and duties of the Director and Deputy Director of the Census, S. 3249, to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to reauthorize the predisaster hazard mitigation program and for other purposes, S. 3196, to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to provide that certain transition services shall be available to eligible candidates before the general election, H.R. 1454, to provide for the issuance of a Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp, H.R. 1345, to amend title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the discriminatory treatment of the District of Columbia under the provisions of law commonly referred to as the "Hatch Act", H.R. 2092, to amend the National Children's Island Act of 1995 to expand allowable uses for Kingman and Heritage Islands by the District of Columbia, S. 3066, to correct the application of the Non-Foreign Area Retirement Equity Assurance Act of 2009 (5 U.S.C. 5304 note) to employees paid saved or retained rates, H.R. 3978, to amend the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept and use gifts for otherwise authorized activities of the Center for Domestic Preparedness that are related to preparedness for and response to terrorism, S. Res. 481, expressing the sense of the Senate that public servants should be commended for their dedication and continued public service to the Nation during Public Service Recognition Week, May 3 through 9, 2010, S. 3200, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 23 Genesee Street in Hornell, New York, as the "Zachary Smith Post Office Building", S. 3012 and H.R. 4425, bills to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2–116th Street in North Troy, New York, as the "Martin G. 'Marty' Mahar Post Office", H.R. 4214, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 45300 Portola Avenue in Palm Desert, California, as the "Roy Wilson Post Office", S. 2945 and H.R. 3250, bills 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", H.R. 3634, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 109 Main Street in Swifton, Arkansas, as the "George Kell Post Office", H.R. 4624, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 125 Kerr Avenue in Rome City, Indiana, as the "SPC Nicholas Scott Hartge Post Office", S. 3013 and H.R. 4628, bills to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 216 Westwood Avenue in Westwood, New Jersey, as the "Sergeant Christopher R. Hrbek Post Office Building", and the nominations of Todd E. Edelman, Milton C. Lee, Jr., and Judith Anne Smith, all to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, Dana Katherine Bilyeu, of Nevada, and Michael D. Kennedy, of Georgia, both to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, and Dennis P. Walsh, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the Special Panel on Appeals, and any pending calendar business, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Contracting Oversight, to hold an oversight hearing to examine contract management at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Robert Neil Chatigny, of Connecticut, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, and John A. Gibney, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, on Drug Safety, 10:30 a.m., 2362A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, on FY 2011 Budget Request for the GSA, 10:30 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, on FY 2011 Budget Overview: National Institutes of Health, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces, hearing on Air Mobility Programs, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing on Whistleblower and Victims' Rights Provision of H.R. 2067, Protecting America's Workers Act, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Consumer Protection, hearing entitled "Public Sales of Hurricane Katrina/Rita FEMA Trailers: Are They Safe or Environmental Time Bombs?" 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing on Clean Energy Policies That Reduce Our Dependence on Oil, 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Antibiotic Resistance and the Threat to Public Health'', 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, hearing entitled ''Legislative Proposals to Preserve Public Housing,'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade, hearing entitled '' Promoting Small and Micro Enterprise in Haiti,'' 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled '' Reviewing FinCEN Oversight Reports,'' 2 p.m., 2220 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 4128, Conflict Minerals Trade Act; H.R. 5138, International Megan's Law of 2010; H.R. 4801, Global Science Program for Security, Competitiveness, and Diplomacy Act of 2010; H.R. 5139, Extending Immunities to the Office of the High Representative and the International Civilian Office in Kosovo Act of 2010; and S. 1067, Lord's Resistance Army Disarmament and North Uganda Recovery Act of 2009, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on House Administration, to consider a Committee resolution relating to energy demonstration projects; followed by a hearing on Oversight of the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Chief Administrative Officer and Inspector General of the House of Representatives, 11 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, hearing on H.R. 2695, Credit Card Fair Fee Act of 2009, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security and Foreign Affairs, hearing entitled ''The Rise of the Drones II: Examining the Legality of Unmanned Targeting,'' 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, to consider H.R. 2499, Puerto Rico Democracy Act of 2009, 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science and Technology, to consider the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, hearing entitled ''Evaluating the Impact of Small Business Trade Policy on Job Creation and Economic Growth,'' 1 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, to continue hearings on Protecting and Restoring America's Great Waters, Part II: The Columbia River and San Francisco Bay, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence, executive, briefing on Hot Spots, 1 p.m., 304 HVC.

Joint Meetings

Conference: meeting of conferees on H.R. 2194, to amend the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 to enhance United States diplomatic efforts with respect to Iran by expanding economic sanctions against Iran, 1 p.m., SVC–210/212.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, April 28

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 90 minutes), Senate will continue consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 3217, Restoring American Financial Stability Act, and after a period of debate, vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at 12:20 p.m.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

10 a.m., Wednesday, April 28

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 5013—IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue.

HOUSE

Adler, John H., N.J., E676
Akin, W. Todd, Mo., E684
Becerra, Xavier, Calif., E682
Berkley, Shelley, Nev., E669
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E686, E687, E687, E687, E688, E688
Carson, André, Ind., E671, E681
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E684
Doyle, Michael F., Pa., E675
Dreier, David, Calif., E687
Ellison, Keith, Minn., E669
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E683
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E672
Faleomavaega, Eni F.H., American Samoa, E680
Giffords, Gabrielle, Ariz., E679
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E669
Israel, Steve, N.Y., E677, E677, E678, E679, E679, E680, E681, E682, E683, E684
Johnson, Sam, Tex., E670, E672, E674, E677, E678, E680, E681, E682, E683, E686
Johnson, Timothy V., Ill., E678, E684
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E677, E685
Latham, Tom, Iowa, E669, E670
Latta, Robert E., Ohio, E670, E671, E674, E676, E678, E679, E680, E682, E682, E684
McNerney, Jerry, Calif., E678
Owens, William L., N.Y., E671
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E674, E686
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E670, E671, E671, E671, E672, E673, E674, E675, E675, E676
Skelton, Ike, Mo., E680, E681, E685
Smith, Lamar, Tex., E683
Speier, Jackie, Calif., E677
Spratt, John M., Jr., S.C., E676
Stupak, Bart, Mich., E675, E679
Sutton, Betty, Ohio, E676
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E684
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E682

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.