

Unfortunately, this occurs far too frequently. Last fall, an investigation by the Boston Globe found that 48 percent of the seafood it sampled from grocery stores and restaurants in the Boston area was not the species that was advertised. Subsequent investigations in Los Angeles and Miami this year produced similar results. These shocking revelations of seafood fraud have exposed a severe shortcoming in the ability of our nation to ensure the integrity of seafood products offered for sale, especially the 85 percent of those products that come from abroad.

In addition to problems with seafood fraud uncovered by these recent reports, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported last year that we are doing a terrible job ensuring that seafood imported into this country is safe for people to consume. GAO found that the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), which is responsible for ensuring seafood safety, inspects only 2 percent of seafood shipments, and that failure to coordinate with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) Seafood Inspection Service has led to hundreds of redundant inspections. This unnecessary duplication of effort is unacceptable, especially as difficult fiscal circumstances have squeezed the budgets of both agencies.

The Safety And Fraud Enforcement for Seafood Act, or SAFE Seafood Act—which I am introducing today along with Mr. FRANK and Mr. KEATING of Massachusetts, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. COURTNEY of Connecticut—addresses the seafood safety problem by ensuring that FDA and NOAA work together to maximize the frequency and effectiveness of seafood inspections, and to prevent unsafe seafood from entering the United States. In addition, it combats seafood fraud by requiring that information such as harvest location, production method, and species name of the seafood stays with that product from sea to sale. The SAFE Seafood Act accomplishes these goals by holding violators accountable with fines and import restrictions if they don't play by the rules.

American consumers have an expectation that the seafood they buy for their families is, in fact, the seafood that is advertised, and that it is safe for them to eat. Similarly, American fishermen, who comply with the most rigorous conservation and quality control standards anywhere in the world, should know they are competing on a level playing field, and not being undercut by an inferior foreign product. Fraudulent and unsafe seafood takes money from consumers and puts their health at risk. The SAFE Seafood Act is an important step toward reducing seafood fraud and increasing seafood safety. We owe it to American families and fishermen to address these problems immediately.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING FUNDING

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 2012

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I understand that these are tough budget times and we have to make a lot of cuts if we're going to balance the budget. However, I also believe that we have to make every possible

effort to retain adequate levels of funding for public broadcasting.

This March, I signed letters to two Appropriations Subcommittees in an attempt to protect funding for public broadcasting. For decades, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) has aired educational programs and helped our children to learn to read, to understand basic math, and to engage in the study of science. It would be a shame to deny the next generation beneficial programs like Reading Rainbow, Sesame Street, and Bill Nye the Science Guy because of budget problems.

Public broadcasting is more than education though. Even as newspapers are shuttering, trying to compete with the internet, 38 million people still listen to National Public Radio (NPR) every week. In Alaska, many communities rely on public broadcasting. The majority of our state can be described as remote and many Alaskans get their news exclusively from a single radio or television station. Fourteen stations, nearly half of those in Alaska, are critically dependent on federal funding and would likely close their doors if they lost that money. This would effectively strand numerous Alaskan communities, leaving them cut off from any form of news or even emergency communications.

I support the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, National Public Radio, and the Public Telecommunications Facilities Program. Funding these programs is not just good for the country, it is vital.

THE TRUE COST OF COAL ACT OF 2012

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 2012

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the True Cost of Coal Act of 2012 that protects the American taxpayer from bearing the costs of transporting coal for private companies to sell. If you were to listen to the coal companies, you would hear them decry the decline in domestic coal consumption. And while it is true that our domestic appetite for coal is waning, much of the rest of the world is still hungry for it.

U.S. coal producers and suppliers are considering the construction of up to 9 coal export terminals in Washington and Oregon. These terminals will have a combined annual export capacity of 170 million tons of coal. To put this in perspective, the U.S. exported just 26 million tons of coal in 2011. This sharp increase in coal exports will be transported primarily through Oregon and my home State of Washington. Without question, this staggering increase will have serious implications on the Northwest's environment, safety, commerce, and public health.

But what does it take to ship 170 million tons of coal through the Pacific Northwest annually? We're talking about a 1.5 mile long train packed with coal travelling thousands of times a year next to pristine waterfronts and through cities along the Puget Sound—each train spewing up to 500 pounds of toxic coal dust into the environment while increasing traffic on already congested rail tracks. These trains will run straight through the heart of my district, the city of Seattle, wreaking havoc on

people's health, the environment, commerce and shipping, and traffic. All of these costs will be endured for the sake of transporting coal that we get no benefit from.

And who will pay for this added cost? Without legislation like this, the taxpayers will pay the costs of mitigating the negative impacts of coal. As traffic increases, and public health risks are exacerbated, coal companies will continue to reap the profits of cheap coal, mined from public lands, and remain largely free from responsibility for any of the negative impacts. This means that States and local governments will need to raise taxes to pay for the additional crossings, the environmental cleanup, and increased health costs. It is time we opened our eyes to the true cost of coal.

This legislation would impose a 10 dollar per ton excise tax on all extracted coal. This money will go to mitigating the negative impacts of coal transportation, and ensure the true cost of coal is paid for by the responsible parties, and not the taxpayers. The money is allocated to the affected States, who are in the best position to determine how best to use their funds.

Make no mistake, these coal exports are not about jobs, they are about profits. The U.S. Energy Information Agency (EIA) estimates that it costs about \$20 per ton to ship coal mined from the Powder River Basin to the Pacific Northwest. The EIA also has data that shows the average price per ton of coal exports is \$148 per ton. I cannot emphasize enough that none of the profits will go to helping the affected communities.

It's time we shine a light on the true cost of coal and protect the American taxpayer from the negative impacts of transporting coal through our States. I have dedicated my career to keeping Washington and the Northwest a place where the environment, public health and efficient transportation do not get trumped by narrow interests. In 1980, I led the successful "Don't Waste Washington" initiative, to keep Washington from becoming the country's nuclear waste dumping ground, and 30 years later I remain just as committed to keeping it that way.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF WILLIAM A. SILVERMAN

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 2012

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of publicist, William A. Silverman.

Born in Toledo, Ohio, Bill was the son of an editor at the Cleveland News. Upon graduating from Centre College of Kentucky and the University of Madrid, he wrote for the Army's Stars and Stripes publication during the Korean War. He also spent five years covering the police beat, and worked for several different public relations firms before opening his own firm, Silverman and Co.

In the 1960s, Bill worked on the mayoral campaigns of Ralph Perk and Seth Taft; his work on Taft's campaign earned him a public relations position with Mayor Stokes and a grant from the nonprofit Greater Cleveland Associated Foundation. Soon after beginning work with Stokes, Silverman opened the Silverman and Co. public relations firm in downtown Cleveland, OH. Together with Stokes, he